



U.S. Department of Justice

OVW

Office on Violence Against Women

Working Together to End the Violence

S•T•O•P Program

**Services • Training • Officers
• Prosecutors**

2008 Report

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acknowledgments..... | 1 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Background..... | 5 |
| Statutory Purpose Areas of STOP Program..... | 5 |
| Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds..... | 6 |
| Eligibility Requirements | 7 |
| Reporting Requirements | 8 |
| Reporting Methods..... | 9 |
| STOP Program 2006: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds..... | 11 |
| 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..... | 14 |
| Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds | 14 |
| Types of Victimitizations Addressed by Funded Projects | 15 |
| Effectiveness of the STOP Program | 17 |
| Coordinated Community Response | 17 |
| Training..... | 20 |
| Victim Services..... | 24 |
| Underserved Populations | 26 |
| American Indians and Alaska Natives | 28 |
| Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Victims/survivors Who Are Older .. | 29 |
| Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees | 33 |
| Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas | 35 |
| The Criminal Justice Response: Specialized Units, Policies and Protocols, Data Collection and Communication Systems | 36 |
| Law enforcement..... | 37 |
| Prosecution | 39 |
| Courts | 44 |
| Probation Supervision | 46 |
| Data Collection and Communication Systems | 48 |
| Sexual Assault..... | 50 |
| Stalking..... | 52 |
| Remaining Areas of Need | 54 |
| STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments..... | 57 |
| Training | 57 |
| Coordinated Community Response..... | 59 |
| Policies | 60 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Products | 61 |
| Data Collection and Communication Systems | 61 |
| Specialized Units | 62 |
| System Improvement..... | 62 |
| Victim Services | 63 |
| Demographics of Victims/survivors Served..... | 64 |
| Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors..... | 66 |
| Protection Orders..... | 67 |
| Criminal Justice..... | 68 |
| Law Enforcement | 68 |
| Prosecution | 68 |
| Courts..... | 69 |
| Probation..... | 70 |
| References | 73 |
| Appendix A. STOP Program Funding Allocation and Distribution: 2006 | 79 |
| Table A1. Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2006 | 81 |
| Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2006 | 83 |
| Appendix B. STOP Program-Funded Activities and Victims/survivors Served: 2006..... | 85 |
| Table B1. Number of awards reported by activities funded, by state | 87 |
| Table B2. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state..... | 89 |
| Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state..... | 91 |
| Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/ who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving services, by state..... | 93 |
| Table B5. Victim’s relationship to offender, by state | 95 |
| List of Tables | |
| Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2006..... | 12 |
| Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2006 | 14 |
| Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2006..... | 15 |
| Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by funded projects in 2006 | 16 |
| Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly/monthly meetings with in 2006..... | 20 |
| Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2006—selected professional positions | 23 |
| Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2006 | 24 |
| Table 8. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2006 | 45 |
| Table 9. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2006 | 46 |
| Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2006..... | 57 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2006..... | 58 |
| Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2006..... | 59 |
| Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2006..... | 60 |
| Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2006..... | 61 |
| Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2006..... | 62 |
| Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2006..... | 62 |
| Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2006..... | 62 |
| Table 18. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2006..... | 63 |
| Table 19. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006, by level of service and type of victimization..... | 63 |
| Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2006, by type of victimization..... | 64 |
| Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006..... | 64 |
| Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006..... | 64 |
| Table 23. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2006..... | 66 |
| Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006..... | 67 |
| Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2006..... | 67 |
| Table 26. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program in 2006..... | 68 |
| Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related charges by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2006..... | 69 |
| Table 28. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2006..... | 70 |
| Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff, by type and number of contacts in 2006..... | 71 |
| Table 30. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2006..... | 71 |

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 participated in meetings with the Muskie School staff during site visits and shared information about the impact of STOP Program funding in their states and communities. Information gathered during these visits, and narrative data reported by STOP administrators and subgrantees, have added significant depth and detail to this report, providing specific examples of the STOP Program's accomplishments on behalf of women who are victims of violence.

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

Introduction

The STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2008 Report is submitted in fulfillment of the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide a biennial¹ 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 5) 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.² “STOP Program 2006: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar year 2006—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 57) 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 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).

¹ Prior to the Violence Against Women Act of 2005, this was an annual report.

² 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 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 and prosecution strategies and victim services.

By statute, STOP Program funds may be used for the following purposes:³

- 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;
- 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

³ VAWA 2005 added purpose areas to the STOP Program that are not included here. This report reflects STOP Program-supported activities for calendar year 2006; the new purpose areas were not implemented until Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007.

- 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; and
 - Providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters.

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 victims⁴ and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States and territories should seek to 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.

Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

The Department of Justice’s (DOJ’s) Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including

⁴ 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.

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

appropriated 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)).

The statute requires each state to distribute STOP Program funds to subgrantees for projects in each of the following areas: 25 percent to law enforcement, 25 percent to prosecution, 30 percent to victim services, and 5 percent to state and local 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)).

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.⁵ 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.⁶

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, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to the prosecution of these crimes or to obtaining protection orders; and, second, states must certify that a government entity incurs the 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 demonstrates 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).

⁵ The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the "STOP administrator(s)."

⁶ 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.

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.⁷ 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, based on the current availability of domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the population, and the 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 (28 CFR 90.23(b)).

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, and how funds will be distributed to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim services providers.

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.⁸ 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)).

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

⁸ 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)).

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 new progress report forms were designed to satisfy OVW grantees' semiannual (discretionary grant programs) and annual (the 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 in greater detail and depth to Congress 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. The Muskie School provided, and continues to provide, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms.⁹ Administrators submit data online through the Office of

⁹ 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.

Justice Programs' Grants Management System; STOP Program subgrantees submit electronic versions of the subgrantee annual reports to their state STOP administrators.¹⁰ Currently, states are required to submit both reports to OVW by March 30 of each year.

¹⁰ Numerous STOP administrators maintain databases containing data provided by subgrantees on a quarterly or semiannual basis; these administrators then use that data to prepare the annual subgrantee reports. All administrators submit the subgrantee reports to OVW on a CD.

STOP Program 2006: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,327 subgrantees from all 50 states, four of the five territories,¹¹ 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 2006. Under a cooperative agreement with OVW, the Muskie School has analyzed data from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.¹² In addition to quantitative and qualitative data derived from these annual reports, this STOP report features a number of STOP-funded programs visited by Muskie School staff during 2006.¹³ STOP Program subgrantees and STOP administrators visited by Muskie staff were asked to describe and document how VAWA funds had affected their communities' responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

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: 25 percent each to law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent to victim services, and no less than 5 percent to state and local courts (42

¹¹ Data from STOP subgrantees in Guam was received too late to be included in the aggregated database used for analysis for this report.

¹² 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 2008 STOP Program Report is the third report to contain data generated from the newer reporting forms.

¹³ States and territories visited during 2006 and early 2007 included the following: American Samoa, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, Puerto Rico, and Wyoming. The Muskie School conducted site visits to all 50 states, five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia between 1999 and the spring of 2007 to gather data and prepare reports demonstrating the effectiveness of VAWA-funded grant programs. Those reports are available at the VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative website at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stprofiles.htm>.

U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).¹⁴ Table 1 shows the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories.

Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2006

| Allocation category | Number of awards to subgrantees | Total funding in category (\$) | Percentage of total dollars awarded |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Courts | 251 | \$7,082,179 | 5 |
| Law enforcement | 942 | \$31,964,786 | 24 |
| Prosecution | 854 | \$32,901,239 | 25 |
| Victim services | 1480 | \$45,759,931 | 34 |
| Administration | N/A | \$7,345,896 | 5 |
| Other ¹⁵ | 256 | \$9,248,815 | 7 |
| Total | 3,783 | \$134,302,846 | 100 |

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A. Similar information based on Annual Progress Reports submitted by subgrantees 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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ Sixty-eight percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide

¹⁴ STOP Program funds awarded to law enforcement and prosecution agencies may be used to support victim advocates and victim witness specialists in those agencies.

¹⁵ Examples of awards reported in this category include fatality review, medical training, CCR (coordinated community response), and BIP (batterer intervention programs).

¹⁶ These staff categories include victim advocates, victim witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, and civil attorneys.

¹⁷ 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

services to victims, 45 percent used funds to provide training, 36 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 14 percent for law enforcement activities, 14 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

In 2006, 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 536,000 victims/survivors received services supported by STOP Program funds (of about 547,000 victims/survivors who sought services). Although the majority were white (58 percent), female (90 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (63 percent), close to half were identified as being of races and ethnicities other than white: Subgrantees reported that 22 percent of the victims/survivors they served were black or African American, and 17 percent were Hispanic or Latino.¹⁸ Twenty-seven percent of the victims/survivors served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims/survivors used victim advocacy (249,000), hotline calls (207,000), and crisis intervention (179,000) in greater numbers than any other services.¹⁹

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 over one-quarter of all people trained with STOP Program funds (more than 71,000 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 31,000 trained. More than 265,000 people in all were trained with STOP Program funds in 2006.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 86,000 calls for assistance, to investigate more than 106,000 incidents of violence, and to serve more than 24,500 protection orders. STOP-funded officers arrested more than 31,300 predominant aggressors and made only 1,200 dual arrests.

Prosecutors. STOP Program-funded prosecutors filed nearly 171,000 new charges during calendar year 2006, 56 percent of which were domestic violence

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.

¹⁸ These percentages are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom race/ethnicity was known. They may be undercounting the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for nearly 13 percent of victims/survivors was reported as unknown for this reporting period. Even when subgrantees improve their data collection systems, there will still be victims/survivors for whom this information will not be known. 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.

¹⁹ Victims/survivors were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year.

misdemeanors. During the same period, prosecutors disposed of 132,000 charges, about 83,000 (63 percent) of which resulted in convictions.

Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

STOP Program funds may be used for 11 statutory purposes. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area during calendar year 2006. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2006

| Purpose area | Subgrantees (N =2,327) | |
|---|------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Victim services projects | 1,616 | 69 |
| Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors | 830 | 36 |
| Specialized units | 646 | 28 |
| Policies, protocols, orders, and services | 620 | 27 |
| Support of statewide, coordinated community responses | 383 | 16 |
| Development of data collection and communication systems | 298 | 13 |
| Assistance to victims in immigration matters | 287 | 12 |
| Stalking initiatives | 245 | 11 |
| Programs to assist older and disabled victims | 234 | 10 |
| Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners | 149 | 6 |
| Tribal populations projects | 81 | 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 2006.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Not surprisingly, given earlier discussions, the number of all domestic violence programs reported as receiving STOP Program funds was greater than that of any other program. 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.

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2006

| Type of agency | Subgrantees (N=2,327) | |
|--|-----------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Domestic violence program | 744 | 32.0 |
| Dual program | 491 | 21.1 |
| Law enforcement | 463 | 19.9 |
| Prosecution | 446 | 19.2 |
| Sexual assault program | 277 | 11.9 |
| Unit of local government | 99 | 4.3 |
| Court | 75 | 3.2 |
| Government agency | 64 | 2.8 |
| Sexual assault state coalition | 45 | 1.9 |
| Domestic violence state coalition | 43 | 1.8 |
| Probation, parole, or other correctional agency | 34 | 1.5 |
| Dual state coalition | 29 | 1.2 |
| University/school | 27 | 1.2 |
| Faith-based organization | 22 | 0.9 |
| Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program | 16 | 0.7 |
| Tribal government | 3 | 0.1 |
| Tribal coalition | 3 | 0.1 |
| Other | 175 | 7.5 |

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

Types of Victimitizations Addressed by Funded Projects

During the first four years of the STOP Program, 47 percent of projects focused on domestic violence alone, and 15 percent addressed sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking.²⁰ As of 2006, the percentage of projects focused solely on domestic violence had decreased to 34 percent, and the percentage addressing domestic violence and/or sexual assault or stalking had risen to 53.9 percent (Table 4). The combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking was 12 percent.

²⁰ STOP Annual Report 2002.

Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by funded projects in 2006

| Type of victimization | Subgrantees (N =2,327) | |
|---|------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Domestic violence only | 792 | 34.0 |
| Sexual assault only | 259 | 11.1 |
| Stalking only | 9 | .4 |
| Domestic violence and sexual assault | 364 | 15.6 |
| Domestic violence and stalking | 99 | 4.3 |
| Sexual assault and stalking | 11 | .5 |
| Domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking | 792 | 34.0 |

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 57.)

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 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 (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, 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).

The statute authorizing the STOP Program specifically authorizes support for “formal and informal multidisciplinary efforts on the state level to coordinate the responses of justice and victim services systems, as well as other state agencies, in their responses to violent crimes against women.” This level of multidisciplinary effort is exemplified in the implementation planning process that takes place in every state. The 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. One STOP administrator describes the impact of the formula for such distribution of funds in this way:

The unique feature of the STOP VAW formula is that it doesn't make law enforcement, prosecution, and victim services compete for the same funding. Due to this feature, I have seen over the last nine years working with VAW grant funds, how the coordination and collaboration between these agencies has increased and has moved to being successful in the goals of keeping victims safe and offenders accountable. These funds have allowed our state to train law enforcement on VAW issues from cadets to seasoned officers, reach out to underserved populations, guide prosecutors in prosecuting VAW cases with success, set up advocates in rural areas and in the court systems to assist victims and the community, and reach some pockets of victims from underserved communities.

– *STOP administrator, Iowa*

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. 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-funded SARTs and DARTs is illustrated in the following examples:

STOP program funding has allowed the Sexual Assault Recovery and Prevention (SARP) Center to maintain on staff a bilingual advocate to participate on the San Luis Obispo County Suspected Abuse Response Team (SART) - providing accompaniment and advocacy services to both English- and Spanish-speaking survivors - and on the multi-disciplinary SART Advisory Board, giving the agency a voice in discussing protocols and issues of concern, including the need for bilingual officers in law enforcement with representatives from local law enforcement, the district attorney's office Forensic Medical personnel and the department of Social Services. Program funding has also allowed the SART Advocate and executive director to continue work on the Bilingual Volunteer Interpreter Committee.

– *Sexual Assault Recovery and Prevention Center, California*

In 2000 we held our first conference to discuss SARTs. At that time there were none in the state. We now assist about two counties/facilities each year in developing SARTs and have a SART training module that has been presented dozens of times throughout the state. Several of the SARTs have taken the initiative to further develop services for their communities, including providing prevention activities.

– *STOP administrator, West Virginia*

Due to ongoing and consistent interaction and cross training over the past nine 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, Inc. 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.

– *Dutchess County, New York*

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 (949, or 41 percent of all subgrantees reported this), domestic violence organizations (900, or 39 percent), courts (786, or 34 percent), and prosecutors (640, or 28 percent).²¹ 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:

Carson City District Attorney's Office hired a domestic violence prosecutor to be in regular communication with victim advocates and the alternative sentencing department, consisting of agencies that monitor offenders and assist victims. This collaboration is proving to be very useful in tracking and prosecuting cases, which increases accountability of offenders and safety of victims.

– *Nevada site visit report*

In addition to collaborating with other organizations in their responses to specific victims, 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 the safety of the victim, hold the offender accountable, and 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 numbers and types of community agencies and organizations that STOP Program subgrantees met with on a weekly or monthly basis in 2006 to address systems-level issues.

²¹ Complete data on CCR activities can be found in Table 12.

Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly/monthly meetings in 2006

| Agency/organization | Subgrantees |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Domestic violence organization | 1,158 |
| Law enforcement | 1,072 |
| Prosecutor's office | 930 |
| Social service organization | 812 |
| Court | 765 |
| Sexual assault organization | 726 |

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

Collaborative efforts can change attitudes over time and lead to more prompt responses and better information for victims, as illustrated below.

Building, as it did, on a history of cooperation, this project has institutionalized a degree of collaboration that is rare. Participation in the [Riley County] Domestic Violence Task Force is purely voluntary. Now in the 11th year of existence, the Task Force is a vital group with active participation from a variety of agencies, including law enforcement, prosecution, child protective services, legal services, court services and probation and parole. Police Response Advocates On Call (PRA's) have responded with Riley County Police Department to every domestic call for seven years [meeting with the victim after the officers have secured the scene for their safety]. Controversial with the police department at the time of its inception, the PRA Program has proven to be good for victims and officers.

– *STOP administrator, Kansas*

With the STOP funding we are able to be a part of the Black Hawk County Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART). This has allowed us to work closely with officers from local police departments and with the county attorney's office. By working as a team we are able to reach more victims and provide victims with more information. We can quickly follow up with victims about their cases and answer any questions or concerns they might have. We can provide them with information about the criminal justice process, no contact orders, victim services, and so much more. The DART team has provided emotional support to victims throughout the criminal justice process too. We go to court with victims to provide support and to help insure victim safety.

– *Seeds of Hope, Iowa*

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 examples, state organizations received funding and were able to reach their respective professionals for the broadest possible impact.

[With our] STOP VAW grant . . . we have been able to fund some key statewide positions in our Area Prosecutions, Iowa Dept. of Public Health, Iowa Law Enforcement Academy, Iowa State Court Administrator's Office, and statewide coalitions (Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault). Each of these unique projects is allowed to provide training and technical assistance to agencies in all of our ninety-nine counties, with each having a focus on a particular field. . . . Special VAW Prosecutor in Area Prosecutions of the Attorney General's Office provides technical assistance and training on prosecuting VAW cases as well as can step in and prosecute these cases if needed. At the Iowa Department of Public Health we fund a Violence Prevention Coordinator who provides assistance to medical clinics/hospitals on VAW issues . . . [and] organizes the Domestic Violence Death Review Team. At the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy we fund a project which encompasses a VAW Law Enforcement Instructor who trains new cadets . . . [and] conducts training and technical assistance to seasoned officers across the state. In the State Court Administrator's Office we fund part of a Website based training project for Judges/Magistrates, which is beneficial to our rural state. This allows staff to receive training on VAW issues without having to leave the comfort of their office space.

