

S•T•O•P Program

**Services • Training • Officers
• Prosecutors**

Annual Report 2005

**U.S. Department of Justice
Office on Violence Against Women**



Contents

Acknowledgments	1
Introduction	3
Background	5
The Statute	5
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds.....	6
Requirements to Receive STOP Program Funds.....	7
Reporting Requirements	8
Reporting Methods	9
STOP Program 2004: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds	11
Sources of Data.....	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators	12
How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees.....	12
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed.....	14
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds.....	15
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects.....	16
Effectiveness of the STOP Program	17
Coordinated Community Response	17
Training.....	19
Victim Services.....	21
Law Enforcement Response	23
Prosecution Response	25
Courts.....	27
Probation Supervision.....	28
Protection Orders	30
Sexual Assault and Stalking	31
Historically Underserved Populations	34
American Indians and Alaska Natives.....	34
Victims with Disabilities and Victims Who Are Older	35
Women Who Are Immigrants or Refugees.....	37
Victims Who Live in Rural Areas	38
STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments	41
Training.....	42
Coordinated Community Response	43
Policies.....	44
Products	45
Data Collection and Communication Systems	45
Specialized Units	46
System Improvement.....	47
Victim services	47

Demographics of Victims Served.....	49
Types of Services Provided to Victims	50
Criminal Justice.....	51
Law Enforcement	51
Prosecution.....	52
Courts	53
Probation	54
References	57

Appendix A

Table A1.1. Federal fiscal year STOP Program allocations by state: 1999–2004	63
Table A1.2. Funding returned unused by subgrantees: 1999–2004.....	64
Table A1.3. Funding awarded to subgrantees: 1999–2004.....	65
Table A2. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to victim services, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004	66
Table A3. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to law enforcement, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004	68
Table A4. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to prosecution, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004	70
Table A5. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to court, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004.....	72
Table A6. STOP Program amount allocated to administration, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004.....	74
Table A7. Number of STOP Program awards and amount allocated to Other, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004.....	75
Table A8. Percentage of allocation by type of victimization, by state	77

Appendix B

Table B1.1. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services	81
Table B1.2. Ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state	83
Table B1.3. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving services, by state	85
Table B1.4. Victim’s relationship to offender, by state	86
Table B2. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state	87

List of Tables

Table 1. Number and distribution of subgrant awards.....	12
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds.....	14
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds	15
Table 4. Types of victimization addressed by funded projects.....	16
Table 5. Subgrantees reporting weekly/monthly meetings with community agencies/organizations.....	19
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds—Selected professional positions.....	20

Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded victim services	22
Table 8. Distribution of new charges filed by STOP Program-funded prosecutors and percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions	26
Table 9. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts	28
Table 10. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments	29
Table 11. Protection orders assisted/processed with STOP Program funds	30
Table 12. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program	41
Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds	42
Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies	43
Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols	44
Table 16. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution	45
Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems	46
Table 18. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems	46
Table 19. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities	46
Table 20. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities	47
Table 21. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees, by level of service and type of victimization	48
Table 22. Victims receiving full or partial service from STOP Program subgrantees, by type of victimization	48
Table 23. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served	48
Table 24. Demographic characteristics of victims served	49
Table 25. Victim's relationship to offender	50
Table 26. Services provided by STOP Program subgrantees	50
Table 27. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program	52
Table 28. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking charges	53
Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders	54
Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program subgrantees, by type and number of contacts	55
Table 31. Disposition of probation violations	55

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). The Muskie staff played a central role in the development of this report to Congress.

We also wish to thank the STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant 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. We also thank the administrators and subgrantees who participated in meetings with the Muskie staff during site visits and shared information about the impact of STOP Program funding in their states and communities. Information gathered during these visits has added significant depth and detail to this report, providing specific examples of the STOP Program's accomplishments on behalf of women who are victims of violence.

Mary Beth Buchanan

Acting Director

Office on Violence Against Women

U.S. Department of Justice

Introduction

The STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2005 Report is submitted in fulfillment of the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide an annual 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” (on page 5) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program—the Program’s goals, reporting requirements, what states must do to receive funding, and how funds are allocated and awarded.¹ “STOP Program 2004: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (on page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar year 2004—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and what types of activities they engaged in. “Effectiveness of the STOP Program” (on page 17) explains the importance of activities supported with STOP Program funds generally and demonstrates how specific projects have contributed to the overall effectiveness of the Program. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (on page 41) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail with regard to activities engaged in with STOP Program funds. Finally, the appendixes provide an opportunity to look at data on awards in the mandated allocation categories and the number and characteristics of victims served on a state-by-state basis.

¹ Throughout this report, the word “state” is intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP allocations— to states as well as to the five U.S. territories and the District of Columbia.

Background

The Statute

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. 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:

- 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 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 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 that address the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes 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 in addressing violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence.
- Training 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.
- 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 sexual assault or domestic violence, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such assault or violence, and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to such older and disabled individuals.
- Providing assistance to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in immigration matters.²

Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

The Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including the territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, are eligible to apply for STOP Program grants to address the crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, 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 its 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)).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. (The state official, or officials,

² VAWA 2005 added purpose areas to the STOP Program that are not included here; this report reflects only STOP Program-supported activities from calendar year 2004.

³ For the purposes of this formula, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are considered one state. Sixty-seven percent of the amount allocated goes to American Samoa, and 33 percent goes to the Northern Mariana Islands (42 U.S.C. section 3791(a)(2); 28 CFR 90.13(b)).

designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the “STOP administrator.”) STOP Program awards may support up to 75 percent of the total cost of each subgrant project. The states are responsible for ensuring compliance with the 25 percent nonfederal match requirement.⁴

Requirements to Receive STOP Program Funds

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, their 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)).

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.⁵ States are required to consult with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including sexual assault and domestic violence service programs, when developing their implementation plans. States are strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes.

The implementation plans should describe how states will:

- (A) 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.
- (B) Determine the amount of subgrants based on the population and geographic area to be served.
- (C) Distribute monies equitably on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of varying geographic sizes.
- (D) Recognize and address the needs of underserved populations (28 CFR 90.23(b)). State implementation plans also should 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.

⁴ VAWA 2005, as amended, created 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)).

⁵ Beginning in Fiscal Year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting 3-year implementation plans and annual updates.

In addition to the statutory purpose areas, states are encouraged to develop and support projects that:

- Implement community-driven initiatives to address the needs of older victims of sexual assault, stalking, and domestic violence and other underserved populations of victims as defined by VAWA 2000.
- Address sexual assault through service expansion; development and implementation of protocols; training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to sexual assault.
- Support safety audits and fatality review teams at the state and local levels to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecutor policies, protocols, and orders.
- Enhance the role of the judiciary and other court personnel in managing offender behavior and securing victim safety through judicial education and court-related projects.

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.⁶ The statute requires the Attorney General to report on the following, 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.
- 4) An evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded with STOP Program monies (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3(b)).

In VAWA 2000, Congress broadened existing reporting provisions to require the Attorney General to report to Congress on a biennial basis on the effectiveness of activities of VAWA-funded grant programs (Public Law No. 106-386, section 1003 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p)).⁷ 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.

⁶ Due to amendments made by VAWA 2005, future reports are due not later than one month after the end of each even-numbered fiscal year (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-3(b)).

⁷ OVW currently funds 11 discretionary grant programs in addition to the STOP Program.

Measuring the effectiveness of the STOP Program and other VAWA-funded grant programs is a uniquely challenging task. Since 1998, states receiving STOP Program funds have been required to submit data reflecting how they and their subgrantees were using these funds in the Subgrant Award and Performance Report. 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, along with OVW, began to develop 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 about which kinds of measures 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, as well as 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 and 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, and enhances OVW's ability to report in greater detail and depth to Congress about the programs funded under VAWA and related legislation.

Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the new grantee and subgrantee report forms for the STOP Program in early 2005. The Muskie School provided extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP Program administrators regarding how to complete the new forms.⁸ Administrators submit data online through the Office of Justice Program's Grants Management System. STOP Program subgrantees complete electronic versions of the subgrantee annual report forms and submit them to their state STOP administrators.⁹ Currently, states are required to submit both forms to OVW by March 30 of each year.

⁸ Because of the large number of subgrantees—approximately 2,500—the STOP administrators were provided with training and technical assistance from Muskie staff, with the understanding that they would then train their states' subgrantees on how to complete the forms.

⁹ Numerous STOP administrators maintain databases containing data that is provided to them by subgrantees on a quarterly or semiannual basis. The administrators then use that data to prepare the annual subgrantee reports.

STOP Program 2004: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,450 subgrantees from 49 of the 50 states, 4 of the 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by all 56 STOP administrators about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar year 2004.¹⁰ Under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice, the Muskie School has analyzed this data. This data was provided to the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.¹¹ In addition to these annual reports, this report relies on data collected by the Muskie School during site visits to 36 states and territories to show the effectiveness of VAWA-funded grant programs. During these visits, grantees (including STOP Program subgrantees and STOP administrators) were asked to describe and document how VAWA funds had affected their communities' responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

In October 2005, administrators submitted data—including the administrators' reports, as well as the reports of all their states' subgrantees—to OVW on STOP Program grant activity for calendar year 2004. Therefore, this 2005 STOP Program Report is the first to contain data generated from the new report forms.¹² Although this is an exciting development that in many cases provides much more information than was previously available, a note of caution should be added: some subgrantees who reported data may not have received direct training on how to complete the new forms and may not have had data collection systems in place during 2004 to capture all of the requested information.

¹⁰ Subgrantee data from the state of Idaho was submitted to the Muskie School, rather than to OVW, and was inadvertently destroyed; no backup data was available to recreate the reports. The Northern Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

¹¹ 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 reports on the STOP Program. This report is the first to rely on the two new separate progress report forms.

¹² As a result of VAWA 2005, the STOP Program will be reporting on a biennial rather than an annual basis, on the same timetable as the discretionary grant programs.

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 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).¹³ Table 1 shows the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories.

Table 1. Number and distribution of subgrant awards

Allocation category	Awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total funding
All categories	4,886	190,512,388	100
Victim services	1,883	64,765,025	34
Law enforcement	1,221	43,405,561	23
Prosecution	1,152	47,937,956	25
Court	226	8,445,341	4
Administration	NA	11,361,313	6
Other	404	14,597,192	8

NA = not available

NOTES: Data derived from STOP Administrators Reports. Similar information based on Annual Progress Reports submitted by subgrantees is available on a state-by-state basis in appendix tables B1 and B2.