– *STOP administrator, Iowa*

Without STOP funding, the NM Judicial Education Center would not have been able to provide regional domestic violence seminars. These seminars have brought education on this important topic to judges, domestic violence commissioners, prosecutors, defense attorneys, law enforcement officers, and victim advocates in many communities throughout the state. Regional seminars offer the advantage of being focused and interactive. This ensures that judges and other participants in the judicial process have their questions and concerns addressed during the seminar. In addition, the local focus provides an opportunity for members of the community to educate each other about their roles and services. The result is that judges are more likely to understand and utilize the services available in their communities for both victims and offenders.

– *New Mexico Judicial Education Center*

After victim services, training is the activity most frequently engaged in by STOP Program subgrantees: 1,043 subgrantees (45 percent of subgrantees) used their STOP Program funds to provide training. An impressive 265,448 professionals were trained with STOP Program funds. Significantly, more than a quarter (27 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, implementation of 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). More generally, methods and practices of police training have been shown historically to be instrumental in either implementing change or, conversely, in thwarting implementation of progressive policies (Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003).

STOP funding has allowed ICADV to provide institutionalized training in the Law Enforcement academy that reaches over 500 officers annually. It has allowed us to continue a relationship with the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy and ensure that each new police recruit that graduates from the Academy has specialized training in domestic violence. In addition, it allowed us to develop and instruct advanced level courses for law enforcement and other professionals, which increased their individual knowledge and also promoted greater working relationships between the professionals.

– *Indiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence*

One law enforcement project used their allocation for specialized training [of] officers and prosecutors in the area of strangulation. This has had a positive impact on investigation techniques and reporting. Since then, more cases have been filed and the prosecutor also has a better understanding of how to prosecute these cases.

– *STOP administrator, Hawaii*

Administracion de los Tribunales (Administration of the Courts) trains judges, marshals, social workers, and clerks in the 13 judicial regions. From 2002-2006, 772 employees were trained on issuing orders of protection, custody/visitation, alimony, child support, property rights, and firearms possession. Thirty percent of those trained are judges.

– *Virgin Islands site visit report*

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 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. 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, 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 31,422 health and mental health professionals; this was the second highest specific category of professionals trained in 2006.²²

Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2006—selected professional positions

| Position | People trained (<i>N</i> =265,448) | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Law enforcement officers | 71,055 | 26.8 |
| Health/mental health professionals | 31,422 | 11.8 |
| Domestic violence organization staff | 19,983 | 7.5 |
| Social service organization staff | 17,281 | 6.5 |
| Nongovernmental advocacy organization staff | 12,994 | 4.9 |
| Attorney/law student/legal services staff | 10,854 | 4.1 |
| Court personnel | 9,734 | 3.7 |
| Sexual assault organization staff | 9,616 | 3.6 |
| Faith-based organization staff | 9,106 | 3.4 |
| Government agency staff | 8,753 | 3.3 |
| Prosecutors | 5,793 | 2.2 |

NOTE: A number of categories above combine professionals, as explained in footnote 23. For a complete listing of all individual categories of people trained, see Table 11.

²² The non-specific category “multidisciplinary group” 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.

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 of domestic violence or sexual assault; developing or improving delivery of victim services to underserved populations; and providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters.

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. Research indicates that women who work with advocates are more effective overall at accessing community resources (Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004). The same study concludes that it is essential that advocacy and other human service programs recognize the need for a comprehensive response to the needs of victims.

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 535,566 victims/survivors in 2006. Of those receiving services, 85 percent were victims of domestic violence, 12.6 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.4 percent were victims of stalking.²³ These victims 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 as needed.

Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2006

| Type of service | Individuals served |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Victim advocacy | 248,538 |
| Hotline calls | 207,364 |
| Crisis intervention | 178,575 |
| Criminal justice advocacy | 157,103 |
| Victim witness notification | 135,113 |
| Civil legal advocacy | 132,763 |
| Counseling/support group | 127,428 |

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, see Table 24.

²³ 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 2006. 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.

Comprehensive and ongoing advocacy services for victims/survivors have been found to be instrumental in reducing revictimization (Sullivan & Bybee, 2000). 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 revictimization (Klein, 2005).

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:

The First Call Response component of the grant provides immediate intervention to domestic violence victims following a referral from law enforcement. Advocates respond immediately following an arrest to the victim's home to provide services to victims and their children. They provide support, information, lethality assessment and safety planning. This approach breaks down survivors' isolation, increases their safety and access to services. The First Call Responder component of this grant has resulted in identifying local agencies, businesses and organizations that may be the first victim's contact. Through regular contacts, information and training, these First Responders have increased the safety net for victims.

– *YWCA Support and Safe House, Wyoming*

When meeting at the court, the DVCL [domestic violence court liaison] triages the victim and makes referrals for appropriate services. This funding provides a court liaison to attend almost every hearing with victims to prepare them for the hearing, prepare them for the terminology of that specific hearing, and even what questions the Court is likely to ask. The DVCL is also able to re-direct a victim's focus when necessary, and frequently, remind the victim of issues she wants to present to the Court. Furthermore, the DVCL then explains the impact of each hearing to the victim. Many victims report being "shocky" [*sic*] while in front of the Court, and they need a "recap" of what actually occurred during the proceeding, and what it all means.

– *City of Bedford, Ohio*

The "Break the Silence" project at LBJ Tropical Medical Center started its program from the bottom up. Before VAWA funding there was no system to track victims of sexual abuse or domestic violence. Since the program began, the social work staff can link victims to services outside of the hospital and are providing support to victims and education to hospital staff to better meet the needs of victims. Social work staff are conducting follow-up and home consultation and are on call 24 hours a day to come into the hospital. As a result of the funding, doctors are more aware of the needs of victims and hospital security keeps the perpetrator and other family members away from the victim in spite of traditional cultural pressure when that is what the victim wants.

– *American Samoa site visit report*

Hogar Ruth, Inc. (House of Ruth) hired four legal advocates to cover 19 of the 76 municipalities which report the highest rates of domestic violence other than San Juan. Women receive assistance with protection orders, in understanding the language of the court, locating family members, counseling referrals, and preparation for their interviews with the attorneys and the judge. Two part-time attorneys work eight hours a week each. The program created a network of attorneys at the law school to assist women. When the program started in 2001, the legal advocates were working from the benches, now the courts provide them with an office.

– *Puerto Rico site visit report*

VAWA funds provided for the allocation of resources to assist victims in obtaining both safety and sobriety. Eighty percent of women who enter our long-term residential substance abuse treatment facility have experienced intimate partner violence. Safety concerns are now addressed immediately as women enter our program and the correlation between domestic violence and substance abuse is highlighted throughout our program. As a result of VAWA funding we are able to provide individual and group counseling, safety planning, case management services, legal advocacy, hospital advocacy, crisis intervention services, and outreach and education.

– *Chrysalis House, Kentucky*

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. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program include specific references to the delivery of services to underserved populations,²⁴ addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims, and assisting victims in immigration matters.

The Prosecution sub-grant programs, to include DC Legal Aide and the Office of Attorney General, provided victim referrals to domestic violence organizations, corrections, courts, law enforcement, legal services organizations, sexual assault organizations, etc. They provided civil legal

²⁴ 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.”

advocacy and court accompaniment to 150 domestic violence victims. They developed "Domestic Violence Intake Center" brochures in Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, Amheric and "Protection Order Violation" Brochures in Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and Korean.

– *STOP administrator, Washington, D.C.*

At both of the statewide coalitions we fund communities of color projects to reach out to victims in these communities, train underserved communities about responding/services, and assist Domestic Abuse/Sexual Abuse programs from across the state to improve their services to underserved communities.

– *STOP administrator, Iowa*

Of all subgrantees providing services in calendar year 2006, 98 percent provided services to victims/survivors in at least one of the underserved categories.²⁵ Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to 9,527 victims/survivors who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; 101,730 victims/survivors who were black or African American; 77,820 victims/survivors who were Hispanic or Latino; 7,942 victims/survivors who were Asian; 14,648 victims/survivors who were 60 years of age or older; 27,485 victims/survivors with disabilities; 37,180 victims/survivors with limited English proficiency; 22,383 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and 143,065 victims/survivors who were living in rural areas.²⁶

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. Training was provided to 6,469 staff of advocacy organizations for older, disabled, and immigrant populations. These nongovernmental, community-based groups are 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 763 subgrantees—73 percent of all subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, 277 subgrantees—53 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

²⁵ 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 are 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.

²⁶ For more detailed demographic information on victims/survivors served by all states, see Table 22; for demographic information on victims/survivors served by individual states see Tables B3 and B4 in Appendix B.

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.

Iowa CASA's [Coalition Against Sexual Assault] Communities of Color Project has been successful in reaching specific underserved populations throughout Iowa. We have emphasized services in Iowa's African-American, Immigrant, Refugee, Asian, and in our institutionalized and isolated communities. Immigrant/Refugees Communities Liaison provided a 20-hour Spanish sexual assault training for 20 sexual assault and domestic violence advocates in November 2006. This is quite an accomplishment due to high turnover of Spanish-speaking staff and volunteers at our rape crisis centers in Iowa.

– *Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault*

Our STOP funding allows us to provide consistent, comprehensive service to the community. Our advocates have a strong relationship within the Cambodian community and our strong presence provides a comfort even for those who are not receiving services. They "know" from their friends and family members that domestic violence support is available if and when they need the intervention. Our presence in the community also delivers the message that domestic violence is an issue that can in fact be confronted and challenged, that there are options. Advocacy is an expensive, labor intensive venture. The STOP funding helps us to remain a viable, healthy alternative for people experiencing domestic violence in their lives.

– *Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence, Massachusetts*

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). For sexual assault, their average annual rate is 3.5 times higher than the rate for non-Indians (Greenfield & Smith, 1999). They also are stalked at a rate that is at least twice that of women in any other ethnic group in the United States: The 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, Thompson, & Mechanic, 2002). Complicating efforts to protect these victims/survivors is the fact that most live in isolated communities and may not have access to telephones, transportation, or emergency services. Also, criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in those communities.

STOP funding greatly increased the capacity of service providers throughout the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta region of Southwest Alaska, in particular for serving victims of sexual assault and addressing the crime

of sexual violence. Law enforcement officers ranging from troopers to local police to village public safety officers and village police officers benefited from trainings funded by STOP monies.

– *Tundra Women's Coalition, Alaska*

STOP funding has allowed the Women's Lodge to provide necessary services to women and children entering our domestic violence shelter offering safety, protection, counseling, legal advocacy, weekly support groups, daily personal advocacy and emergency relocation services. With STOP funding we were able to provide community outreach presentations and trainings for community members as well as professionals in our area.

– *Native American Women's Health Education Resource Center
Women's Lodge, South Dakota*

The St. Regis Mohawk Tribal Police are responding to Domestic Violence incidents and sending the reports to the program on a regular basis. We are receiving more self referrals and more referrals from other programs. We are also working closely with the Assistant District Attorney in Franklin County. He ensures that the victims have a voice in court.

– *STOP Domestic Violence Program, New York*

We have been able to maintain our Domestic Violence Legal Advocate. Having this staff person has allowed us to provide comprehensive victim services for tribal members from the Chehalis Reservation. We have also been able to collect and track data because of these funds.

– *Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, Washington*

Six subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding identified themselves as tribal coalitions or tribal governments.²⁷ Seventy-four subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited well over 100 unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals made up two percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2006, with 9,527 victims/survivors receiving services. Training on issues specific to victims/survivors who are American Indian or Alaska Native was provided by 120 subgrantees, and approximately 1,248 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 (Tyiska, 1998). Victimization rates for women with

²⁷ 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.

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).

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).

Barrier Free Justice was launched in Kings County New York, with a STOP VAWA grant in January 2000. It appears to be the first project within a prosecutor's office to address violence against women with disabilities. Year-to-date, we have worked with some 1257 women with cognitive, psychiatric, or physical disabilities who are victims of sexual assault and/or domestic violence. STOP funding of Barrier Free Justice has allowed us to streamline what can be an otherwise intimidating experience during a highly stressful time. Through Barrier Free Justice, accessibility to the criminal justice system and social services is created for victims with disabilities where historically there was none. By taking into consideration the highly specific needs of the victim, the social worker facilitates understanding and accommodation for both the victim and the prosecutor. Providing early intervention for the victim, training professionals, identifying problems in the system, building a network of advocates, and tracking cases are the focal points of Barrier Free Justice. Over the past six years, Barrier Free Justice has hosted more than 100 trainings. The goal of these trainings is to fill the gaps in service accessibility so that domestic violence and sexual assault victims with disabilities in Brooklyn have the same access to justice as their non-disabled peers. Barrier Free Justice also works to disseminate correct information about options in seeking assistance and legal advocacy.

– *Kings County District Attorney's Office (Barrier Free Justice), New York*

Riverton Police provides services to crime victims with a focus on women who are older and women with disabilities. The office works with agencies and medical personnel to develop a SART program in Fremont County and to research disability related services statewide, cross-referencing the information by county in order to offer more choices to

victims with disabilities. A statewide manual on disabilities is being developed.

– *Wyoming site visit report*

Project Shield continues to work to increase awareness and knowledge of abuse against people with developmental disabilities, but much remains to be accomplished. This training program is seen as a first step toward more fully addressing the needs of people with developmental disabilities.

Prior to receiving this funding for Project Shield, there was little attention paid to the issue of sexual abuse against people with Mental Retardation or Developmental Disabilities. While this population remains vulnerable to abuse, Project Shield has trained a large number of community members, social service providers, law enforcement officers, and consumers themselves about this important issue. These trainings have opened doors of communication between these individuals that did not exist before. There remain a large number of agencies and individuals that could benefit from Project Shield training and services.

– *Kings County District Attorney's Office (Project Shield), New York*

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 & Myeonghwan, 2000); 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.²⁸ 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 suggests that only one in 14 incidents come to the attention of authorities.

Although intimate partner violence is covered by states' general domestic and family violence statutes and sexual assaults are covered by broader criminal statutes, the general political, policy, and law enforcement focus on younger victims has resulted in less attention to elder victimization. As a result, social service and criminal justice agencies have largely failed to develop responses tailored to the needs of elder victims. Battered women's shelters may not even be able to accommodate older victims. These limitations require that STOP-funded programs engage in creative approaches to increase awareness about abuse of elders and to identify and provide services to victims/survivors who are older.

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. While many domestic violence organizations offer programs that assist those 18-45, and while many adult protective

²⁸ "Intimate partner violence" and "domestic violence" are used interchangeably to mean violence that is committed by intimate partners.

services offer assistance for elder abuse, neither approach addresses the unique needs of senior victims of domestic abuse as programs such as Project REACH, nor do they cover the often-times overlooked population of those 50 to 60 years of age. Programs that focus exclusively on serving this population are uncommon. Many domestic violence organizations focus services on younger victims; very few currently serve older women. With the support of SOVWA [State Office of Victim Witness Advocacy] funding, Project REACH has been able to not only provide services to older victims, but to increase awareness of the problem of domestic violence affecting individuals of all ages and the issue of elder abuse specifically.

– *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*

YWCA Support and Safe House (SASH) provides services to older victims of domestic violence/sexual assault through weekly contact in their city and in Green River. Staff at Meals-on-Wheels and at the centers receive domestic violence training. Offering services and information at the Senior Citizen Centers has increased referrals.

– *Wyoming site visit report*

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. Ten percent (234) 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 27,485 victims/survivors with disabilities and 14,648 victims/survivors over the age of 60—5.1 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively, of all victims served.²⁹ 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. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 407 subgrantees to other professionals; those professionals included 4,442 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 184 subgrantees.

²⁹ 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 individuals with disabilities 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/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 victims of intimate partner homicides (Frye, Hosein, Waltermaurer, Blaney, & Wilt, 2005)

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 22,383 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 4.2 percent of all victims served. Training on issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 297 subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims face are complex, and the consequences of reporting domestic violence incidents are often more serious for them than for other victims. 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 158 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 2,601 unique products in 28 different languages.³⁰

As is the case with numerous other STOP subgrantees, the subgrantee cited below not only provided direct services to victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers, but also engaged in activities, such as curriculum development and training, that had a broader impact.

STOP funding enabled Na Loio to establish a model protocol for the identification and referral of immigrant victims from the Honolulu Prosecuting Attorneys Office to Na Loio. STOP funding also allowed Na Loio to provide training for select staff at the Honolulu Prosecuting Attorneys Office on issues related to immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, with an emphasis on U and T visas, VAWA self-petitions, asylum, and other immigration law remedies to secure lawful status in the United States. Na Loio also created a model training curriculum and training materials for interpreters who work with sexual assault and domestic violence survivors statewide. The model materials were enthusiastically received by the community and by national organizations who have reviewed the same. Topics included domestic violence 101, criminal laws, confidentiality, the role of an interpreter, and cultural issues at play in Hawaii's immigrant community.

³⁰ For a listing of the specific languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 61, the Products section of "STOP Aggregate Accomplishments."

Finally, STOP funds allowed Na Loio to provide civil legal immigration services for immigrant victims of domestic violence and sexual assault who were eligible for a U visa.