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. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims represent 46 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.¹⁴ By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 13 percent of FTEs and prosecutors 10 percent. When the number of subgrantees using funds for staff is considered without regard to FTEs, 62 percent directed funds to victim services staff positions, and 32 percent directed funds to criminal justice system staff positions.¹⁵

¹³ STOP Program funds awarded to law enforcement and prosecution agencies may be used to support victim advocates and victim witness specialists in those agencies.

¹⁴ These staff categories include victim advocates, victim witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, and civil attorneys.

¹⁵ These positions include law enforcement officers, prosecutors, probation officers, and court personnel.

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.¹⁶ Two-thirds (67 percent) of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims, 47 percent used funds to provide training, 25 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 15 percent for law enforcement activities, 14 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

STOP Program funds were used to carry out the fundamental activities of offering victim services, providing training, and supporting law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and probation agencies.

Services. Approximately 630,000 victims received services supported by STOP Program funds (of the 645,000 victims who sought services). Although the victims were most likely to be white (58 percent), female (90 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (61 percent), close to half of the victims were identified as being of other races and ethnicities. Subgrantees reported that 23 percent of the victims they served were Black or African American, and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.¹⁷ Twenty-three percent of the victims served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims used victim advocacy (278,000), hotline calls (220,600), and crisis intervention (215,000) in greater numbers than any other services.¹⁸

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 one-third of all people trained with STOP Program funds (more than 105,000 individuals) were law enforcement officers is a reflection of the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Health and mental health professionals were the next largest category, with more than 28,000 trained. More than 303,000 people in all were trained with STOP Program funds in 2004.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to 129,000 calls for assistance, to investigate 106,000 incidents of violence, and to serve 34,000 protection orders.

¹⁶ Some subgrantees receive funds to pay for a portion of a shelter advocate's salary; another may receive funding for a number of full-time advocates. This analysis considers only the number of subgrantees that used their funds in these ways, regardless of the amount of STOP Program funding they received. Because subgrantees often fund more than one category of activity, these percentages will total more than 100 percent.

¹⁷ These percentages are based on the number of victims for whom race/ethnicity was known. They may well be undercounting the true number of underserved, because the race/ethnicity of nearly 20 percent of victims was reported as unknown for this reporting period. Even when subgrantees improve their data collection systems, there will still be victims for whom this information will not be known. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this information, as it could prevent victims from seeking help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim's safety, service providers usually opt not to collect it.

¹⁸ Victims were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year.

The overall dual arrest rate for arrests made by STOP Program-funded officers was 3.3 percent, dramatically lower than most other reported rates (Klein, 2004).¹⁹

Prosecutors. STOP Program-funded prosecutors filed more than 209,000 new charges during calendar year 2004, 59 percent of which were domestic violence misdemeanors. During the same period, prosecutors disposed of 153,000 charges, 98,000—or 64 percent—of which resulted in convictions.

Courts and Probation. Although the percentages of grantees who reported using funds for court and probation activities were relatively low (1 percent for each), the reach of their activities was impressive. Two-thirds of the courts (21 of 33 subgrantees) receiving STOP Program funds conducted judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of nearly 2.5 hearings per offender for more than 3,200 offenders during calendar year 2004. Two-thirds of the courts also processed nearly 15,600 new charges and disposed of more than 15,400 new and pending charges during 2004.

Probation programs funded by the STOP Program reported an overall average of 9 contacts per offender for more than 7,600 offenders during 2004. Although probation officers' contacting victims is a relatively new practice in the field, probation personnel contacted nearly 2,000 victims an average of 4 times each during the reporting period.

Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

VAWA 2000 sets forth 11 purpose areas for which STOP Program funds may be used. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area during calendar year 2004. 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

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N = 2,450)	
	Number	Percent
Victim services projects	1,666	68
Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	920	38
Specialized units	706	29
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	678	28
Support of statewide, coordinated community responses	407	17
Development of data collection and communication systems	338	14
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	284	12

¹⁹ In dual arrests, both persons involved in an incident of domestic violence are arrested. This dual arrest rate was calculated using the number of predominant aggressor arrests reported, plus the number of incidents in which dual arrests were made as the denominator, and the number of dual arrest incidents reported as the numerator.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds (continued)

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N = 2,450)	
	Number	Percent
Stalking initiatives	283	12
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	277	11
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	145	6
Tribal populations projects	100	4

NOTE: Detail does not add to total because subgrantees could select all purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar year 2004.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Not surprisingly, given earlier discussions, domestic violence programs were reported most frequently as using STOP Program funds. Law enforcement and prosecution agencies and dual programs (e.g., programs that address both sexual assault and domestic violence), at 19 percent each, were the next most frequently reported as having received STOP Program funding. 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

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N = 2,450)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence program	687	28.0
Prosecution	474	19.3
Law enforcement	473	19.3
Dual program	466	19.0
Sexual assault program	273	11.1
Other	176	7.2
Unit of local government	113	4.6
Court	88	3.6
Government agency	70	2.9
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	41	1.7
Domestic violence state coalition	39	1.6
Dual state coalition	38	1.6
Sexual assault state coalition	37	1.5
University/school	33	1.3
Faith-based organization	23	0.9

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds (continued)

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N = 2,450)	
	Number	Percent
Tribal sexual assault and/or domestic violence program	16	0.7
Tribal government	6	0.2
Tribal coalition	2	0.1

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

Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

During the first 4 years of the STOP Program, 47 percent of projects focused on domestic violence alone, and 15 percent addressed domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.²⁰ As of 2004, 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 54 percent (table 4). The combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking was 13 percent.