– *Na Loio Immigrant Rights and Public Interest Center, Hawaii*

The following subgrantees point out the many challenges faced by these victims/survivors and how they use STOP funds to respond to their particular needs:

Our clients need culturally-sensitive services delivered by a multi-lingual staff because their foreign language, cultural and religious practices, food requirements etc., make them uncomfortable in housing provided by mainstream organizations. Our clients face other specific barriers to independence as well. As recent immigrants, often with financial dependence on their spouses, they may not have the credit history required by landlords, their immigration petitions may be in process (and can often take up to 12-24 months), or they may need job training or English literacy classes to find jobs. Aggravating the situation is the fact that Asian battered women tend to have fewer supportive networks to turn to for help in dealing with legal and other issues. These are a few of the enormous barriers to integration, entering the workforce, finding affordable housing and becoming self-sufficient. The enormity of these barriers causes some women to return to their abusive situations. Transitional housing alleviates this situation by giving battered immigrant women the time and space to work through their crisis and make informed decisions. During clients' participation in the transitional housing program, they are able to get the necessary counseling and job training to give them the confidence and skills to make it on their own. They also have adequate time to resolve their legal issues and work long enough to save for permanent housing. The degree of success we have experienced with this program would not be possible without the time and support provided by transitional housing beyond our emergency shelter.

– *Apna Ghar, Illinois*

Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (ANDVSA) uses additional VAWA STOP funds to continue the immigrant victim program. This project, which works on the often complex legal issues faced by battered immigrant women and children, serves low-income, immigrant victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and is the only non-profit program of its kind in the state. This project is very important because a large number of the victims it serves fail to seek traditional services, often due in-part to threats made by their perpetrators regarding their immigration status.

– *STOP administrator, Alaska*

Boat People SOS--Community Against Domestic Violence is a national organization with 14 branches serving Vietnamese people. The District of Columbia branch increased services including bilingual outreach, education, and support services. Advocates train Department of Human Services workers, the faith community, and nail salon workers on domestic violence issues related to immigrant victims. The program developed a comprehensive media campaign through radio talk shows. Outreach is provided to Vietnamese-owned businesses and through visits to the homes of Vietnamese victims of domestic violence.

– *Washington, D.C. site visit report*

Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas

Although some studies suggest that women in urban areas are victimized at a higher rate than women in rural areas, (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006), smaller specific studies have found higher rates in rural communities. Two studies of adult sexual victimization found that sexual assault rates were higher in certain rural counties (Lewis, 2003; Ruback & Ménard, 2001), though rates of reporting victimization were higher in urban counties (Ruback & Ménard, 2001). A victim/survivor of sexual or domestic violence in a rural community is not likely to report to police or to locate or access services (Lewis, 2003).

Lower reporting rates in rural areas are arguably due to a number of factors: geographic isolation and the resulting physical and emotional dependency of the victim on the offender; the greater likelihood that the victim, perpetrator, criminal justice personnel, and service providers will be acquainted with each other than they would be in urban settings; limited or lack of medical, legal, counseling, and other support services. Finally, people in rural communities tend to be close-knit, self-sufficient, and unlikely to turn to “outsiders” for assistance.

STOP Program funds were used to provide services to 143,065 victims/survivors who resided in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country) during 2006; 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 478 subgrantees (46 percent of those using funds for training). 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:

Since 2000, four to five multidisciplinary domestic violence and sexual assault trainings per year have occurred in rural areas of the state. The trainings have been well attended by law enforcement officers, prosecutors, clergy, school counselors, nurses, university personnel, advocates, Emergency Medical Technicians, and social workers, and are requested by local domestic violence/rape crisis and law enforcement agencies. Bringing training to the rural areas of the state has increased professional knowledge and allowed community members to network with each other hopefully priming them to develop a coordinated community response team.

– *STOP administrator, North Dakota*

Serving victims/survivors in rural areas may also involve responding to victims/survivors who are underserved because of ethnicity and limited English proficiency.

Highlighting one of the rural projects funded with S.T.O.P. VAWA funds, the Liberal Area Rape Crisis/Domestic Violence Services program (LARC/DVS) is located in extreme southwest Kansas in a very rural and isolated part of the state. They serve a six-county region. In addition to serving a rural locale, there is a large and growing Hispanic population, placing a strain on law enforcement, service providers, educators, and

medical providers due to language barriers. LARC/DVS utilized these funds to assist domestic violence and sexual assault victims with outreach services, offering safe alternatives for victims and promoting public awareness of available services through the assistance of their outreach coordinator and to enhance victims' safety through a police response advocacy program. In 2006, LARC/DVS provided services to 214 victims of domestic violence, 10 victims of sexual assault and three victims of stalking (according to the primary victimization). More than half of the victims served with STOP VAWA funds in 2006 were of Hispanic ethnicity. All of the victims served live in rural areas and 36 victims had limited English proficiency.

– *STOP administrator, Kansas*

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 646 STOP subgrantees (28 percent of all subgrantees reporting) reported using funds to support specialized units. 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 620 STOP subgrantees (27 percent of all subgrantees reporting) 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 298 subgrantees (13 percent of all subgrantees reporting).

Several states have made awards to statewide agencies and organizations to broaden the reach of STOP funds. Michigan has done this in the areas of training and policy development:

Two STOP funded statewide projects support law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and service provider training, best practice, and policy development efforts. Recipients of these contracts are the Michigan State Police (MSP) / Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCOLES), and the Prosecuting Attorney's Association of Michigan (PAAM). These set-asides for the State organizations of law enforcement and prosecution maximize the use of VAWA funds throughout the State by enabling training and policy development to reach the largest number of agencies and communities.

– *STOP administrator, Michigan*

Law enforcement

Specialized law enforcement units have been shown to be more likely to collect evidence that becomes useful to prosecutors (Townsend, Hunt, Kuck, & Baxter, 2006). Researchers documented that the specialized domestic violence law enforcement unit in Mecklenburg County (Charlotte), North Carolina, for example, collected evidence in 61.8 percent of its cases compared to only 12.5 percent collected by patrol officers. In addition, while 30 percent of victims whose cases were handled by regular patrols declined to prosecute, only 8 percent of victims whose cases were handled by the specialized unit did so (Friday, Lord, Exum, & Hartman, 2006).

In some cases, STOP funding may provide a jurisdiction with its first full-time staff dedicated to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases, as illustrated by the following STOP subgrantee statements:

Several Parish Sheriffs' Offices reported that this funding enabled them to fund deputies to work full-time solely on domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases. It also allowed trainings to be available to their deputies and staff who had not received trainings for these types of crimes in the past. Many jurisdictional districts have recognized that a vast number of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking cases are underreported and the victims are often poorly informed of their rights.

– *STOP administrator, Louisiana*

Prior to this funding, the City of Madison Police Department did not have a specific investigator handling domestic violence cases, and no priority was placed on them. With this funding, an investigator has been placed in the position of focusing solely on domestic violence, allowing individual attention to be given to the victims and offenders. This also allows intervention and prevention measures to be taken.

– *City of Madison, Alabama*

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, fully investigating cases to enhance effective prosecution, serving protection orders on offenders, 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.

STOP funding has afforded the Fayette County Sheriff's Office to have Specialized Units and personnel to concentrate on victim safety/offender accountability 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 in.

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

The impact of a specialized unit may extend beyond the particular agency or department in which it is located, as discussed by subgrantees from Saline County, Arkansas, and Horry County, South Carolina:

The funding has enabled SCSO [Saline County Sheriff's Office] to develop a Domestic Violence Unit by hiring a detective and a victim advocate specifically assigned to investigating and providing victim services for adult female victims of domestic violence/spousal abuse, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking. Saline County did not and still does not have the financial resources to hire either of these people. Victims have benefited by having a detective assigned to these types of cases because that detective has become very familiar with how the cases should be handled and is able to share his or her expertise with the entire Sheriff's Department as well as with other local law enforcement agencies that call for advice on how to handle their own cases. The victims have also benefited by having a victim advocate devoted to these types of cases. The detective or deputy who first comes in contact with the victim can immediately advise them that a victim advocate is available to them at the Sheriff's Office and will be able to assist and inform them of the many ways in which they can get assistance.

– *Saline County Sheriff's Department, Arkansas*

The VAWA grant is a true asset to our department. Having someone who is compassionate and caring of others who can walk a victim through the system is beneficial for police and community relations. This grant funds one investigator for our agency and that investigator has a tremendous responsibility. It is their responsibility to document all CDV, CSC, and stalking cases, maintain a tracking form, attend bond hearings, interview victims and suspects, make sure all warrants are being served on these subjects, as well as many other tasks. The documentation has paid off. By being able to present to other agencies the large number of cases of domestic violence and the rate of recidivism, the County as a whole can work toward one common goal.

– *Horry County Police, South Carolina*

During the calendar year 2006, 328 subgrantees (14 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 355 FTEs.³¹ Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2006 received 85,841 calls for assistance from sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking victims. They responded and prepared incident reports in 102,711 cases, investigated 106,136 cases, made 31,322 arrests of predominant aggressors and 1,217 dual arrests, and referred 53,642 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than 24,533 protection/restraining orders, arrested offenders for 6,107 violations of court orders, and enforced 10,037 warrants.³²

³¹ For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see page 68, section on Law Enforcement.

³² Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and may 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.

In addition to traditional law enforcement activities, subgrantees also engaged in the following activities designed to improve law enforcement response and arrests of offenders: 352 used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; 665 provided training on law enforcement response and 328 specifically addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 127 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor and 100 developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

An appropriate law enforcement response is also a critical component of an effective coordinated community response. As the first responder, the police officer is often the person who can direct the victim/survivor to appropriate services and send a clear message to the perpetrator that the community views domestic violence as a serious criminal matter.

It is not unusual for specialized officers and victim advocates, some of whom may be located in the law enforcement agency, to respond together to incidents. Following are examples of this collaborative response to domestic violence incidents:

- Police Response Advocates on Call (PRAs) respond with the Riley County (Kansas) Police Department to every domestic violence incident and have done so from 1999 through 2006; the advocates meet with victims after the officers have secured the scene.
- In Manhattan, Kansas, domestic violence advocates from the Crisis Center, Inc., respond to crime scenes with the officers and engage in systematic follow-up with victim. One of their advocates who is located in the police department also reviews 911 calls, documents the domestic violence cases, and compiles histories on offenders.
- Advocates from the Crisis Center for Domestic Abuse/Sexual Assault in Fremont, Wyoming, accompanied police officers and provided on-the-scene crisis intervention services 62 times in the first half of 2006.

Prosecution

As with specialized law enforcement units, specialized domestic violence prosecution units have been found to be particularly valuable in promoting effective prosecution of abusers. These specialized prosecution programs generally include fast track scheduling (thereby reducing victim vulnerability pending trial); increased victim contact pending trial; and victim-friendly proceedings that remove, as much as possible, victim involvement with the mechanics of prosecution. They may also include vertical prosecution, which means that a single prosecutor handles each case through all its stages—from the initial investigation and case filing through sentencing. These activities differ from those in jurisdictions where studies indicate some prosecutors treat victims like civil claimants, requiring, for example, victims to sign complaints in order to file charges (Worden, 2001).

While victims 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' needs; as a result, fewer homes in the jurisdiction suffer from family or intimate violence (Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld, 2003).

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 preparing the case was positively associated with successful prosecution. The Ohio study also found that high prosecution caseloads were negatively associated with successful outcomes (Belknap et al., 2000).

Following are examples of STOP Program-funded specialized prosecution units:

STOP funding is important to this office because it allows the office to have a Deputy Prosecutor solely focused on Domestic Violence crimes. Without STOP funding, domestic violence cases would be handled by the other Deputy Prosecutors along with all of their other cases. One of the largest benefits of the position is consistency. There are four Courts in Morgan County, each having a Deputy Prosecutor assigned to it. Each Court and each Deputy Prosecutor has his or her own way of dealing with a given case. In many instances, this leads to inconsistency in resolution. In addition, Domestic Violence cases are unique in that they require extra time to be spent with the victim and the rest of the family.

– *Morgan County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana*

STOP Program funding has allowed us to dedicate prosecutors solely to the prosecution of Domestic Violence. These dedicated prosecutors are able to become fully conversant in the prosecution of domestic violence. The ability of prosecutors to focus solely on domestic violence allows them to learn the many facets of prosecuting these crimes and increases their effectiveness in holding offenders accountable. Without STOP funding, domestic violence cases would all go into the large misdemeanor and felony case pools and would not receive as much individual attention as our STOP prosecutors are able to give.

– *Tulsa County District Attorney, Oklahoma*

Prior to STOP grant funding, there was no ability in the Office of the District Attorney to coordinate cases. Due to the high volume of cases, every offense committed by a domestic violence offender was treated separately, and often handled by different assistant district attorney who was unaware of the offender's history. With STOP grant funding, the Office of the District Attorney has been able to create a Domestic Violence Unit. Every offense committed by a single offender is tracked and coordinated with any other pending matters. The STOP prosecutor is aware of an offender's domestic violence history, general criminal history, as well as any history of addictions, dependencies, or mental health history which the court should be made aware of for sentencing. Additionally, the presence of a county detective within the unit ensures the presentation of stronger cases for prosecution. The county detective is available as a resource to investigating officers, and can follow up on investigations to prepare for trial.

– *Lancaster County, Pennsylvania*

Other specialized projects such as our former Domestic Violence (misdemeanor prosecution) project, demonstrated that vertical prosecution, expeditious prosecution, and interagency coordination produced successful case outcomes. Prior to the grant, the Office of the Prosecuting Attorney lacked the financial resources to specifically designate an attorney to "vertically" prosecute crimes of domestic violence or sexual assault at the Circuit Court level. . . . The grant has enabled the Office of the Prosecuting Attorney the capability to create and maintain a specialized unit devoted to the prosecution of violent crimes perpetrated against women. The designation of a specialized attorney has meant that violent crimes against women are no longer treated as "just another case."

– *Hawaii County Office of the Prosecuting Attorney*

Vertical prosecution provides the victim and the prosecutor the opportunity to work together throughout the life of the case. Cook County (Chicago) victims 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. Unit victims 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, often along with prosecution-based advocates, specialized investigators, and support staff such as legal assistants and clerks; some or all of these specialized staff may be funded under STOP. Examples of funded jurisdictions that reported engaging in vertical prosecution are Bonneville County, Idaho; Hawaii and Kauai Counties in Hawaii; Lubbock County, Texas; and Carson City, Nevada.

The office implemented vertical prosecution of cases involving domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking to ensure continuity and uniformity for victims in case investigation, prosecution, and disposition when evidence is lacking.

– *Carson City District Attorney's Office, Nevada*

STOP Program funding has allowed Kauai's Office of the Prosecuting Attorney to operate a specialized Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit consisting of a Special Prosecuting Attorney (SPA) at sixty percent full-time equivalent (.6 FTE) and a Legal Clerk at fifty percent (.5 FTE). Using the vertical prosecution method, 97% of Kauai's domestic violence cases were prosecuted by the SPA from the beginning to the end of the case as opposed to having different county funded prosecutors assigned to different stages of a case such as preliminary hearing, subsequent hearings, trials and sentencing. Objectives accomplished over the last program year demonstrate the success of the program. 94% of reports received from the Kauai Police Department were screened and charged (or declined) within 30 days of receipt of the police report. The SPA accomplished a 62% conviction rate of cases disposed. The vertical prosecution method was utilized in over 97% of domestic violence cases.

– *County of Kauai, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, Hawaii*

Receiving STOP funding has allowed our office to form a specialized Domestic/Family Violence Unit consisting of a Domestic Violence Prosecutor and a Domestic Violence Legal Assistant. We also have a Domestic Violence Investigator that is not funded under the STOP grant, but is part of our specialized unit. . . . Now, when we receive a case that is identified as a Domestic/Family Violence case, it is handled completely by that team in the initial filing stage all the way through the prosecution stage. . . . We are also now able to make sure that victims/survivors have the opportunity to do victim impact statements, apply for Crime Victims Funds and have advance notice of court hearing and dispositions of cases. Prior to receiving STOP funds, our office was not able to take the needed time to adequately serve victims due to the lack of manpower and time restraints.

– *Lubbock County, Texas*

Prosecution offices, such as the one featured below, may use STOP funds for victim advocates (often referred to as victim witness specialists or coordinators) to provide information to victims and direct them to resources.

With this grant, we are able to make contact with the victim the next day after the incident. This helps give the victim immediate access to resources in the community, including Victim Compensation and medical treatment when needed. Meeting the victim face to face shortly after the incident also has a strong impact, much different than if victim rights materials are sent through the mail (which would be unlikely to reach domestic violence victims either because they must move or because their abuser keeps materials away from them.) Having met the victim advocate in person, the victim is more likely to keep in touch and seek assistance. In addition to meeting the victim advocate, the victim also meets a police officer who specializes in domestic abuse who can help get additional information about the case, including photographic evidence of injuries.

– *10th Judicial District Attorney's Office, Colorado*

Using STOP funds for dedicated prosecutors and specialized units can lead to training, improved CCR, and improved information-sharing. The impact of STOP funding can go well beyond the successful prosecution of cases, in some cases providing models for other jurisdictions.

Since receiving funding under the STOP grant, our office was able to hire a prosecutor dedicated to prosecuting the majority of the domestic violence cases in our judicial district, which has resulted in numerous benefits. Our domestic violence prosecutor is able to provide training to law enforcement officers, victims rights advocates, and court personnel in areas including domestic violence and stalking statutes, orders of protection and orders granting bond in domestic violence cases, and prosecution policies. Furthermore, by having a single point-of-contact in regard to domestic violence, law enforcement officers, court personnel, and victims rights advocates in our judicial district can more efficiently consult and communicate with our office about matters related to domestic violence. Some additional benefits of having a domestic violence prosecutor is that our office is better able to track domestic violence-related arrests among multiple offenders, and can more easily

track offenders' progress in regard to compliance with conditions of release such as batterer's intervention program attendance and drug/alcohol treatment.