Table 4. Types of victimization addressed by funded projects

Type of victimization	Subgrantees (N = 2,450)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence only	839	34.3
Sexual assault only	283	11.6
Stalking only	11	0.5
Domestic violence and sexual assault	394	16.1
Domestic violence and stalking	82	3.4
Sexual assault and stalking	14	0.6
Domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	824	33.7

²⁰ STOP Annual Report 2002.

Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes key areas of activity, why they are important, and how they contribute to the goals of VAWA—improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, including specific examples of the many successful programs funded by STOP. (For a more detailed presentation of data reflecting the aggregate activities of all STOP Program-funded projects, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” on page 41.)

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 programs funded by OVW. CCR brings criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, and social services program staff together to create a multidisciplinary, integrated response that holds offenders fully accountable, improves the system response to victims, and helps victims heal from violence. Research shows that efforts to respond to violence against women are most effective when combined and integrated as part of a CCR (Sheppard, 1999). STOP Program funds allow states to support communities in their efforts to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women and to develop and strengthen victim services in cases involving such crimes.

Communities generally adopt two types of CCR efforts—Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs) and Domestic Abuse Response Teams (DARTs)—to specifically address sexual assault and domestic violence. SARTs, often organized around Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs, help to foster a coordinated community victim-centered response in sexual assault cases. SARTs coordinate the efforts of medical providers, counselors, advocates, and criminal justice agencies to ensure that victims are not retraumatized (i.e., that victims only have to tell their stories once). At least 10 STOP administrators reported that their states used STOP Program funds to support SARTs.

Because of the VAWA grant, many positive changes have occurred. We now have in place a SANE program through our local hospital. Through the SANE program, sexual assault victims are given the forensic evidence collection exam. We have a SART team in place. The SART team consists of law enforcement, the DA's [District Attorney] Office, SANE Nurses, victim advocates, and health departments. The members of this SART team meet regularly to assess the efficiency of the process of victim services.

—*Community Connection of Northeast Georgia*

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, and Lichty, 2005; Crandall and Helitzer, 2003).

CCR has been associated with significant reductions in domestic violence homicides. In 1995, San Diego reported 13 intimate partner homicides. In 2002, the city opened a Family Justice Center that provided colocated, comprehensive justice, advocacy, and social services for victims.²¹ By 2005, the number of homicides had decreased to five (Gwinn and Strack, 2006). In Guam, after the Attorney General implemented a pro-family, zero-tolerance policy across the island, domestic homicides fell from an average of two to three a year before 2003, to zero by February 2004 (Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans, 2004). In Palm Beach County, FL, the County Sheriff reported more than five domestic murders per year before 2001. Since 2001, and after the DARTs and the new technology system were implemented, the County reported an average of two domestic murders per year; in 2002 and 2005, there were no murders at all (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2005).

Although it may be difficult to quantify or report on CCR, all subgrantees are required to report on their contact with Memorandum of Understanding partners and other groups in the community. Significant numbers of subgrantees reported daily contact with the following organizations: domestic violence organizations (914, or 37 percent of all subgrantees), law enforcement agencies (910, or 37 percent), courts (760, or 31 percent), and prosecutors (604, or 25 percent).²² These interactions may involve referrals (e.g., law enforcement referring a victim to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the courts so that victims may obtain protection orders) 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). Subgrantees reported having daily or weekly interactions with the following entities: domestic violence and sexual assault organizations, the courts, law enforcement, prosecutors' offices, and health/mental health, legal services, and social services organizations.

To some extent, these interactions are necessary, given the nature of the work that is being done. But historically, a number of these organizations had contentious relationships, worked in isolation from each other, and resisted contact. This was especially true for victim advocates and law enforcement agencies. Because community stakeholders now are working together on task forces on the local, regional, and state levels, a common understanding has developed, and common ground has been identified. This change is reflected in what the STOP Program subgrantees reported about their participation in weekly and monthly meetings of task forces, work groups, or other regularly scheduled forums involving organizations that respond to and serve victims. These groups often involve decisionmakers who develop protocols that set out how they 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 courts and probation, in addition to

²¹ The term "colocated services" is associated with the President's Family Justice Centers. It is meant to refer to various agencies operating "under the same roof" (i.e., in the same location).

²² Complete data on CCR activities can be found in "STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments" on page 41.

other systems. These decisionmakers are in a position to direct the implementation of agreed-upon protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration among their agencies and other participants. The data in table 5 reflect the number of STOP Program subgrantees meeting with community agencies and organizations on a weekly or monthly basis:

Table 5. Subgrantees reporting weekly/monthly meetings with community agencies/organizations

Agency/organization	Subgrantees
Domestic violence organization	1,104
Law enforcement	1,043
Prosecutor's office	868
Social service organization	768
Sexual assault organization	695
Court	690

This funding has . . . [had] a tremendous impact in our community by increasing the effectiveness of the network of community agencies and members of the criminal justice system serving victims of domestic violence and their families. The 34-member Review Team has spawned a level of trust, rooted in confidentiality and immunity, that fosters honest introspection . . . [about] policies, procedures, and system behavior. Sometimes [the] system's behaviors contribute to tragic outcomes. It is uncommon to find this type of candid critique and critical analysis in a multisector collaborative effort including judges, prosecutors, public defenders, advocates, probation officers, psychologists, corporate human resource directors, social workers, and policymakers.

—*Domestic Fatality Review Team, Fourth Judicial District
Hennepin County, MN*

Connecticut established a new collaborative law enforcement and victim advocacy project known as *VALE* [Victim Advocate Law Enforcement]. The *VALE* project has nongovernmental victim advocates stationed in five local police departments throughout the state. The *DV* [domestic violence] advocates work on behalf of the victim and are integrated into the law enforcement response team. The *VALE* project also provides resources and funding for multidisciplinary *DV* training for police and advocates.

—*STOP Administrator, Connecticut*

Training

As communities have developed coordinated response initiatives, the need for quality training has become evident. The STOP Program, as does every other OVW grant program, supports the training of professionals to improve their response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (see table 6). After victim services, training is the activity most frequently engaged in by STOP Program subgrantees: 1,153 subgrantees (47 percent of STOP Program funding recipients) used those funds to provide training. The fact that 303,306 professionals were trained

with STOP Program funds is impressive. Significantly, more than one-third 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 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.

Funding has allowed us the opportunity to send cold case detectives, SANE nurses, prosecutors, and the [crime] analyst to several seminars and classes on how to investigate, preserve evidence, prosecute, and link cold cases. The funding has also allowed the cold case detectives to author new polic[ies] . . . and procedures for sexual assault investigations, travel to other agencies within the state to train other law enforcement officers and SANE nurses on the collection and preservation of evidence, how to reopen and investigate sexual assault cold cases, and how to present these cases to their prosecutors.

—Phoenix, AZ, Police Department

STOP Program funds also supported the training of health and mental health professionals. These professionals become involved in the lives of victims at critical times, and 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 (e.g., engaging in marriage counseling with a controlling batterer and a victim, blaming the victim for her injuries, or recommending that the victim leave the batterer without understanding the dangers that presents). Other professionals receiving training were domestic violence and sexual assault staff, nongovernmental advocacy organizations (for elderly, disabled, and immigrant populations), faith-based organization staff, social services organizations, attorneys and law students, court personnel, prosecutors, and government agency staff (table 6).²³

Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds—Selected professional positions

Position	People trained (N = 303,306)	
	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	105,566	35
Health/mental health professionals	28,185	9
Domestic violence staff	14,160	5
Nongovernmental advocacy organization staff	12,640	4
Faith-based organization staff	11,369	4
Sexual assault staff	10,477	3
Social service organization staff	10,208	3

²³ For more detailed information on categories of people trained, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” on page 41.

Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds—Selected professional positions (continued)

Position	People trained (N = 303,306)	
	Number	Percent
Attorney/law student/ legal services staff	10,165	3
Court personnel	8,943	3
Prosecutors	6,842	2
Government agency staff	6,833	2

NNADV [Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence] initiated a project that involves outreach and education for medical professionals throughout the state. This project seeks to incorporate domestic violence education into the curriculum at the university medical school and/or continuing education courses for a variety of medical professionals.

—STOP Administrator, Nevada

The Inter-Faith Task Force on Domestic Violence project provides training to clergy members of all faiths throughout the Las Vegas area. This project has been well received among the faith community in southern Nevada. They have invited national experts to present at their conference, which highlights how the clergy can assist members of their congregations who are seeking help in domestic violence situations.

—STOP Administrator, Nevada

Subgrantees addressed the following topics in their training events: domestic violence overview, dynamics, and services (858, or 75 percent, of the subgrantees using their STOP Program funds for training reported addressing this topic); advocate response (720, or 63 percent); and law enforcement response (678, or 60 percent). Interestingly, 798 subgrantees (69 percent) offered training on issues relating to victims in underserved populations, including rural, disabled, elderly, immigrant, and homeless populations, as well as those with mental health or substance abuse issues. (For more information, see “Historically Underserved Populations” on page 34.)

STOP [Program] funds have given us the resources to give law enforcement training the attention it needs. Training law enforcement about [the] needs of refugee and immigrant women, immigration issues and their importance, [the] harm caused by dual arrests and not identifying the primary aggressor, available resources, victim safety and law enforcement safety, etc., have assisted [us] in educating officers about this population. Also, the training has served to encourage officers to seek technical assistance and [enabled us to] provide them with resources.

—Tapestri, Inc., Georgia

Victim Services

The provision of services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking represents the most frequently funded activity under the STOP Program. More than 627,000 victims received services funded under the STOP Program. Subgrantees

provided a wide range of services to these victims, including victim/survivor advocacy (to help the victim obtain needed resources or services), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. A significantly smaller number of victims received the following critical services: shelter, hospital accompaniment, and civil legal assistance.²⁴ Subgrantees providing these services also provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims as needed. Table 7 shows the number of individuals receiving a broad array of STOP Program-funded victim services:

Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded victim services

Type of service	Individuals served
Victim advocacy	278,301
Hotline calls	220,590
Crisis intervention	214,661
Criminal justice advocacy	195,093
Civil legal advocacy	163,069
Counseling/support group	149,160
Victim witness notification	149,026
Shelter (includes transitional housing)	26,168
Hospital accompaniment	22,071
Civil legal assistance	21,208

Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. Victim advocacy assists the survivor in navigating the systems in their community to obtain needed resources. These resources may be found in the criminal justice system, health care institutions, churches, or social services agencies. Victims of domestic violence often need a variety of services, including help with material goods and services, and assistance with a variety of issues related to health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing. Recent research indicates that women who worked with advocates were more effective overall at accessing community resources (Allen, Bybee, and 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.