– *23rd Judicial District Attorney General, Tennessee*

Bonneville County has been the leader in prosecutorial efforts to hold batterers accountable for crimes against women. The Bonneville County design hosts a vertical prosecution effort with accompanying misdemeanor probation that focuses on holding the batterer accountable. This design allows for the instantaneous revocation of bond and consistent follow-through via formal coordination agreements among law enforcement, victim services, courts, prosecution and probation. Additionally, Bonneville County has implemented a comprehensive evaluation tool that tracks offenders' demographics and recidivism. To date, the Bonneville model has been replicated in Kootenai County and Nez Perce County.

– *STOP administrator, Idaho*

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received 162,162 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking for charging consideration and filed charges, on average, in 125,692 (78 percent) of those cases. Data reported for 2006 by STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 38 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors when compared with other types of dispositions.³³ 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 (*Albuquerque Journal*, 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 2006, 332 subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with a total of 316 FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by 352 subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve the prosecution response: 375 provided training on prosecution response; 108 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed victim witness notification; and 101 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.

³³ 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.

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 2004 study found 160 jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence courts. The majority of these courts had the following traits in common: 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 courts staffing for domestic violence cases; 3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims by court staff, often assisted by related, specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; 4) court processes to ensure victims' 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).

STOP funding has allowed our judicial district to create a specialized domestic violence court and to provide supervision to high risk offenders while on bond supervision. Prior to the creation of this specialized court, domestic violence cases were mixed in with all criminal offenses. There was no particular attention to the needs of the victim, as most offenders bonded out with few conditions and no supervision. Now, in conjunction with our District Attorney's Office and local shelter, the victim receives specialized services at the time of the first appearance, and the offender may be placed on bond supervision with specialized conditions to protect the victim's safety and initiate batterer intervention programming with the offender. In addition, our community has been very active in addressing domestic violence issues, as well as the issues of the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. This activity has all been spurred on by the inception of the specialized domestic violence court.

– 10th Judicial District Court-Domestic Violence Program, Kansas

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, and increased offender accountability. These courts seek to link different cases involving the same offender and victim (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).

Such streamlining of cases involving domestic violence victims is one goal of a demonstration project in the Family Court system of North Dakota, which is described below:

The purpose of the Family Court is to better coordinate family law cases dealing with domestic violence issues so that victims are optimally

served. It is with STOP funding that we have been able to create a demonstration project for the state of North Dakota, to work towards improving the court system's response to domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking issues. A goal of the Family Court is to better streamline court services for victims and offenders. Results have included improvements in community collaboration along with improved monitoring of service compliance and accountability.

– *The North Dakota Supreme Court*

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:

The Orleans Parish Criminal District Court, Domestic Violence Monitoring Court, could not properly handle the caseload with only one case manager. STOP Program funding allowed the Court to hire an additional case manager so that the caseload could be distributed between them resulting in a more efficient and effective handling of all cases. This is especially significant now after the hurricane since the number of domestic violence arrests are on the rise.

– *Orleans Parish Criminal District Court, Louisiana*

Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, and/or stalking by 23 STOP subgrantees. More than 60 percent of the courts receiving STOP Program funding (14 of the 23 subgrantees that used funds for court activities) conducted judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 2.8 hearings per offender for 4,450 offenders during calendar year 2006. 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 three-quarters of the dispositions for offenders who violated protection orders and/or engaged in new criminal behavior; none of the offenders who engaged in new criminal behavior received a verbal warning and only one received a fine; and verbal or written warnings represented only three percent of the dispositions for those who violated protection orders.

Table 8. Dispositions of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2006

| Violation | Verbal/ written warning (%) | Partial/full revocation of probation (%) | Conditions added (%) | Fine (%) | No action taken (%) |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Protection order (N=445) | 13 (3%) | 328 (74%) | 86 (19%) | 0 | 18(4%) |
| New criminal behavior (N=441) | 0 | 332 (75%) | 105 (24%) | 1 | 3 (1%) |
| Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N=821) | 435 (53%) | 311 (38%) | 36 (4%) | 0 | 39(5%) |

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 enforce a 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 works. 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 reabuse and rearrest, and increased victim satisfaction when compared with nonspecialized supervision (Klein, Wilson, Crowe, & DeMichele, 2005). This study builds on earlier research indicating that probationary sentences with short periods of jail, which is allowed or mandated in most states as a condition of probation, reduced recidivism over lesser sentences (Thistlewaite, Wooldredge, & Gibbs, 1998).

As illustrated in Table 9 below, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers in 2006 failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, probation revocation rates ranged from 47 percent for failure to attend a BIP, to 49 percent for protection order violations, to 53 percent for new criminal behavior.

Table 9. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2006

| Violation | Verbal/ written warning (%) | Partial/full revocation of probation (%) | Conditions added (%) | Fine (%) | No action taken (%) |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Protection order (<i>N</i> = 204) | 24 (12%) | 99 (49%) | 53 (26%) | 2 (1%) | 26 (13%) |
| New criminal behavior (<i>N</i> = 1035) | 40 (4%) | 547 (53%) | 222 (21%) | 22 (2%) | 204 (20%) |
| Failure to attend batterer intervention program (<i>N</i> = 664) | 143 (22%) | 310 (47%) | 80 (12%) | 5 (1%) | 126 (19%) |

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding.

The Delaware Department of Corrections has used STOP funding for an innovative partnership between law enforcement and probation and parole designed to quickly apprehend offenders in violation of release conditions in serious cases.

The STOP Program funding has allowed the Delaware Probation and Parole, Domestic Violence Units, to be available 24 hours/7 days per week to assist any police agency responding to a new domestic violence incident (where the perpetrator is under probation and parole

supervision). The funding has enabled us to lease pagers to use for after-hours response, including weekends and to pay probation officers' stand-by and call back pay. Many times, batterers are released on low bail, which can lead to further problems if they return home. The police contact with the Probation and Parole Office was designed to address those cases where the police officer who responded to the scene has concerns for the safety of the victim, either because of the repetitive nature of the offense or because of the seriousness of the new offenses. With the assistance of the Probation and Parole Stand-by Officer, the probation officer can file the necessary paperwork to commit the offender to detention in a correctional facility.

– *Delaware Department of Corrections*

The probation officer is a critical partner in the CCR necessary for an effective domestic violence court, as illustrated in this example from Oklahoma:

Prior to receiving this funding, we were not able to form the Domestic Violence Court because of the need for a probation officer. Although we receive some funding through unsupervised probation fees, this is a minimal amount, and is divided among five counties in our district. We had limited means through the county due to an already strained budget. The Probation Officer is a very essential part of the Domestic Violence Court because of the mandatory reporting policies. The Probation Officer ensures that the offenders are complying with court orders by attending court ordered services. If the offender does not comply, then the Probation Officer sends an immediate report to the District Attorney, resulting in a hearing before the Court. This is an integral part of the Court due to the immediate sanctions and offender accountability. These efforts have increased the safety of victims of domestic abuse because of the ability to monitor the offenders.

– *District Attorney, District 2, Oklahoma*

Probation officers funded under the STOP Program supervised 8,077 offenders and made a total of 42,270 contacts with those offenders, for an average of 5.2 contacts per offender. The majority of these contacts (56 percent) were face-to-face, 32 percent were by telephone, and 12 percent were unscheduled surveillance. Some probation officers have also begun to reach out to victims; officers made 6,149 contacts with 3,832 victims during 2006. Regular contact provides an opportunity to inform victims about services available in the community and lets them know that the criminal justice system is continuing to hold the offender accountable.

An increasing number of probation departments are including victim services personnel to work with victims and help ensure their safety in particularly serious cases. In the following example, the person in this role also facilitated a monthly victim impact panel.

The STOP Program funding has allowed the Dallas County Community Supervision & Corrections Department to maintain a full-time VAWA probation officer in the Victim Services Unit. Without having this funding, the notification process and contacts currently being done by this victim services unit would have to be greatly reduced, if not worse. Early victim notification, especially when an offender is at large with an active probation violation warrant, is necessary when dealing with cases which are assaultive and threatening in nature. Sharing this information with

the victims/survivors should greatly increase the chances of maintaining her safety and decrease the risk of having another domestic dispute happen. The monthly domestic violence victim impact panel currently being facilitated by this VAWA officer enables some of these offenders to hear first-hand personal life experiences presented by victim volunteers.

– Dallas County Community Supervision and
Correction Department, Texas

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 in order 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 298 subgrantees;³⁴ 177 of those subgrantees reported using STOP funds to link systems and share information. The purposes most frequently cited for these systems were the following: case management, protection orders, arrests, incident reports, evaluation/outcome measures, and prosecutions.

Following are a number of examples of how STOP Program funds were used for these and related purposes in a criminal justice system, a network of domestic violence programs, a sexual assault coalition, and two courts:

This Domestic Violence Unit (DVU), through collaboration, has built a network throughout the district which, in essence, has provided a safety net for victims. The DVU initially set up a database to track these crimes. The database contains histories of perpetrators (as well as victim information). These histories are used by both prosecutors and law enforcement officers for prosecution and probable cause issues. These histories are also used for lethality assessment as they relate to the continuum of violence and for safety planning for victims. In summary, without the funding we have received, we would still be in the dark ages, stumbling around, occasionally being reactive to situations as they arrive. But now we have a collaborative effort among many different types of agencies. Further, we are acquainted with domestic violence

³⁴ 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 298 subgrantees; the second question received affirmative responses from 359.

interdiction and are proactive in our strategies regarding prosecution, enforcement of Tennessee laws, offender accountability, and certainly victim safety.

– *STOP administrator, Tennessee*

The STOP funds have allowed the entire development of the database and the establishment of a uniform method of collection and submission from all 14 local domestic violence programs. It has allowed for a tool to determine the demographics of victims served, details on the services received, demographics of their abusers, and their protection order history. During 2006, the STOP funds have allowed for the training of 25 representatives of local program staff on the database. It also helped focus on training issues local program staff felt most need to be addressed, especially how the local programs may make better use of the data contained within their own databases. The STOP funds have allowed a new focus on securing and maintaining the confidentiality on the data victims provide the local programs. It has also helped bring a new focus on victim safety planning as it involves the use of technology; i.e. computers, phones, GPS, etc. STOP funds have created networks in West Virginia that previously did not exist.

– *STOP administrator, West Virginia*

The STOP funding has allowed the Second Judicial District Court to hire a Resource Coordinator and develop a new data collection/communication program. The Resource Coordinator shares information with other agencies involved with certain cases in order to provide a coordinated response to families involved with the court system. This coordinated response assists all public servants involved with these cases to receive as much information as possible in order to make a more informed decision, which is likely to be the most accurate and appropriate decision for any particular case. This practice of coordinating information provides the best possible service to the public involved with the court system. The data collection/communication program called the "DV lookup" is designed to help relate cases so that a decision making authority can tell if an individual has other cases in the same court. This program also allows court employees to organize cases and their parties in a very convenient manner; by social security number, date of birth, and type of case. The ability to organize cases in this manner definitely increases offender accountability, but also assists the court in learning about more aspects of a given family which leads to more appropriate decisions being made to assist that family.

– *2nd Judicial District Court, New Mexico*

The VAWA subgrant award allowed us to develop a standardized way to capture law enforcement sexual crimes data in our state. The success of this process led to the development of a standardized way to capture service provider data, and data from Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner units, as well. The depiction of the pervasiveness of sexual assault as portrayed by the findings from this multi-disciplinary data, led to the first ever statewide victimization survey being funded. The findings from this survey have identified many areas that need to be addressed (that were never known before) to respond to the issue of sexual violence in our

state. As a result, VAWA, State Government, and other funding agencies have developed requests for proposals to fund programs to respond to the newly identified sexual assault problems.

– *New Mexico Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs*

This funding has allowed our agency to provide a Domestic Violence Coordinator to establish and maintain a Domestic Violence Docket. The coordinator works closely with the judicial system, Department of Human Services, and other referring agencies in compiling necessary information regarding offenders. The coordinator is responsible for collecting the data not only for the courts, but for funding purposes of the amount of clients seen through our agency. This expanded coordination has enabled a closer working environment that benefits all entities in respect to greater collaboration efforts in reducing domestic violence in our area. This is shown through the low recidivism rate in our county.

– *Family Resource Center, Oklahoma*

Sexual Assault

STOP-funded programs are permitted by VAWA to fund the training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in “the treatment of trauma related to sexual assault, collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and 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 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 of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is critical because a victim/survivor’s decision to appear at a medical facility to be examined is the necessary first step in the process of holding offenders accountable. Historically, victims of sexual assault were often retraumatized 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 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 sexual assault nurse examiners (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 (Crandall & Helitzer, 2003; Campbell et al., 2005).

Through the work of the Kansas Sexual Assault Network (KSAN), training for Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners and Sexual Assault Response Teams

(SANE/SART) has reached all areas of Kansas. Working collaboratively with the Kansas Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence, training components specifically for the sexual assault advocates has been implemented into the curriculum.

– *Kansas site visit report*

Six percent (149) of all subgrantees reported that they used funds for SANE training. STOP Program funds were used by 26 STOP subgrantees to support 24 FTE SANE staff positions.³⁵ More significantly, in terms of the Program's broader impact, funds supported training for 2,660 SANEs. In addition to the SANEs, an unknown number of additional medical personnel, reported as trained under the category "health professionals," may also have been conducting forensic exams on sexual assault victims.

More than 300 sexual assault organizations—277 local programs and 45 state sexual assault coalitions³⁶—received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims/survivors made up 12.6 percent of all victims/survivors served with Program funds in 2006. Although it is not possible to know exactly what services were provided to sexual assault survivors, subgrantees did report that 20,141 victims/survivors were accompanied to the hospital; those hospital visits are most often for forensic exams for sexual assault victims. In addition to providing services to sexual assault victims, 662 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 three percent of all new charges filed during 2006 by STOP Program-funded prosecutors. Of those felony sexual assault charges disposed of during 2006, an overall average of 56 percent resulted in convictions.³⁷

STOP funding for sexual assault services has been used to ensure the availability of SANEs; to enable providers to work more comprehensively with victims/survivors; to provide training on sexual assault; and to provide separate, private examination spaces for victims/survivors seeking medical attention immediately following the assault, as illustrated by the following examples:

STOP funding has allowed us to provide far more comprehensive follow-up and in-person services to survivors of sexual assault than we were prior to this funding. We are now able to offer a survivor one specific advocate who will assist them with whatever needs may arise following a sexual assault. This level of ongoing case-management services to survivors may include a range of assistance, from help with accessing services for emergency housing, to medical and mental health treatment, to legal resources. Further, this same advocate can accompany the

³⁵ 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.

³⁶ Subgrantees also reported that 491 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs and 20 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2006.

³⁷ This rate includes deferred adjudications. For purposes of comparison, the average conviction rate for domestic violence misdemeanors was 60 percent and for domestic violence felonies was 66 percent.

survivor to any related medical appointments, interviews with law enforcement and prosecutors, court appearances, as well as assist with protection orders. This advocate has ongoing contact with the investigator in the case and the District Attorney's Office.

–*Sexual Assault Response Services of Southern Maine*

The STOP funding has allowed the Madison County Sexual Assault Treatment Center to maintain the integrity of the 24-hour on-call status of sexual assault nurse examiners. These specially trained registered nurses respond to sexual assault victims within sixty minutes of receiving the page/report. Through this immediate availability of a sexual assault nurse examiner, activation of the sexual assault response team is initiated and a comprehensive forensic medical examination is conducted, along with evidence identification, collection, and preservation. During FY 2006, educational brochures for the center were translated into Spanish and distributed throughout the Latino and Hispanic communities of Madison County.

– *Madison County Sexual Assault Treatment Center, Indiana*

Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) rooms are created because of that training and victims who once stayed for hours in an ER waiting to be seen can now go to SANE rooms to be examined by qualified nurses and can shower and put on fresh clothes while their families wait, have coffee, talk to police and advocates. Law enforcement is being trained on why and how sexual assault happens, the fundamentals of a successful rape investigation, that men can be and are raped and how not to revictimize rape victims. Standards were created and are maintained because of this money. We are able to hire and train evaluators who perform site visits at rape crisis centers across the state, ensuring quality of service for victims no matter where in the state the state their perpetration occurs.

– *STOP administrator, Alabama*

Stalking

The National Violence Against Women (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). This helps to explain the low percentage (2.4 percent) of stalking victims reported as receiving services funded under the STOP Program in 2006; a significant number of the domestic violence and sexual assault victims could also have been victims of stalking, but would not have been reported as stalking victims by STOP subgrantees.³⁸ The NVAW survey also found that half of all stalking victims report the stalking to the police, and a quarter of those cases result in arrests. The survey reported that state stalking laws vary widely in their definitions of stalking, in the

³⁸ Subgrantees were instructed to report an *unduplicated* count of victims/survivors and to select only *one primary victimization* for each victim/survivor served during calendar year 2006. Given the results of the NVAW survey, 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.

number of acts necessary to constitute the crime of stalking, and in their threat and fear requirements.