Of those receiving services, 84 percent were domestic violence victims, 14 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2 percent were victims of stalking. (See also “Sexual Assault and Stalking” on page 31.) Although it is not possible to report the percentage of victims from underserved populations (victims may be included in a number of the underserved categories, and to add them together would result in overcounting), the data does show that 96 percent of all subgrantees serving victims

²⁴ The number of examinations by SANEs is not captured on the report form. However, 22,071 victims were accompanied to the hospital, and those accompaniments were most often for forensic exams for sexual assault victims.

provided services in at least one of the underserved categories.²⁵ (For more information on these populations, see “Historically Underserved Populations” on page 34.)

Research indicates that social isolation and ineffective community responses are key factors in undermining the ability of domestic violence victims to protect themselves and their children. For these victims, comprehensive and ongoing advocacy services have been found to be instrumental in reducing revictimization (Sullivan and 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, and McFerron, 1990). Subsequent studies of shelter residents indicated that if residents are connected to supportive services and assistance, most do not return to their abusers and, therefore, experience less revictimization (Klein, 2005).

These funds enable SafeHouse to have a full bilingual program that provides services to Spanish-speaking women and children. For the year . . . 2004, we served a total of 182 women and children and responded to 1,353 calls from Spanish-speaking clients.

—*SafeHouse, Inc., Denver, CO*

With your support we have been able to help victims . . . in the Brazilian, Cape Verdean, and Portuguese communities. We provided crisis intervention; developed safety plans for clients and their families; made referrals for specialized services (mainly legal, mental health, and basic needs assistance); provided translation and interpretation; and provided an education group.

—*Massachusetts Alliance of Portuguese Speakers*

STOP Program funding is one of the primary foundations of our outreach to victims in Atlanta’s Jewish community. The program includes culturally specific outreach materials and community training and consultation, coupled with direct services of individual counseling/advocacy and support groups.

—*Jewish Family and Career Services, Inc., Georgia*

Law Enforcement Response

The STOP Program promotes a proactive, thorough police response to violence against women, with the aim of increasing the likelihood of arrests. Historically, intimate partner violence and related incidents did not lead to arrests. Arrest statistics show that police and sheriffs’ departments receiving OVW funding have higher arrest rates for intimate partner violence than other police and sheriffs’ departments.²⁶ In

²⁵ See appendix tables B1.2 and B1.3 (on pages 83–85) for detailed demographic information. For the purposes of this report, “Underserved” includes races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the U.S. Census Bureau), individuals more than 60 years old, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.

²⁶ Law enforcement departments receiving funding through the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program reported making arrests of predominant aggressors in an average of 49 percent of the domestic violence incidents they investigated during the first six months of 2005. From: <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/arrestgraphs.htm>.

Denver, for example, police arrested only 20 percent of abusers who violated court protection orders in 1980 (Klein, 2004). More recent data revealed that arrests were made in 49 percent of cases investigated by departments receiving OVW grants.

Extensive research confirms that arrest deters repeat abuse, even in cases involving individuals deemed to be high-risk abusers. The research overwhelmingly shows that the arrest of an intimate partner does not increase a victim's risk, despite earlier reports to the contrary (Maxwell, Garner, and Fagan, 2001). Households in states that mandate arrest for domestic violence are less likely to suffer from domestic violence (Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld, 2003).

A law enforcement officer's responsibilities only begin with the initial response to the domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking call. To ensure victim safety, it is vital that an arrest be made, that the case be fully investigated to ensure effective prosecution, that protection orders be served on offenders, and that arrests be made for violations of bail conditions and of protection orders. STOP Program subgrantees are funding law enforcement agencies that are collectively engaging in a broad range of these activities.

Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program responded to approximately 134,000 calls for assistance from sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking victims. They responded and prepared incident reports in 129,000 cases, investigated more than 106,000 cases, arrested 44,000 predominant aggressors (which, when compared with 1,500 dual arrests, results in an overall average dual arrest rate of 3.3 percent), and referred more than 54,000 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served 33,928 protection/restraining orders, arrested offenders for 8,600 violations of court orders, and enforced 11,300 warrants.²⁷

Before the Domestic Violence Unit was established in 1999, statistics show[ed] that 68 percent of all the emergency protective orders in the county were not served in a proper manner, if they were even served at all. In 2004, the number of unserved orders was around 18 percent. A significant decrease in 5 years. Without the STOP [Program] funds, the Domestic Violence Unit would not have been possible, and with them, the Williamsburg Police Department is providing a valuable and much needed service to both victims and area law enforcement.

—*City of Williamsburg, KY*

The specialized training that STOP Program-funded law enforcement agencies participate in and the policies and protocols implemented by their departments influence how they conduct their activities. Of all 400 subgrantees using funds for law enforcement activities, 235—or nearly 60 percent—also used funds for training and/or policy development/implementation. Identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor was addressed by 306 subgrantees in training and 151 subgrantees in policy development/implementation. Pro-arrest policies were

²⁷ Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and may not engage in other activities referred to here. 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.

addressed by 269 subgrantees. The 3.3 percent dual arrest rate for STOP Program subgrantees may be attributed to the training and policy development the Program's funds make possible in law enforcement agencies.

The Project Coordinator and Chief of County Court provided training on dual arrests, impact on the victim, and dual arrest analysis to several law enforcement agencies in the judicial district. The result was a 35 percent reduction in dual arrest domestic violence misdemeanor cases in 2003. . . . [The following year, during the period April to June 2004,] dual arrests [continued to decline and were] down 41 percent [below the 2003 level].

—*District Attorney's Office, 18th Judicial District, Colorado*

An appropriate law enforcement response is 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 to appropriate services and send a clear message to the perpetrator that the community views domestic violence as a serious criminal matter.

The San Jose Police Department made more than 10,000 "After Care" calls to domestic violence victims in the last 6 months of Fiscal Year 2002. The recently established program ensures that every victim for whom a police report is written is telephoned within 24 hours after an incident to be made aware of the services and options available to them.

—*STOP Administrator, California*

Before we received STOP Program funds, we did not have a specific detective assigned to investigate domestic violence and adult sexual assault incidents. Cases referred to the Criminal Investigations Division were given to the detective "on-call." Since receiving the STOP Program funds, we have been able to establish a Domestic Violence/Adult Sexual Assault (DV/ASA) Unit with one full-time detective dedicated to the DV/ASA cases and a half-time case coordinator to record and track the data and provide administrative support to the Unit. The DV/ASA detective especially targets cases for followup where the victims are members of special populations (elderly, pregnant, ethnic minority, etc.).

—*Putnam County Sherriff's Office, Florida*

Prosecution Response

OVW Grant Programs promote the aggressive prosecution of alleged perpetrators. Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received more than 203,000 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking for charging consideration and filed charges in approximately 147,000 (72 percent) of those cases. A study conducted in Minneapolis in the early 1980s showed that fewer than 2 percent of those arrested for domestic violence were ever prosecuted (Sherman and Berk, 1984).

Data reported for 2004 by STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 35 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors, when compared with other types of dispositions.²⁸ Studies of other localities showed that:

- Eighty percent of domestic assault cases were dismissed in the Albuquerque, NM, Metropolitan Court in 2004, compared with 34 percent of drunk driving cases (Gallagher, 2005).
- In Bernalillo County, NM, 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).
- Only 20 percent of criminal stalking cases in Utah resulted in convictions in 2002 (Bryson, 2004).

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program filed 209,374 new charges during 2004. Seventy-nine percent of those charges were domestic violence charges—59 percent misdemeanor domestic violence, 13 percent felony domestic violence, and 7 percent domestic violence ordinance. Table 8 shows the distribution of charges and the conviction rates for those cases disposed of by STOP Program-funded prosecutors during 2004.

Table 8. Distribution of new charges filed by STOP Program-funded prosecutors and percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions

Charge	Percentage of new charges filed (N = 209,374)	Percentage of dispositions resulting in convictions (N = 97,633)
All charges	100	64
Misdemeanor domestic violence	59	62
Felony domestic violence	13	67
Violation of protection order	8	73
Domestic violence ordinance	7	59
Felony sexual assault	4	87
Violation of probation/parole	4	63
Other	5	NA

NA = not available

NOTE: Of the new charges filed, 152,562 were disposed of. Dispositions resulting in convictions include deferred adjudications. "Other" includes misdemeanor sexual assault, misdemeanor stalking, violations of other court orders, other charges, violations of bail, and homicide related to sexual assault, domestic violence, and/or stalking.

²⁸ 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.)

Research indicates that aggressive prosecution deters repeat abuse, holds offenders accountable, and encourages law enforcement to sustain higher arrest rates. Although some studies have found that prosecution rates do not affect rates of repeat abuse, these studies examined jurisdictions in which decisions to prosecute were not based on offender risk or victim input (Belknap et. al., 1999; Davis, Smith, and Nickles, 1998). Other research has documented that prosecution tied to offender risk and, in one case, victim desires, significantly reduced repeat abuse (Ford and Regoli, 1993; Klein, 2004; Thistlewaite, Wooldredge, and Gibbs, 1998). Prosecutors' offices that adopt specialized policies and practices to deal with intimate partner abusers are more sensitive to victims' needs and, as a result, fewer homes in the jurisdiction suffer from family or intimate violence (Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld, 2003).

STOP [Program] funding has allowed the training of law enforcement and the specialization of the prosecutor's staff. [Before] . . . the STOP Grant-funded training of the deputy prosecutor from a rural nongrant county, most domestic violence cases were deferred or dropped. The STOP Grant has allowed the deputy prosecutor to implement new procedures concerning domestic violence. With the use of STOP [Program] funding, . . . [a] nondrop policy was instituted, vertical prosecution was started, and the implementation of protective orders in domestic violence was also started. Also, by meeting each victim, the prosecutor can allay any fears about the case and allow . . . victim[s] to start to gain control of their lives again.