STOP Program-funded prosecution units most often address stalking along with, or in the context of, domestic violence, as demonstrated by the following examples:

The STOP program funding has allowed us to have a team dedicated solely to prosecuting domestic violence stalking cases. Most of these cases are labor intensive and prolonged in duration. Many of the cases have a lengthy history because by definition, stalking involves a "course of conduct." Having a reduced caseload and a team trained specifically to handle these cases ensures that the victims of this life altering crime are given the attention and assistance they require. Additionally, the training and experience of a team dedicated to this area helps to quickly and accurately identify and recognize these cases. This also helps to provide the highest level of service to these victims. Without the grant funding, it is doubtful these cases would be given such dedicated attention.

– *County of San Diego, California*

As a result of the STOP funding, this prosecutor has been able to dedicate time and attention specifically to domestic violence and stalking victims. We have continued our protocol of (1) meeting with each individual domestic violence or stalking victim at least once prior to trial in a controlled and safe office setting, (2) attending community functions to raise community awareness and distribute materials, (3) vertically prosecuting domestic violence and stalking cases, (4) attending training geared toward domestic violence and stalking issues, and (5) conducting domestic violence trainings for local law enforcement officers. Without the STOP funding, achieving these dedicated domestic violence prevention and prosecution objectives would be made more difficult. The STOP funding has allowed this office to maintain a dedicated domestic violence prosecutor to accomplish these goals.

– *Clark County Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault Prosecution Team, Virginia*

The danger of stalking is often underestimated. The findings of a ten-city study of abuse victims and victims of attempted or actual partner femicide indicated 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 femicide. It also found that women who reported that they were being followed or spied on had a more than twofold increase in the risk of becoming a femicide 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 and others in collecting evidence necessary to prosecute the crime, and how to keep the stalking victim safe. Following are two examples of STOP Program-funded strategies to address stalking:

Our agency has stalking kits available for use by victims. The kits include disposable cameras, informational brochures, incident logs, pens, disposable gloves, paper bags, flashlights, whistles and pepper spray. More stalking kits will be distributed to law enforcement agencies this year. Currently a bill in legislature will allow women to keep their

addresses confidential so their perpetrator cannot find them. Hopefully, this will be passed and women will be able to feel safe when leaving their batterer.

RDVIC has handed out many stalking kits to victims and law enforcement personnel. Stalking occurs many times after a victim has left her batterer because of power and control issues.

– *Rape and Domestic Violence Information Center, West Virginia*

Reno Police Department, in Nevada (STOP Program) assigns an advocate on every stalking report taken by the agency to enhance the victim's level of safety through follow-up contacts. Training of officers has been implemented to increase stalking reports and response.

– *Nevada site visit report*

STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, or strengthen programs that address stalking by 245, or 11 percent, of subgrantees. Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported filing a total of 2,546 new stalking charges in 2006, which constituted 1.5 percent of all new charges; 29 percent of the new stalking charges were for felony stalking. The conviction rates for ordinance, misdemeanor, and felony-level stalking charges disposed of during 2006 were 64 percent, 81 percent, and 64 percent, respectively. While the number of stalking cases prosecuted by STOP subgrantees is relatively low, the conviction rates for stalking crimes are significantly higher at the ordinance and misdemeanor levels when compared with those for domestic violence, which were 51 percent and 60 percent, respectively. Training on stalking issues was provided by 496 subgrantees (nearly 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 were asked to report on the most significant areas of unmet need in their states. They regularly reported the following: courts; legal resources for victims; law enforcement response; economic self-sufficiency for victims/survivors; and providing services to underserved populations.

Specific areas regarding courts include the need for coordination among probate, criminal, and civil courts, and more specialized domestic violence services for victim/survivors. The coordination would provide efficient, accurate communication of information from court to court, ensuring more effective monitoring by probation and parole, thereby increasing offender accountability and enhancing victim safety. Administrators also report the need to train court personnel, including guardians ad litem, custody evaluators, and judges, on sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking.

Victims/survivors require a wider range of legal services, including greater access to legal 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.

STOP administrators cited the need for training law enforcement officers on more effective handling of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases. They suggest that training improves enforcement of protection orders and effectiveness of investigations, thus enhancing victim safety. Administrators state the need to improve forensic interview skills, evidence processing, and lethality assessments.

Economic self-sufficiency is a necessity for victims/survivors. STOP administrators reported the need for increased transitional and permanent housing, more employment and skills training, affordable childcare, and assistance with transportation. Administrators suggest that without these services it is difficult, if not impossible, for survivors of domestic violence to return to an economically stable situation for themselves and their families.

Another commonly reported area of need involves providing services to underserved and marginalized populations. The barriers to providing services to victims/survivors living in rural areas include transportation to and from remote locations, and the lack of access to communication tools, including telephones, cellular phones, and computers. Immigrants and tribal populations are in need of greater access to linguistically and culturally appropriate services. Disabled and elder victims/survivors require more accessible emergency, short term, and transitional housing, and informed service providers.

STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the STOP Program in all states, five of the six U.S. territories,³⁹ 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: 2,184 (94 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2006

| Staff | Number | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|
| All staff | 3,300 | 100.0 |
| Victim advocate | 1,085 | 32.9 |
| Program coordinator | 414 | 12.5 |
| Law enforcement officer | 355 | 10.8 |
| Prosecutor | 316 | 9.6 |
| Counselor | 221 | 6.7 |
| Support staff | 170 | 5.2 |
| Legal advocate | 164 | 5.0 |
| Administrator | 139 | 4.2 |
| Victim-witness specialist | 101 | 3.1 |
| Civil attorney | 93 | 2.8 |
| Trainer | 75 | 2.3 |
| Paralegal | 43 | 1.3 |
| Probation officer | 20 | 0.6 |
| Information technology specialist | 14 | 0.4 |
| Court personnel | 13 | 0.4 |
| Other | 76 | 2.3 |

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

³⁹ Data from STOP subgrantees in Guam was received too late to be included in the aggregated database used for analysis for this report.

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: 1,043 (45 percent of all subgrantees)
- Total number of people trained: 265,448
- Total number of training events: 18,821

Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2006

| People trained | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| All people trained | 265,448 | 100.0 |
| Law enforcement officers | 71,055 | 26.8 |
| Multidisciplinary group | 29,152 | 11.0 |
| Health professionals | 22,090 | 8.3 |
| Social service organization staff | 17,281 | 6.5 |
| Domestic violence program staff | 14,993 | 5.6 |
| Volunteers | 14,671 | 5.5 |
| Court personnel | 9,734 | 3.7 |
| Mental health professionals | 9,332 | 3.5 |
| Attorneys/law students | 9,329 | 3.5 |
| Faith-based organization staff | 9,106 | 3.4 |
| Government agency staff | 8,753 | 3.3 |
| Community advocacy organization staff | 6,525 | 2.5 |
| Sexual assault program staff | 5,867 | 2.2 |
| Correction personnel | 5,829 | 2.2 |
| Prosecutors | 5,793 | 2.2 |
| Victim-witness specialists | 3,328 | 1.3 |
| Elder organization staff | 2,958 | 1.1 |
| Sexual assault forensic examiners | 2,660 | 1.0 |
| Immigrant organization staff | 2,027 | 0.8 |
| Domestic violence coalition staff | 1,662 | 0.6 |
| Batterer intervention program staff | 1,568 | 0.6 |
| Legal services staff | 1,525 | 0.6 |
| Disability organization staff | 1,484 | 0.6 |
| Sexual assault coalition staff | 1,089 | 0.4 |

Table 11. People trained using STOP Program funds in 2006

| People trained | Number | Percent |
|---|--------|---------|
| Tribal government/tribal government agency | 1,015 | 0.4 |
| Tribal coalition staff | 233 | 0.1 |
| Supervised visitation and exchange center staff | 201 | 0.1 |
| Other | 6,188 | 2.3 |

The most common topics of training events were overviews of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; advocate response; law enforcement response; confidentiality; domestic violence statutes/codes; protection orders; 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 2006

| Agency/organization | Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance | | | Meetings | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|
| | Daily | Weekly | Monthly | Weekly | Monthly | Quarterly |
| Batterer intervention program | 152 | 337 | 420 | 125 | 403 | 303 |
| Community advocacy organization | 69 | 189 | 315 | 32 | 362 | 213 |
| Corrections | 172 | 374 | 502 | 94 | 463 | 352 |
| Domestic violence organization | 900 | 557 | 313 | 366 | 792 | 403 |
| Faith-based organization | 90 | 251 | 497 | 33 | 317 | 305 |
| Court | 786 | 636 | 249 | 245 | 520 | 373 |
| Law enforcement | 949 | 627 | 263 | 345 | 727 | 402 |
| Prosecutor's office | 640 | 576 | 354 | 307 | 623 | 347 |
| Government agency | 260 | 388 | 413 | 54 | 299 | 237 |
| Health/mental health organization | 273 | 658 | 587 | 88 | 616 | 378 |
| Legal services organization | 331 | 581 | 472 | 71 | 442 | 337 |
| Sexual assault organization | 386 | 396 | 483 | 188 | 538 | 374 |

Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2006

| Agency/organization | Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance | | | Meetings | | |
|--|--|--------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|
| | Daily | Weekly | Monthly | Weekly | Monthly | Quarterly |
| Social service organization | 523 | 636 | 381 | 142 | 670 | 329 |
| Tribal government/tribal government agency | 21 | 56 | 140 | 9 | 85 | 100 |
| Other | 49 | 83 | 75 | 28 | 143 | 63 |

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: 523 (22 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2006

| Policy/protocol | Subgrantees using funds (N = 523) | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Providing information to victims about victim services | 211 | 40.3 |
| Appropriate response to underserved populations | 200 | 38.2 |
| Confidentiality | 173 | 33.1 |
| Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements | 155 | 29.6 |
| Mandatory training | 141 | 27.0 |
| Protection order | 138 | 26.4 |
| Identifying primary aggressor/ discouraging dual arrest | 127 | 24.3 |

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: 587 (25 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2006

| Product | Number developed or revised | Number used or distributed |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| All products | 2,601 | 2,000,806 |
| Brochures | 619 | 967,840 |
| Manuals | 251 | 57,997 |
| Training curricula | 608 | 21,425 |
| Training materials | 488 | 86,727 |
| Other | 635 | 866,817 |

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, or translated products in the following 28 languages:

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| ASL (American Sign Language) | Hmong | Portuguese |
| Bengali | Llokano | Russian |
| Bosnian | Inupiat | Samoan |
| Chinese | Japanese | Somali |
| Chuukese | Khmer | Spanish |
| Creole | Korean | Tai Dam |
| French | Lao | Urdu |
| Gujarati | Marathi | Vietnamese |
| Hindi | Marshallese | Yupik |
| | Nuer | |

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 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: 359 (15 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2006

| Activity | Subgrantees using funds (N = 359) | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Develop/install/expand data collection/communication systems | 195 | 54.3 |
| Link existing data collection/communication systems | 62 | 17.3 |
| Share information with other community partners | 158 | 44.0 |
| Manage data collection and communication | 221 | 61.6 |
| Purchase computers/other equipment | 97 | 27.0 |

Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2006

| Purpose | Subgrantees reporting |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Case management | 217 |
| Protection orders | 162 |
| Arrests | 159 |
| Incident reports | 145 |
| Evaluation/outcome measures | 144 |
| Prosecutions | 144 |

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: 626 (27 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2006

| Activity | Law enforcement | Prosecution | Court | Probation/parole |
|---|-----------------|-------------|-------|------------------|
| Develop a new unit | 29 | 25 | 7 | 1 |
| Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit | 316 | 317 | 39 | 26 |
| Train a specialized unit | 53 | 38 | 8 | 5 |
| Other | 9 | 8 | 2 | 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: 282 (12 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 18. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2006

| Activity | Victim services | Law enforcement | Prosecution | Court | Probation/parole |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------|------------------|
| Evaluation | 89 | 50 | 38 | 22 | 17 |
| Interpreters | 90 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 4 |
| Language lines | 22 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Meetings between tribal and non-tribal entities | 10 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Safety audits | 15 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 3 |
| Security personnel or equipment | 8 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Translation of forms and documents | 86 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 1 |
| Other | 41 | 29 | 24 | 18 | 21 |

Victim Services

During the 12-month reporting period, a total of 1,579 subgrantees (68 percent of all subgrantees) used funds for victim services. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 535,566 victims/survivors (98 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence. Only two percent of victims/survivors seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See Tables 19 and 20 for information on the level of service provided and the types of victims/survivors served by subgrantees, and Table 21 for the most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served.)

- Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services: 1,579 (68 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 19. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006, 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 | 546,826 | 100 | 465,832 | 100 | 68,029 | 100 | 12,965 | 100 |
| Not served | 11,260 | 2.1 | 10,419 | 2.2 | 736 | 1.1 | 105 | 0.8 |
| Served | 513,024 | 93.8 | 436,452 | 93.7 | 64,188 | 94.4 | 12,384 | 95.5 |
| Partially Served | 22,542 | 4.1 | 18,961 | 4.1 | 3,105 | 4.6 | 476 | 3.7 |

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 2006, by type of victimization

| Type of victimization | Victims/survivors served | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| All victimizations | 535,566 | 100.0 |
| Domestic violence | 455,413 | 85.0 |
| Sexual assault | 67,293 | 12.6 |
| Stalking | 12,860 | 2.4 |

Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006

| Reason | Subgrantees reporting |
|--|-----------------------|
| Did not meet eligibility or statutory requirements | 234 |
| Program reached capacity | 199 |
| Services not appropriate for victim/survivor | 186 |
| Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor | 127 |
| Transportation problems | 122 |
| Conflict of interest | 118 |
| Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with mental health problems | 116 |
| Geographic or other isolation of victim/survivor | 114 |
| Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with substance abuse problems | 101 |
| Need not documented | 93 |

Demographics of Victims/survivors Served

Of the more than 535,566 victims/survivors served during the 12-month reporting period, the majority of those who were served or partially served were white (58 percent), female (90 percent), and ages 25-59 (63 percent).

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006

| Characteristic | Victims/survivors receiving services | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Race/ethnicity | | |
| Black/African American | 101,730 | 21.8 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 9,527 | 2.0 |
| Asian | 7,942 | 1.7 |
| Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander | 3,752 | 0.8 |

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006

| Characteristic | Victims/survivors receiving services | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Hispanic/Latino | 77,820 | 16.7 |
| White | 269,533 | 57.7 |
| Unknown | 68,576 | na |
| Gender | | |
| Female | 462,359 | 90.2 |
| Male | 50,077 | 9.8 |
| Unknown | 23,130 | na |
| Age | | |
| 0–17 | 36,334 | 7.8 |
| 18–24 | 120,464 | 25.8 |
| 25–59 | 295,395 | 63.3 |
| 60+ | 14,648 | 3.1 |
| Unknown | 68,725 | na |
| Other | | |
| Disability | 27,485 | 5.1 |
| Limited English proficiency | 37,180 | 6.9 |
| Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers | 22,383 | 4.2 |
| Resident of rural area | 143,065 | 26.7 |

na = not applicable

NOTES: STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 535,566 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.

Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom the information was known.

Table 23. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2006

| Relationship to offender | Domestic violence | | Sexual assault | | Stalking | |
|---|-------------------|---------|----------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Current/former spouse or intimate partner | 292,981 | 72.7 | 11,427 | 19.8 | 7,696 | 56.2 |
| Other family or household member | 45,426 | 11.3 | 13,847 | 24.0 | 760 | 5.6 |
| Dating relationship | 55,962 | 13.9 | 5,900 | 10.2 | 2,227 | 16.3 |
| Acquaintance | 6,923 | 1.7 | 19,213 | 33.3 | 2,677 | 19.6 |
| Stranger | 985 | 0.2 | 7,248 | 12.6 | 327 | 2.4 |
| Unknown | 68,495 | na | 16,249 | na | 3,108 | na |
| Other | 902 | 0.2 | 63 | 0.1 | 6 | 0.0 |
| Total | 471,674 | 100.0 | 73,947 | 100.0 | 16,801 | 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 24, STOP Program subgrantees routinely provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2006

| Type of service | Victims/survivors served (N = 535,566) | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Victim advocacy | 248,538 | 46.4 |
| Hotline calls | 207,364 | 38.7 |
| Crisis intervention | 178,575 | 33.3 |
| Criminal justice advocacy | 157,103 | 29.3 |
| Victim witness notification | 135,113 | 25.2 |
| Civil legal advocacy | 132,763 | 24.8 |
| Counseling/support group | 127,428 | 23.8 |
| Civil legal assistance | 21,393 | 4.0 |
| Hospital response | 20,141 | 3.8 |
| Other | 6,339 | 1.2 |

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:

- 20,742 victims/survivors and 19,471 family members received a total of 692,747 emergency shelter bed nights.
- 857 victims/survivors and 1,197 family members received a total of 182,577 transitional housing bed nights.

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 2006, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims/survivors in obtaining more than 201,104 temporary and final protection orders. Courts funded under the STOP Program processed 19,801 civil protection orders, 14,702 of which were temporary and 5,099 of which were final.

Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2006

| Provider | Total | Temporary | Final |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------|--------|
| All providers | 201,104 | 123,868 | 77,236 |
| Victim services staff | 130,346 | 77,780 | 52,566 |
| Law enforcement | 44,893 | 29,535 | 15,358 |
| Prosecution | 25,865 | 16,553 | 9,312 |

Close to half (516) of all subgrantees using funds for training addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and 226 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: 162 subgrantees reported this, making it the second 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 26 summarizes STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2006. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: 328 (14 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 26. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program in 2006

| Activity | Subgrantees responding | Total activities |
|---|------------------------|------------------|
| Cases/incidents investigated | 300 | 106,136 |
| Incident reports | 239 | 102,711 |
| Calls for assistance | 198 | 85,841 |
| Referrals of cases to prosecutor | 236 | 53,642 |
| Arrests of predominant aggressor | 224 | 31,322 |
| Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served | 155 | 24,533 |
| Protection orders issued | 124 | 17,278 |
| Enforcement of warrants | 158 | 10,037 |
| Arrests for violation of protection order | 185 | 5,169 |
| Dual arrests | 120 | 1,217 |
| Arrests for violation of bail bond | 54 | 938 |
| Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor | 33 | 110 |

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 27 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking charges during 2006.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: 332 (14 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related charges by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2006

| Charge | New charges filed | | Charges disposed | Dispositions resulting in convictions | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | | Number | Percent |
| All charges | 170,718 | 100.0 | 132,005 | 82,982 | 62.9 |
| Misdemeanor domestic violence | 95,720 | 56.1 | 79,551 | 47,934 | 60.3 |
| Felony domestic violence | 23,142 | 13.6 | 16,449 | 10,871 | 66.1 |
| Violation of protection order | 16,974 | 9.9 | 14,239 | 9,350 | 65.7 |
| Domestic violence ordinance | 15,193 | 8.9 | 5,373 | 2,739 | 51.0 |
| Violation of probation/parole | 7,429 | 4.4 | 5,965 | 5,290 | 88.7 |
| Felony sexual assault | 5,052 | 3.0 | 3,978 | 2,216 | 55.7 |

NOTES: Eight tribal grantees referred 858 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 23 courts that received STOP funding, 14 used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders' compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- 4,450 offenders were monitored.
- 12,525 individual judicial review hearings were held.

The data in Table 28 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 that were disposed of and nearly three-quarters of the protection order violations resulted in partial or full revocation of probation.

- Number of subgrantees using funds for court: 23 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 28. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2006

| 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 = 445) | 13 | 2.9 | 328 | 73.7 | 86 | 19.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 18 | 4.0 |
| New criminal behavior (N = 441) | 0 | 0.0 | 332 | 75.3 | 105 | 23.8 | 1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.7 |
| Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 821) | 435 | 53.0 | 311 | 37.9 | 36 | 4.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 39 | 4.8 |
| Other (N = 756) | 85 | 11.2 | 499 | 66.0 | 56 | 7.4 | 80 | 10.6 | 36 | 4.8 |

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. 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 2006 was 8,077; these offenders received a total of 42,270 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 3,832 victims/survivors received 6,149 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2006.

- Number of grantees using funds for probation: 22 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff, by type and number of contacts in 2006

| Type of contact | Number of offenders | Number of contacts |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Face-to-face | 5,818 | 23,462 |
| Telephone | 3,445 | 13,615 |
| Unscheduled surveillance | 1,993 | 5,193 |

- Offenders completing probation without violations: 943 (61 percent of those completing probation)
- Offenders completing probation with violations: 602 (39 percent)

The data in Table 30 reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff. Partial or full revocation represented approximately 50 percent of the dispositions for offenders who violated protection orders (48.5 percent) or who engaged in new criminal behavior (52.9 percent).

Table 30. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2006

| 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 = 204) | 24 | 11.8 | 99 | 48.5 | 53 | 26.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 26 | 12.7 |
| New criminal behavior (N = 1,035) | 40 | 3.9 | 547 | 52.9 | 222 | 21.4 | 22 | 2.1 | 204 | 19.7 |
| Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 664) | 143 | 21.5 | 310 | 46.7 | 80 | 12.0 | 5 | 0.8 | 126 | 19.0 |
| Other (N = 911) | 210 | 23.1 | 414 | 45.4 | 112 | 12.3 | 5 | 0.5 | 170 | 18.7 |

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. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

References

- Albuquerque Journal. (2004, November 15). Officials push domestic violence initiatives. *Albuquerque Journal*, p. A10.
- Allen, N., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. (2004). Battered women's multitude of needs: Evidence supporting the need for comprehensive advocacy. *Violence Against Women, 10*(9), 1015–1035.
- Anderson, M. J. (1993). A license to abuse: The impact of conditional status on female immigrants. *Yale Law Journal, 102*, 1401-1430.
- 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, executive summary* (NCJ Report No. 184112). 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*, 902-921.
- 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 16). A tide of violence. *Deseret Morning News*, p. A01.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2006). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 2005 statistical tables*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (2003). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Campbell, D. W., Sharps, P. W., Gary, F., Campbell, J. C., & Lopez, L. M. (2002). Intimate partner violence in African American women. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 7*(1).

- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichty, L. (2005). The effectiveness of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs: A review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 6*(4), 313–329.
- Committee on Law and Justice. Petersilia, J., Foote, J., & Crowell, N. (Eds.). (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* (NCJ Report No. 203276). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2003). Do domestic violence services save lives? *National Institute of Justice Journal, 250*, 20–25.
- Elliott, L., Nerney, M., Jones, T., & Friedmann, P. (2002). Barriers to screening for domestic violence. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 17*, 112-116.
- Elman, A. (2005). *Confronting the sexual abuse of women with disabilities*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWnet Applied Research Forum. Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_SVDisability.pdf.
- Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2004). Ethnic differences in intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*(4), 303-317.
- Fleury, R. E., Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D. I. (2000). When ending the relationship does not end the violence. *Violence Against Women, 6*(12), 1363-1383.
- Friday, P., Lord, V., Exum, M., & Hartman, J. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence police unit* (NCJ Report No. 215916). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 397-405.
- Frye, V., Hosein, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S., & Wilt, S. (2005). Femicide in New York City 1990 to 1999. *Homicide Studies, 9*(3), 204–228.
- Gallagher, M. (2005, May 1). 8 of 10 assault cases dismissed. *Albuquerque Journal*.
- Gondolf, E. (2000). Mandatory court review and batterer program compliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(4), 428-437.
- Gondolf, E. W., Fisher, E., & McFerron, J. R. (1990). The helpseeking behavior of battered women: An analysis of 6,000 shelter interviews. In E. Viano (Ed.), *The victimology handbook: Research findings, treatment and public policy*. New York, NY: Garland.

- Hamberger, L., 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.
- Harrell, A., Castro, J., Newmark, L., & Visser, C. (2007). *Final report on the evaluation of the judicial oversight demonstration: Executive summary* (NCJ Report No. 219386). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hartley, C. & Frohmann, L. (2003). *Cook County target abuser call (TAC): An evaluation of a specialized domestic violence court* (NCJ Report No. 202944). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Keilitz, S. (2004). *Specialization of domestic violence case management in the courts: A national survey* (NCJ Report No. 199724). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Klein, A. (2004). *The criminal justice response to domestic violence*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Klein, A. (2005). *Rhode Island domestic violence shelter and advocacy services: An assessment*. Sudbury, MA: Advocates for Human Potential.
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). *An evaluation of Rhode Island's specialized supervision of domestic violence probationers*. Waltham, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corporation & American Probation and Parole Association.
- Lee, R., Thompson, V., & Mechanic, M. (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). *Sexual assault in rural communities*. Harrisburg, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main_Doc.php?docid=419.
- Luna-Firebaugh, E., 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* (NCJ Report No. 195174). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved October 16, 2007, from <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/195174.pdf>.
- McFarlane, J., Campbell, J., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 20*, 51-68.
- Martin, S., Neepa, R., Sotres-Alvares, D., Kupper, L., Moracco, K., Kickens, P., et al. (2006). Physical and sexual assault of women with disabilities. *Violence Against Women, 12*(9), 823-837.
- National Center on Elder Abuse. (2005). *Fact sheet: Elder abuse prevalence and incidence*. Washington, DC: National Center on Elder Abuse.

- Nosek, M., Foley, C., Hughes, R., & Howland, C. (2001). Vulnerabilities for abuse among women with disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability, 19*(3), 177–189.
- Owens, S. (2004, November 26). Domestic violence cases fuel dispute. *Orlando Sentinel*, p. B1.
- 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.
- Ramsey-Klawnsnik, H. (1991). Elder sexual abuse: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect, 3*(3), 73–90.
- Rennison, C. (2001). *Violent victimization and race, 1993-1998* (NCJ Report No. 176354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ruback, B. R., & 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.
- 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.
- Shepard, M., Falk, D., & Elliott, B. (2002). Enhancing coordinated community responses to reduce recidivism in cases of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 551-568.
- 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* (NCJ Report No.187772). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Smith, D. (2008). Disability, gender and intimate partner violence: Relationships from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Sexuality and Disability, 26*(1), 15-28.
- Sullivan, C., & Bybee, D. (2000). Using a longitudinal data set to further understanding of the trajectory of intimate violence over time (NCJ Report No.199727). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Teaster, P., Roberto, K., Duke, J., & Myeonghwan, K. (2000). Sexual abuse of older adults: Preliminary findings of cases in Virginia. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect, 12*(3/4), 1–16.
- Thistlewaite, A., Wooldredge, J. & Gibbs, D. (1998). Severity of dispositions and domestic violence recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency, 44*(3), 388-399.

- Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N. (1998). Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey (NCJ Report No. 172837). 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* (NCJ Report No. 183781). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>.
- Townsend, M., Hunt, D., Kuck, S. & Baxter, C. (2006). *Law enforcement response to domestic violence calls for service* (NCJ Report No. 215915). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Tyiska, C., (1998). Working with victims of crime with disabilities [Bulletin]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime.
- Worden, A. (2001). *Models of community coordination in partner violence cases: A multi-side comparative analysis, final report* (NCJ Report No.187351). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Appendix A. STOP Program Funding Allocation and Distribution: 2006

Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2006

| | Number of subgrantee awards | | | | | | Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$) | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|---------|
| | Total | VS | LE | PRO | CRT | OTH | VS | LE | PRO | CRT | OTH | Total | ADM |
| Alabama | 47 | 26 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1,174,281 | 633,378 | 493,760 | 298,752 | 88,070 | 2,688,241 | 197,504 |
| Alaska | 19 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 432,248 | 362,901 | 188,569 | 44,232 | 31,442 | 1,059,392 | 38,491 |
| American Samoa | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 223,428 | 159,590 | 159,590 | 31,918 | 0 | 574,526 | 63,836 |
| Arizona | 46 | 25 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 961,594 | 489,344 | 327,263 | 140,568 | 0 | 1,918,769 | 145,935 |
| Arkansas | 49 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 697,662 | 731,098 | 747,315 | 52,849 | 374,106 | 2,603,030 | 68,681 |
| California | 197 | 131 | 26 | 36 | 1 | 3 | 3,409,830 | 2,529,169 | 3,484,082 | 542,918 | 1,132,563 | 11,098,562 | 571,493 |
| Colorado | 114 | 66 | 17 | 24 | 4 | 3 | 1,404,222 | 873,850 | 875,678 | 176,739 | 164,911 | 3,495,400 | 283,600 |
| Connecticut | 14 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 695,898 | 427,775 | 380,713 | 76,650 | 0 | 1,581,036 | 87,018 |
| Delaware | 18 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 361,822 | 209,159 | 199,026 | 11,131 | 0 | 781,138 | 41,650 |
| District of Columbia | 15 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 232,521 | 193,653 | 186,365 | 37,173 | 0 | 649,712 | 0 |
| Florida | 84 | 24 | 24 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 2,354,425 | 1,312,000 | 1,289,743 | 281,829 | 0 | 5,237,997 | 234,464 |
| Georgia | 59 | 26 | 14 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 1,512,228 | 734,448 | 674,721 | 69,184 | 524,249 | 3,514,830 | 167,136 |
| Guam | 12 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 174,674 | 145,562 | 145,562 | 29,112 | 87,337 | 582,247 | 64,694 |
| Hawaii | 14 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 283,892 | 216,225 | 336,879 | 43,245 | 0 | 880,241 | 32,335 |
| Idaho | 18 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 259,834 | 264,076 | 233,842 | 40,608 | 65,697 | 864,057 | 0 |
| Illinois | 34 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 955,025 | 1,429,408 | 248,929 | 798,009 | 3,431,371 | 22,977 |
| Indiana | 71 | 30 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 5 | 816,632 | 572,627 | 617,725 | 127,015 | 140,341 | 2,274,340 | 249,651 |
| Iowa | 65 | 25 | 28 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 630,050 | 373,758 | 368,200 | 71,076 | 0 | 1,443,084 | 74,817 |
| Kansas | 28 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 556,274 | 386,494 | 260,034 | 108,965 | 0 | 1,311,767 | 36,059 |
| Kentucky | 34 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 523,340 | 522,325 | 424,607 | 225,589 | 249,855 | 1,945,716 | 48,943 |
| Louisiana | 62 | 33 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 635,245 | 413,362 | 320,103 | 131,797 | 0 | 1,500,507 | 94,500 |
| Maine | 38 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 280,983 | 325,159 | 224,652 | 88,850 | 235,928 | 1,155,572 | 75,000 |
| Maryland | 106 | 43 | 22 | 17 | 5 | 19 | 607,737 | 537,526 | 478,577 | 89,935 | 287,027 | 2,000,802 | 182,399 |
| Massachusetts | 72 | 16 | 28 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 689,900 | 598,104 | 616,614 | 117,000 | 353,471 | 2,375,089 | 177,428 |
| Michigan | 356 | 88 | 90 | 90 | 88 | 0 | 1,597,574 | 887,541 | 887,541 | 177,508 | 0 | 3,550,164 | 125,519 |
| Minnesota | 32 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 543,493 | 154,711 | 195,289 | 86,364 | 300,830 | 1,280,687 | 160,933 |
| Mississippi | 36 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 816,093 | 474,800 | 310,286 | 39,867 | 173,389 | 1,814,435 | 83,599 |
| Missouri | 69 | 34 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 939,033 | 588,726 | 687,980 | 200,780 | 127,317 | 2,543,836 | 91,134 |
| Montana | 25 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 247,480 | 206,700 | 214,607 | 50,000 | 60,319 | 779,106 | 86,567 |

Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2006

| | Number of subgrantee awards | | | | | | Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$) | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Total | VS | LE | PRO | CRT | OTH | VS | LE | PRO | CRT | OTH | Total | ADM |
| Nebraska | 54 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 320,190 | 266,825 | 266,825 | 53,365 | 160,095 | 1,067,300 | 222,529 |
| Nevada | 51 | 22 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 460,921 | 364,055 | 203,143 | 72,475 | 107,775 | 1,208,369 | 77,215 |
| New Hampshire | 22 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 380,301 | 235,339 | 275,777 | 77,600 | 0 | 969,017 | 56,439 |
| New Jersey | 51 | 19 | 14 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 935,635 | 716,366 | 615,964 | 44,535 | 538,065 | 2,850,565 | 239,154 |
| New Mexico | 23 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 135,048 | 150,766 | 84,695 | 35,000 | 41,146 | 446,655 | 117,511 |
| New York | 126 | 50 | 37 | 32 | 1 | 6 | 1,848,171 | 1,304,867 | 1,565,570 | 274,185 | 301,325 | 5,294,118 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 28 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 883,993 | 725,002 | 782,778 | 138,527 | 836,800 | 3,367,100 | 159,978 |
| North Dakota | 149 | 38 | 40 | 38 | 2 | 31 | 435,086 | 350,774 | 346,083 | 71,162 | 218,857 | 1,421,962 | 97,823 |
| No.Mariana Islands | 24 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 400,454 | 250,727 | 280,219 | 149,144 | 0 | 1,080,544 | 74,638 |
| Ohio | 122 | 36 | 28 | 32 | 11 | 15 | 1,155,300 | 1,102,698 | 1,118,854 | 200,915 | 391,329 | 3,969,096 | 194,200 |
| Oklahoma | 47 | 16 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 436,620 | 366,704 | 345,121 | 131,112 | 276,224 | 1,555,781 | 59,697 |
| Oregon | 71 | 39 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 709,942 | 293,347 | 328,030 | 103,018 | 0 | 1,434,337 | 159,488 |
| Pennsylvania | 282 | 92 | 94 | 94 | 2 | 0 | 1,982,179 | 999,672 | 999,671 | 188,318 | 0 | 4,169,840 | 218,116 |
| Puerto Rico | 25 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 586,824 | 385,875 | 385,875 | 159,587 | 0 | 1,518,161 | 263,715 |
| Rhode Island | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 374,380 | 209,550 | 204,525 | 0 | 0 | 788,455 | 183,340 |
| South Carolina | 40 | 12 | 15 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 502,859 | 466,844 | 530,207 | 81,523 | 222,818 | 1,804,251 | 188,550 |
| South Dakota | 80 | 51 | 6 | 19 | 2 | 2 | 415,575 | 380,515 | 389,712 | 98,157 | 155,075 | 1,439,034 | 70,905 |
| Tennessee | 64 | 30 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 916,918 | 580,509 | 554,802 | 155,874 | 0 | 2,208,103 | 0 |
| Texas | 205 | 95 | 46 | 61 | 3 | 0 | 5,655,604 | 3,584,540 | 3,799,430 | 736,498 | 0 | 13,776,072 | 583,688 |
| Utah | 53 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 403,475 | 310,254 | 359,057 | 179,301 | 216,276 | 1,468,363 | 69,027 |
| Vermont | 23 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 262,500 | 194,500 | 269,885 | 39,411 | 0 | 766,296 | 38,900 |
| Virgin Islands | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331,055 | 224,020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 555,075 | 38,900 |
| Virginia | 92 | 37 | 22 | 16 | 5 | 12 | 834,758 | 664,464 | 619,988 | 125,720 | 293,654 | 2,538,584 | 205,200 |
| Washington | 113 | 50 | 31 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 918,328 | 681,509 | 684,256 | 105,885 | 65,000 | 2,454,978 | 218,871 |
| West Virginia | 77 | 18 | 27 | 19 | 1 | 12 | 349,012 | 278,443 | 307,582 | 52,080 | 114,926 | 1,102,043 | 80,485 |
| Wisconsin | 99 | 30 | 24 | 22 | 20 | 3 | 853,133 | 417,807 | 553,113 | 168,204 | 10,550 | 2,002,807 | 221,164 |
| Wyoming | 91 | 46 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 209,277 | 179,728 | 271,346 | 0 | 104,039 | 764,390 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 3,783 | 1,480 | 942 | 854 | 251 | 256 | 45,759,931 | 31,964,786 | 32,901,239 | 7,082,179 | 9,248,815 | 126,956,950 | 7,345,896 |

Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2006

| State | Sexual assault | Domestic violence | Stalking | Total |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------|-------|
| Alabama | 20 | 80 | 0 | 100 |
| Alaska | 35 | 60 | 5 | 100 |
| American Samoa | 50 | 50 | 0 | 100 |
| Arizona | 20 | 75 | 5 | 100 |
| Arkansas | 18 | 77 | 5 | 100 |
| California | 33 | 58 | 9 | 100 |
| Colorado | 25 | 74 | 1 | 100 |
| Connecticut | 35 | 65 | 0 | 100 |
| Delaware | 25 | 75 | 0 | 100 |
| District of Columbia | 10 | 85 | 5 | 100 |
| Florida | 34 | 65 | 1 | 100 |
| Georgia | 31 | 66 | 3 | 100 |
| Guam | 1 | 99 | 0 | 100 |
| Hawaii | 30 | 69 | 1 | 100 |
| Idaho | 15 | 80 | 5 | 100 |
| Illinois | 50 | 50 | 0 | 100 |
| Indiana | 18 | 78 | 4 | 100 |
| Iowa | 30 | 67 | 3 | 100 |
| Kansas | 21 | 74 | 5 | 100 |
| Kentucky | 25 | 65 | 10 | 100 |
| Louisiana | 31 | 50 | 19 | 100 |
| Maine | 35 | 62 | 3 | 100 |
| Maryland | 19 | 79 | 2 | 100 |
| Massachusetts | 23 | 75 | 2 | 100 |
| Michigan | 19 | 76 | 5 | 100 |
| Minnesota | 49 | 49 | 2 | 100 |
| Mississippi | 45 | 45 | 10 | 100 |
| Missouri | 20 | 79 | 1 | 100 |
| Montana | 20 | 75 | 5 | 100 |
| Nebraska | 15 | 84 | 1 | 100 |
| Nevada | 21 | 71 | 8 | 100 |
| New Hampshire | 20 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| New Jersey | 25 | 75 | 0 | 100 |
| New Mexico | 37 | 57 | 6 | 100 |
| New York | 40 | 60 | 0 | 100 |
| North Carolina | 14 | 85 | 1 | 100 |
| North Dakota | 16 | 83 | 1 | 100 |

Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2006

| State | Sexual assault | Domestic violence | Stalking | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Northern Mariana Islands | 6 | 90 | 4 | 100 |
| Ohio | 14 | 80 | 6 | 100 |
| Oklahoma | 20 | 74 | 6 | 100 |
| Oregon | 25 | 75 | 0 | 100 |
| Pennsylvania | 35 | 60 | 5 | 100 |
| Puerto Rico | 8 | 90 | 2 | 100 |
| Rhode Island | 35 | 60 | 5 | 100 |
| South Carolina | 40 | 54 | 6 | 100 |
| South Dakota | 24 | 75 | 1 | 100 |
| Tennessee | 7 | 90 | 3 | 100 |
| Texas | 21 | 75 | 4 | 100 |
| Utah | 16 | 81 | 3 | 100 |
| Vermont | 20 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| Virgin Islands | 13 | 80 | 7 | 100 |
| Virginia | 15 | 82 | 3 | 100 |
| Washington | 31 | 68 | 1 | 100 |
| West Virginia | 14 | 77 | 9 | 100 |
| Wisconsin | 38 | 61 | 1 | 100 |
| Wyoming | 15 | 80 | 5 | 100 |

Appendix B. STOP Program-Funded
Activities and Victims/survivors
Served: 2006

Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state:
2006

| State | Staff | Training | Policies | Products | Data collection and communication systems | Specialized units | System improvement | Victim services | Law enforcement | Prosecution | Courts | Probation and parole |
|----------------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|
| Alabama | 35 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 22 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| Alaska | 8 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| American Samoa | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Arizona | 25 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Arkansas | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| California | 121 | 28 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 31 | 1 | 109 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 2 |
| Colorado | 61 | 39 | 22 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 54 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Delaware | 12 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| District of Columbia | 8 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Florida | 42 | 14 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 19 | 2 | 25 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 55 | 37 | 22 | 25 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 38 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Guam | 9 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Hawaii | 20 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Idaho | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois | 10 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Indiana | 61 | 30 | 19 | 13 | 11 | 25 | 7 | 38 | 6 | 19 | 2 | 0 |
| Iowa | 58 | 36 | 19 | 6 | 7 | 33 | 4 | 26 | 17 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| Kansas | 18 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Kentucky | 28 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 65 | 24 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 25 | 1 | 45 | 20 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Maine | 24 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland | 59 | 28 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 13 | 9 | 33 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 61 | 32 | 15 | 25 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 49 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Michigan | 47 | 30 | 17 | 11 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 45 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Minnesota | 37 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 43 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 24 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Missouri | 68 | 24 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 23 | 5 | 42 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| Montana | 22 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Nebraska | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 |

Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state:
2006

| State | Staff | Training | Policies | Products | Data collection and communication systems | Specialized units | System improvement | Victim services | Law enforcement | Prosecution | Courts | Probation and parole |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|---|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|
| Nevada | 33 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| New Hampshire | 20 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 60 | 43 | 23 | 31 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 49 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 40 | 12 | 7 | 15 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 21 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| New York | 119 | 78 | 45 | 49 | 26 | 31 | 14 | 98 | 12 | 23 | 1 | 3 |
| North Carolina | 35 | 20 | 18 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 19 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 34 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 103 | 38 | 14 | 20 | 17 | 32 | 17 | 77 | 15 | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| Oklahoma | 38 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Oregon | 48 | 14 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 47 | 38 | 25 | 16 | 11 | 33 | 6 | 45 | 28 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| Puerto Rico | 12 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 8 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 29 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 34 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 50 | 21 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 6 | 31 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Texas | 119 | 55 | 24 | 27 | 23 | 47 | 11 | 85 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 1 |
| Utah | 34 | 17 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 29 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont | 8 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Virgin Islands | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 89 | 68 | 25 | 73 | 27 | 24 | 14 | 61 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 75 | 35 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 11 | 57 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 24 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 23 | 1 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 43 | 28 | 14 | 22 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2,184 | 1,043 | 523 | 587 | 359 | 626 | 282 | 1,579 | 328 | 332 | 23 | 22 |

Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2006

| State | Subgrants | Subgrantees | Victims seeking services | | | | Victims receiving services | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| | | using funds for victim services | Total | Served | Partially served | Not served | Total | Domestic violence | Sexual assault | Stalking |
| Alabama | 36 | 22 | 8,556 | 8,354 | 139 | 63 | 8,493 | 7,689 | 706 | 98 |
| Alaska | 8 | 4 | 625 | 477 | 29 | 119 | 506 | 382 | 120 | 4 |
| American Samoa | 6 | 3 | 1,055 | 1,049 | 6 | 0 | 1,055 | 862 | 193 | 0 |
| Arizona | 25 | 20 | 7,781 | 7,109 | 659 | 13 | 7,768 | 7,506 | 234 | 28 |
| Arkansas | 24 | 19 | 5,251 | 4,985 | 196 | 70 | 5,181 | 4,955 | 213 | 13 |
| California | 142 | 109 | 11,987 | 11,087 | 402 | 498 | 11,489 | 6,170 | 5,272 | 47 |
| Colorado | 62 | 54 | 18,564 | 17,540 | 362 | 662 | 17,902 | 15,171 | 2,453 | 278 |
| Connecticut | 7 | 6 | 4,809 | 4,809 | 0 | 0 | 4,809 | 4,123 | 686 | 0 |
| Delaware | 17 | 11 | 3,139 | 3,000 | 127 | 12 | 3,127 | 2,413 | 692 | 22 |
| District of Columbia | 9 | 8 | 4,903 | 3,615 | 691 | 597 | 4,306 | 3,559 | 735 | 12 |
| Florida | 42 | 25 | 14,852 | 14,170 | 672 | 10 | 14,842 | 13,019 | 1,625 | 198 |
| Georgia | 57 | 38 | 17,001 | 15,809 | 911 | 281 | 16,720 | 10,428 | 5,490 | 802 |
| Guam | 13 | 7 | 1,754 | 1,699 | 34 | 21 | 1,733 | 1,378 | 337 | 18 |
| Hawaii | 20 | 11 | 3,189 | 3,090 | 19 | 80 | 3,109 | 2,793 | 311 | 5 |
| Idaho | 6 | 4 | 2,344 | 2,344 | 0 | 0 | 2,344 | 1,851 | 196 | 297 |
| Illinois | 20 | 17 | 12,697 | 11,783 | 806 | 108 | 12,589 | 10,800 | 1,785 | 4 |
| Indiana | 67 | 38 | 14,313 | 12,783 | 375 | 1,155 | 13,158 | 12,336 | 696 | 126 |
| Iowa | 65 | 26 | 4,463 | 4,398 | 61 | 4 | 4,459 | 3,723 | 723 | 13 |
| Kansas | 18 | 13 | 6,361 | 6,191 | 110 | 60 | 6,301 | 5,445 | 384 | 472 |
| Kentucky | 29 | 20 | 10,384 | 9,797 | 497 | 90 | 10,294 | 9,813 | 398 | 83 |
| Louisiana | 76 | 45 | 25,494 | 24,740 | 327 | 427 | 25,067 | 21,268 | 3,518 | 281 |
| Maine | 28 | 10 | 2,084 | 1,457 | 603 | 24 | 2,060 | 1,718 | 334 | 8 |
| Maryland | 62 | 33 | 7,159 | 6,347 | 607 | 205 | 6,954 | 6,146 | 696 | 112 |
| Massachusetts | 62 | 49 | 13,892 | 12,906 | 883 | 103 | 13,789 | 13,101 | 633 | 55 |
| Michigan | 47 | 45 | 21,583 | 21,536 | 37 | 10 | 21,573 | 18,193 | 2,312 | 1,068 |
| Minnesota | 37 | 22 | 2,807 | 2,574 | 155 | 78 | 2,729 | 2,142 | 558 | 29 |
| Mississippi | 43 | 24 | 5,347 | 5,049 | 200 | 98 | 5,249 | 4,606 | 624 | 19 |
| Missouri | 69 | 42 | 13,679 | 12,985 | 441 | 253 | 13,426 | 11,109 | 1,740 | 577 |
| Montana | 22 | 10 | 2,068 | 2,068 | 0 | 0 | 2,068 | 1,551 | 365 | 152 |

Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2006

| State | Subgrants | Subgrantees | Victims seeking services | | | | Victims receiving services | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | using funds for victim services | Total | Served | Partially served | Not served | Total | Domestic violence | Sexual assault | Stalking |
| Nebraska | 15 | 12 | 4,756 | 4,630 | 123 | 3 | 4,753 | 4,392 | 330 | 31 |
| Nevada | 35 | 26 | 10,305 | 9,505 | 747 | 53 | 10,252 | 8,361 | 1,079 | 812 |
| New Hampshire | 21 | 11 | 2,079 | 1,980 | 98 | 1 | 2,078 | 1,502 | 356 | 220 |
| New Jersey | 62 | 49 | 13,834 | 13,634 | 128 | 72 | 13,762 | 12,379 | 1,372 | 11 |
| New Mexico | 40 | 21 | 3,222 | 3,083 | 90 | 49 | 3,173 | 2,938 | 197 | 38 |
| New York | 120 | 98 | 37,460 | 33,813 | 2,691 | 956 | 36,504 | 31,975 | 4,245 | 284 |
| North Carolina | 37 | 19 | 4,915 | 4,657 | 251 | 7 | 4,908 | 4,583 | 68 | 257 |
| North Dakota | 36 | 31 | 1,649 | 1,619 | 26 | 4 | 1,645 | 1,380 | 246 | 19 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 4 | 2 | 170 | 162 | 8 | 0 | 170 | 156 | 9 | 5 |
| Ohio | 108 | 77 | 35,194 | 33,585 | 865 | 744 | 34,450 | 30,297 | 2,417 | 1,736 |
| Oklahoma | 40 | 19 | 4,464 | 4,145 | 232 | 87 | 4,377 | 3,734 | 527 | 116 |
| Oregon | 49 | 40 | 10,309 | 9,344 | 366 | 599 | 9,710 | 8,287 | 1,247 | 176 |
| Pennsylvania | 48 | 45 | 29,264 | 27,633 | 1,293 | 338 | 28,926 | 21,388 | 7,060 | 478 |
| Puerto Rico | 12 | 9 | 6,116 | 5,769 | 347 | 0 | 6,116 | 5,957 | 36 | 123 |
| Rhode Island | 9 | 7 | 11,014 | 11,014 | 0 | 0 | 11,014 | 10,710 | 296 | 8 |
| South Carolina | 37 | 22 | 8,060 | 7,905 | 139 | 16 | 8,044 | 6,858 | 987 | 199 |
| South Dakota | 35 | 28 | 8,008 | 7,867 | 127 | 14 | 7,994 | 5,919 | 809 | 1,266 |
| Tennessee | 51 | 31 | 5,542 | 5,349 | 131 | 62 | 5,480 | 4,499 | 823 | 158 |
| Texas | 122 | 85 | 32,825 | 30,826 | 1,723 | 276 | 32,549 | 28,583 | 3,324 | 642 |
| Utah | 37 | 29 | 16,970 | 12,633 | 2,137 | 2,200 | 14,770 | 13,764 | 818 | 188 |
| Vermont | 9 | 8 | 3,700 | 3,700 | 0 | 0 | 3,700 | 3,004 | 677 | 19 |
| Virgin Islands | 3 | 2 | 340 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 320 | 20 | 0 |
| Virginia | 91 | 61 | 16,925 | 15,695 | 892 | 338 | 16,587 | 14,337 | 1,974 | 276 |
| Washington | 87 | 57 | 12,546 | 12,330 | 80 | 136 | 12,410 | 11,029 | 1,226 | 155 |
| West Virginia | 27 | 16 | 6,581 | 6,483 | 62 | 36 | 6,545 | 6,235 | 207 | 103 |
| Wisconsin | 47 | 13 | 8,692 | 7,833 | 631 | 228 | 8,464 | 5,530 | 2,651 | 283 |
| Wyoming | 26 | 26 | 3,745 | 3,739 | 6 | 0 | 3,745 | 3,046 | 263 | 436 |
| TOTAL | 2,327 | 1,579 | 546,826 | 513,024 | 22,542 | 11,260 | 535,566 | 455,413 | 67,293 | 12,860 |

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2006

| State | Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | Gender | | | Age | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|---------------------|--------|---------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-----|---------|
| | Black/ African American | American Indian/Alaska Native | Asian | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | Hispanic/ Latino | White | Unknown | Female | Male | Unknown | 0-17 | 18-24 | 25-29 | 60+ | Unknown |
| Alabama | 3,164 | 22 | 33 | 15 | 156 | 4,668 | 448 | 7,314 | 879 | 300 | 416 | 1,649 | 4,394 | 213 | 1,821 |
| Alaska | 13 | 111 | 70 | 6 | 83 | 165 | 59 | 480 | 24 | 2 | 49 | 92 | 333 | 19 | 13 |
| American Samoa | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1,036 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 845 | 210 | 0 | 111 | 409 | 441 | 94 | 0 |
| Arizona | 305 | 527 | 42 | 3 | 2,699 | 2,464 | 1,796 | 5,577 | 1,451 | 740 | 368 | 1,127 | 4,518 | 202 | 1,553 |
| Arkansas | 1,145 | 9 | 30 | 0 | 127 | 3,882 | 31 | 4,672 | 505 | 4 | 291 | 1,656 | 3,061 | 123 | 50 |
| California | 666 | 288 | 272 | 66 | 2,865 | 3,145 | 4,452 | 10,212 | 705 | 572 | 1,744 | 1,973 | 3,396 | 155 | 4,221 |
| Colorado | 942 | 491 | 169 | 33 | 4,361 | 9,080 | 2,933 | 15,196 | 2,392 | 314 | 1,558 | 3,132 | 9,232 | 513 | 3,467 |
| Connecticut | 1,222 | 5 | 57 | 12 | 1,526 | 1,744 | 243 | 3,892 | 915 | 2 | 422 | 1,001 | 2,973 | 113 | 300 |
| Delaware | 663 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 323 | 1,805 | 327 | 2,813 | 220 | 94 | 252 | 551 | 2,025 | 68 | 231 |
| District of Columbia | 2,296 | 18 | 58 | 4 | 560 | 123 | 1,268 | 2,818 | 409 | 1,079 | 171 | 559 | 2,434 | 106 | 1,036 |
| Florida | 3,595 | 16 | 48 | 3 | 1,650 | 7,284 | 2,302 | 10,769 | 2,226 | 1,847 | 475 | 2,957 | 6,960 | 385 | 4,065 |
| Georgia | 8,163 | 1 | 325 | 2 | 1,303 | 6,433 | 524 | 15,326 | 1,369 | 25 | 2,726 | 3,904 | 9,335 | 279 | 476 |
| Guam | 6 | 1 | 76 | 1,547 | 2 | 40 | 75 | 1,352 | 377 | 4 | 357 | 341 | 927 | 28 | 80 |
| Hawaii | 13 | 4 | 116 | 257 | 25 | 251 | 2,452 | 3,109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 492 | 28 | 2,413 |
| Idaho | 17 | 37 | 22 | 3 | 314 | 1,899 | 56 | 1,936 | 405 | 3 | 590 | 959 | 671 | 124 | 0 |
| Illinois | 3,821 | 24 | 180 | 9 | 2,214 | 5,098 | 1,338 | 11,549 | 1,040 | 0 | 1,849 | 2,725 | 7,446 | 472 | 97 |
| Indiana | 2,958 | 39 | 63 | 8 | 764 | 8,691 | 691 | 12,223 | 755 | 180 | 463 | 3,428 | 7,604 | 224 | 1,439 |
| Iowa | 232 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 655 | 3,347 | 175 | 4,107 | 336 | 16 | 459 | 1,025 | 2,461 | 133 | 381 |
| Kansas | 1,086 | 32 | 68 | 9 | 965 | 3,512 | 642 | 5,055 | 759 | 487 | 393 | 1,571 | 3,514 | 142 | 681 |
| Kentucky | 2,270 | 6 | 40 | 0 | 321 | 7,599 | 247 | 9,089 | 1,165 | 40 | 319 | 2,762 | 6,761 | 284 | 168 |
| Louisiana | 8,018 | 117 | 57 | 4 | 418 | 12,092 | 4,371 | 20,119 | 2,020 | 2,928 | 1,843 | 5,842 | 12,318 | 432 | 4,632 |
| Maine | 96 | 8 | 20 | 1 | 134 | 563 | 1,240 | 1,942 | 118 | 0 | 17 | 287 | 389 | 8 | 1,359 |
| Maryland | 2,806 | 9 | 207 | 5 | 844 | 2,712 | 447 | 6,875 | 69 | 10 | 47 | 1,379 | 4,291 | 259 | 978 |
| Massachusetts | 1,476 | 13 | 280 | 10 | 3,357 | 7,365 | 1,386 | 11,858 | 1,399 | 532 | 956 | 2,735 | 7,861 | 494 | 1,743 |
| Michigan | 6,398 | 154 | 97 | 14 | 549 | 13,922 | 476 | 19,506 | 1,926 | 141 | 1,419 | 6,565 | 12,144 | 492 | 953 |
| Minnesota | 326 | 689 | 20 | 10 | 170 | 1,201 | 321 | 2,601 | 128 | 0 | 189 | 865 | 1,379 | 167 | 129 |
| Mississippi | 2,027 | 50 | 16 | 0 | 110 | 2,270 | 816 | 4,295 | 596 | 358 | 590 | 1,150 | 2,533 | 55 | 921 |
| Missouri | 2,713 | 62 | 57 | 17 | 326 | 7,918 | 2,456 | 12,727 | 694 | 5 | 492 | 2,959 | 6,888 | 249 | 2,838 |
| Montana | 21 | 474 | 6 | 0 | 61 | 1,280 | 227 | 1,926 | 127 | 15 | 160 | 808 | 982 | 46 | 72 |

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2006

| State | Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | Gender | | | Age | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Black/ African American | American Indian/Alaska Native | Asian | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | Hispanic/ Latino | White | Unknown | Female | Male | Unknown | 0-17 | 18-24 | 25-29 | 60+ | Unknown |
| Nebraska | 414 | 110 | 30 | 4 | 565 | 3,219 | 411 | 4,270 | 460 | 23 | 169 | 1,324 | 2,623 | 135 | 502 |
| Nevada | 1,197 | 206 | 204 | 51 | 2,074 | 5,820 | 703 | 8,538 | 1,661 | 53 | 640 | 2,133 | 6,433 | 426 | 620 |
| New Hampshire | 84 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 77 | 1,594 | 328 | 1,724 | 309 | 45 | 112 | 705 | 1,103 | 59 | 99 |
| New Jersey | 3,504 | 21 | 503 | 10 | 3,783 | 4,499 | 1,449 | 12,273 | 1,159 | 330 | 506 | 2,831 | 8,830 | 447 | 1,148 |
| New Mexico | 56 | 283 | 19 | 5 | 1,925 | 847 | 46 | 2,684 | 484 | 5 | 140 | 808 | 2,067 | 104 | 54 |
| New York | 7,329 | 259 | 1,549 | 9 | 5,232 | 15,077 | 7,317 | 30,282 | 2,885 | 3,337 | 2,524 | 6,468 | 18,867 | 1,155 | 7,490 |
| North Carolina | 1,652 | 37 | 21 | 0 | 496 | 2,229 | 474 | 3,785 | 1,114 | 9 | 139 | 1,134 | 2,945 | 100 | 590 |
| North Dakota | 36 | 270 | 5 | 1 | 53 | 1,007 | 274 | 1,500 | 143 | 2 | 24 | 536 | 1,046 | 38 | 1 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 0 | 0 | 71 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 158 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 136 | 5 | 0 |
| Ohio | 7,540 | 17 | 81 | 10 | 1,282 | 19,015 | 6,692 | 28,604 | 2,410 | 3,436 | 1,394 | 8,373 | 17,767 | 535 | 6,381 |
| Oklahoma | 307 | 429 | 15 | 10 | 330 | 2,828 | 537 | 3,493 | 440 | 444 | 470 | 847 | 2,446 | 80 | 534 |
| Oregon | 154 | 250 | 60 | 45 | 966 | 4,430 | 3,810 | 7,374 | 829 | 1,507 | 439 | 1,378 | 4,616 | 366 | 2,911 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,519 | 36 | 350 | 10 | 4,196 | 17,726 | 3,288 | 26,362 | 2,250 | 314 | 2,680 | 5,543 | 18,318 | 1,076 | 1,309 |
| Puerto Rico | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6,081 | 30 | 3 | 6,116 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 1,578 | 4,020 | 130 | 289 |
| Rhode Island | 1,007 | 75 | 130 | 0 | 1,430 | 7,400 | 1,412 | 8,288 | 2,117 | 609 | 653 | 4,845 | 4,659 | 402 | 455 |
| South Carolina | 2,871 | 26 | 22 | 3 | 429 | 4,441 | 260 | 7,273 | 768 | 3 | 352 | 2,071 | 4,875 | 557 | 189 |
| South Dakota | 245 | 2,916 | 21 | 11 | 118 | 4,046 | 658 | 6,688 | 1,226 | 80 | 608 | 2,064 | 4,037 | 144 | 1,141 |
| Tennessee | 1,062 | 16 | 32 | 12 | 317 | 3,973 | 68 | 5,260 | 220 | 0 | 114 | 1,361 | 3,629 | 123 | 253 |
| Texas | 6,406 | 238 | 307 | 84 | 14,299 | 10,490 | 923 | 29,779 | 2,733 | 37 | 2,063 | 8,100 | 20,904 | 727 | 755 |
| Utah | 280 | 244 | 48 | 156 | 2,862 | 9,790 | 1,530 | 12,919 | 1,380 | 471 | 1,058 | 2,897 | 8,805 | 355 | 1,655 |
| Vermont | 76 | 53 | 26 | 27 | 37 | 2,203 | 1,278 | 3,257 | 384 | 59 | 553 | 781 | 1,586 | 47 | 733 |
| Virgin Islands | 200 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 132 | 24 | 0 | 256 | 84 | 0 | 93 | 46 | 187 | 4 | 10 |
| Virginia | 5,014 | 13 | 290 | 10 | 1,404 | 9,240 | 764 | 14,832 | 1,611 | 144 | 743 | 3,536 | 11,006 | 461 | 841 |
| Washington | 805 | 487 | 294 | 90 | 1,671 | 8,942 | 136 | 11,917 | 492 | 1 | 0 | 3,269 | 8,556 | 432 | 153 |
| West Virginia | 287 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 49 | 4,845 | 1,415 | 5,683 | 861 | 1 | 720 | 1,234 | 3,164 | 495 | 932 |
| Wisconsin | 1,176 | 109 | 1,306 | 2 | 802 | 2,428 | 2,666 | 5,593 | 414 | 2,457 | 781 | 1,066 | 2,912 | 203 | 3,502 |
| Wyoming | 51 | 191 | 29 | 12 | 328 | 2,822 | 331 | 3,268 | 412 | 65 | 533 | 921 | 2,095 | 135 | 61 |
| TOTAL | 101,730 | 9,527 | 7,942 | 3,752 | 77,820 | 269,533 | 68,576 | 462,359 | 50,077 | 23,130 | 36,334 | 120,464 | 295,395 | 14,648 | 68,725 |

Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2006

| State | Disabled | Limited English proficiency | Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers | Live in rural areas |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Alabama | 361 | 51 | 19 | 2,218 |
| Alaska | 30 | 127 | 170 | 332 |
| American Samoa | 0 | 102 | 4 | 948 |
| Arizona | 137 | 1,294 | 522 | 1,629 |
| Arkansas | 115 | 89 | 212 | 1,629 |
| California | 546 | 896 | 148 | 1,344 |
| Colorado | 1,539 | 1,506 | 689 | 6,291 |
| Connecticut | 185 | 576 | 41 | 8 |
| Delaware | 126 | 264 | 197 | 1,519 |
| District of Columbia | 212 | 512 | 506 | 0 |
| Florida | 195 | 1,097 | 621 | 3,485 |
| Georgia | 228 | 1,233 | 1,143 | 3,027 |
| Guam | 25 | 35 | 74 | 56 |
| Hawaii | 38 | 26 | 18 | 310 |
| Idaho | 250 | 245 | 96 | 1,646 |
| Illinois | 662 | 1,139 | 223 | 2,087 |
| Indiana | 780 | 612 | 378 | 3,130 |
| Iowa | 256 | 406 | 281 | 2,923 |
| Kansas | 142 | 508 | 137 | 2,444 |
| Kentucky | 384 | 217 | 200 | 3,696 |
| Louisiana | 2,787 | 192 | 299 | 10,431 |
| Maine | 255 | 56 | 216 | 1,061 |
| Maryland | 318 | 800 | 557 | 2,168 |
| Massachusetts | 703 | 1,985 | 1,430 | 923 |
| Michigan | 1,019 | 208 | 51 | 3,752 |
| Minnesota | 173 | 66 | 66 | 933 |
| Mississippi | 239 | 124 | 16 | 1,795 |
| Missouri | 985 | 236 | 176 | 5,677 |
| Montana | 205 | 0 | 0 | 684 |
| Nebraska | 165 | 268 | 159 | 1,407 |
| Nevada | 560 | 1,179 | 425 | 1,998 |
| New Hampshire | 98 | 21 | 6 | 206 |
| New Jersey | 746 | 1,792 | 939 | 1,111 |
| New Mexico | 96 | 556 | 467 | 2,396 |
| New York | 1,849 | 3,739 | 3,377 | 6,577 |
| North Carolina | 195 | 405 | 58 | 1,064 |
| North Dakota | 98 | 9 | 2 | 405 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 4 | 33 | 21 | 61 |
| Ohio | 1,420 | 816 | 252 | 7,177 |
| Oklahoma | 181 | 188 | 59 | 3,061 |
| Oregon | 643 | 704 | 324 | 4,807 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,939 | 682 | 1,883 | 8,018 |

Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2006

| State | Disabled | Limited English proficiency | Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers | Live in rural areas |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Puerto Rico | 389 | 360 | 148 | 776 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 599 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 332 | 312 | 66 | 4,397 |
| South Dakota | 108 | 44 | 12 | 2,599 |
| Tennessee | 280 | 268 | 242 | 2,668 |
| Texas | 1,346 | 4,615 | 2,193 | 6,826 |
| Utah | 782 | 1,869 | 1,209 | 1,696 |
| Vermont | 412 | 27 | 16 | 3,458 |
| Virgin Islands | 2 | 37 | 64 | 0 |
| Virginia | 1,176 | 974 | 726 | 4,378 |
| Washington | 881 | 1,017 | 357 | 4,691 |
| West Virginia | 378 | 24 | 14 | 3,720 |
| Wisconsin | 195 | 1,927 | 838 | 826 |
| Wyoming | 315 | 113 | 36 | 2,596 |
| TOTAL | 27,485 | 37,180 | 22,383 | 143,065 |

Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2006

| State | Current/former spouse or intimate partner | Other family or household member | Dating | Acquaintance | Stranger | Relationship unknown | Other |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------|--------------|----------|----------------------|-------|
| Alabama | 4,821 | 462 | 943 | 251 | 83 | 2,122 | 42 |
| Alaska | 348 | 42 | 90 | 16 | 9 | 41 | 0 |
| American Samoa | 354 | 152 | 85 | 178 | 87 | 200 | 0 |
| Arizona | 2,964 | 698 | 731 | 127 | 189 | 3,227 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 3,602 | 1,215 | 644 | 72 | 26 | 197 | 0 |
| California | 3,333 | 684 | 565 | 1,805 | 558 | 4,758 | 0 |
| Colorado | 11,448 | 1,847 | 2,130 | 1,020 | 288 | 1,889 | 2 |
| Connecticut | 1,660 | 743 | 421 | 263 | 66 | 1,656 | 0 |
| Delaware | 2,152 | 324 | 113 | 234 | 106 | 233 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 2,167 | 457 | 400 | 187 | 61 | 1,192 | 22 |
| Florida | 7,481 | 1,427 | 1,433 | 495 | 170 | 4,296 | 0 |
| Georgia | 7,646 | 3,306 | 1,628 | 1,622 | 617 | 2,564 | 33 |
| Guam | 482 | 510 | 368 | 88 | 7 | 396 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 434 | 68 | 20 | 98 | 20 | 2,474 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2,052 | 148 | 276 | 63 | 28 | 1,406 | 0 |
| Illinois | 5,379 | 1,358 | 3,870 | 609 | 330 | 1,142 | 0 |
| Indiana | 9,762 | 818 | 2,445 | 739 | 183 | 825 | 0 |
| Iowa | 3,068 | 405 | 309 | 351 | 64 | 351 | 0 |
| Kansas | 4,228 | 580 | 670 | 204 | 28 | 642 | 0 |
| Kentucky | 7,680 | 1,112 | 1,039 | 147 | 31 | 491 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 11,382 | 2,794 | 3,060 | 1,414 | 501 | 7,142 | 0 |
| Maine | 1,645 | 103 | 168 | 175 | 20 | 24 | 0 |
| Maryland | 4,310 | 542 | 1,613 | 427 | 171 | 503 | 39 |
| Massachusetts | 6,274 | 2,541 | 3,938 | 292 | 98 | 1,557 | 0 |
| Michigan | 15,415 | 1,409 | 3,835 | 1,571 | 349 | 546 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 1,717 | 356 | 334 | 286 | 29 | 129 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 4,070 | 461 | 623 | 239 | 29 | 79 | 0 |
| Missouri | 9,157 | 1,398 | 1,090 | 1,282 | 359 | 2,558 | 0 |
| Montana | 1,656 | 3 | 38 | 220 | 66 | 116 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 2,893 | 74 | 1,030 | 212 | 20 | 536 | 0 |
| Nevada | 6,363 | 1,216 | 1,688 | 438 | 149 | 594 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 1,315 | 279 | 233 | 178 | 25 | 127 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 8,428 | 1,617 | 1,840 | 526 | 160 | 1,832 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 2,010 | 320 | 660 | 121 | 35 | 61 | 0 |
| New York | 18,165 | 3,555 | 6,439 | 1,631 | 658 | 6,691 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 3,452 | 603 | 713 | 220 | 64 | 203 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 1,273 | 136 | 74 | 104 | 18 | 93 | 0 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 103 | 25 | 27 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Ohio | 22,418 | 3,166 | 2,159 | 1,591 | 205 | 5,540 | 22 |
| Oklahoma | 2,536 | 922 | 777 | 515 | 127 | 512 | 0 |
| Oregon | 5,891 | 629 | 539 | 307 | 84 | 2,494 | 4 |

Table B5. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2006

| State | Current/former spouse or intimate partner | Other family or household member | Dating | Acquaintance | Stranger | Relationship unknown | Other |
|----------------|--|---|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Pennsylvania | 17,814 | 4,592 | 2,721 | 1,951 | 676 | 2,081 | 0 |
| Puerto Rico | 4,617 | 22 | 198 | 82 | 5 | 418 | 774 |
| Rhode Island | 399 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,623 | 26 |
| South Carolina | 5,391 | 1,199 | 660 | 489 | 215 | 360 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 3,219 | 658 | 283 | 208 | 79 | 3,723 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 3,431 | 594 | 644 | 285 | 188 | 495 | 0 |
| Texas | 24,086 | 5,674 | 3,320 | 2,278 | 517 | 989 | 0 |
| Utah | 8,999 | 2,204 | 775 | 307 | 47 | 2,623 | 0 |
| Vermont | 2,270 | 626 | 692 | 260 | 34 | 513 | 0 |
| Virgin Islands | 280 | 67 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 0 |
| Virginia | 11,861 | 1,837 | 1,649 | 799 | 237 | 633 | 0 |
| Washington | 8,835 | 1,262 | 1,879 | 411 | 148 | 67 | 3 |
| West Virginia | 4,146 | 1,022 | 1,160 | 212 | 26 | 629 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 2,977 | 1,042 | 562 | 896 | 188 | 3,106 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 2,245 | 717 | 484 | 307 | 72 | 134 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 312,104 | 60,033 | 64,089 | 28,813 | 8,560 | 87,852 | 971 |