—Harrison County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana

Through funding from the STOP Grant, the Clay County Prosecutor's Office was able to form a team that targets domestic violence and sexual assault. The primary population targeted is rural women. The Special Prosecution Team consists of a prosecutor, investigator, and a victim advocate. The Team has established policies and procedures to maximize conviction rates and minimize trauma and confusion experienced by the victim.

—Clay County Victim Assistance, Indiana

Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases—administrative and magisterial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for making courthouses safer and more efficient. This can be accomplished by providing separate waiting rooms for victims, special dockets, and even special courts. In their magisterial role, judges can be critical in holding offenders accountable and ensuring the safety of victims. Although in most cases judges are ratifying plea agreements, they do set the parameters of what types of sentences they will accept, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Another critical role of courts is the monitoring of offenders to review their progress and compliance with court orders.

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).

Two-thirds of the courts receiving STOP Program funding (21 of 33 subgrantees) conducted judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of nearly 2.5 hearings per offender for more than 3,200 offenders during calendar year 2004.²⁹ These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders, as shown in table 9.

Table 9. Disposition of selected violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts

Violation	Verbal/ written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions Added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order (N = 741)	41	25	16	6	12
New criminal behavior (N = 172)	1	87	11	1	0
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 236)	19	42	17	0	22

This program addresses a need that was [often] . . . ignored until STOP [Program] funding allowed its implementation. Previous to the DVEA [Domestic Violence Education and Assistance] Program, most convicted noncompliant PFMA [Protection from Marital Abuse] offenders were never held accountable to their sentence. Offenders who failed to comply with their sentences were not revoked, and when their sentence expired, the criminal justice system was at that point helpless to take any further action. The DVEA Program has created a database that tracks all domestic incidents reported to the Flathead County Sheriff's Office, including incidents that do not include arrests. This information is invaluable in monitoring offenders, tracking general area trends, and in tracking cases not referred for supervision.

—Flathead County Courts, Montana

Probation Supervision

Probation offers the opportunity to avoid incarceration by complying with specific court-ordered conditions that are monitored by a probation officer. 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 on their probationers, and many require

²⁹ Two-thirds of the courts also processed nearly 15,600 new charges and disposed of more than 15,400 charges.

attendance at batterer intervention programs (BIPs) or sex offender treatment programs. Some probation offices have also begun to reach out to victims.

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 persons convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of reabuse and rearrest, and increased victim satisfaction when compared with nonspecialized supervision (Klein et al., 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, and Gibbs, 1998).

When offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers in 2004 failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, probation revocation rates ranged from 49 percent for failure to attend a BIP, to 53 percent for protection order violations, to 72 percent for new criminal behavior (table 10).

Table 10. Disposition of selected probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments

Violation	Verbal/ written warning (%)	Partial/full revocation of probation (%)	Conditions Added (%)	Fine (%)	No action taken (%)
Protection order (N = 167)	5	53	16	8	18
New criminal behavior (N = 247)	4	72	13	2	8
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 418)	33	49	11	1	6

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

Probation officers funded under the STOP Program supervised more than 7,600 offenders and made a total of nearly 68,000 contacts with those offenders, for an average of 9 contacts per offender. The majority of these contacts—70 percent—were face-to-face, 23 percent were by telephone, and 6 percent were unscheduled surveillance. These officers also made approximately 7,300 contacts with nearly 2,000 victims during 2004. 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.

In Riverside County, the Moreno Valley and Riverside police departments now have three officers in the Probation Specialized Unit providing intensive supervision to a maximum of 40 offenders who have committed serious violent offenses against women. There were 177 closed cases in the first 3 years. Of the 177 cases, 155 have known outcomes. Twenty-

nine percent completed probation under favorable circumstances, and 71 percent were revoked and went to jail/prison, or are in process.

—*Moreno Valley and Riverside, California, Police Departments*

STOP Program funding has also helped with providing victims the opportunity to participate in determining the level of supervision. Victims are contacted by the victim coordinator and are asked to complete a Spousal Assault Risk Assessment. After the assessment is completed, the victim coordinator scores the assessment and then confers with [the] probation officer to determine the appropriate level of supervision. Also, if a victim requests to be a victim notification case, the victim is asked to keep the victim coordinator informed of any concerns he/she may have. This allows for more containment of the offender and helps hold the offender accountable for his actions.

—*18th Judicial District Probation Department, Colorado*

Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders (table 11). STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims in the protection order process. In 2004, STOP Program-funded victim advocates and law enforcement and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims in obtaining more than 240,000 temporary and final protection orders (table 11). Courts funded under the STOP Program processed 17,335 civil protection orders, 13,741 of which were temporary and 3,594 of which were final.

Table 11. Protection orders assisted/processed with STOP Program funds

Provider	Total	Temporary	Final
All providers	243,372	146,184	97,188
Victim services staff	159,878	90,060	69,818
Law enforcement	32,501	22,731	9,770
Prosecution	50,993	33,393	17,600

Several major studies confirm that having protection orders in place reduces the reoccurrence of abuse (Holt et al., 2002; Keilitz, 2001). Lack of service and enforcement have long been recognized as the “Achilles’ heel” of protection order effectiveness (Finn, 1991). Many state laws now provide for the mandatory, warrantless arrest of abusers who violate protection orders. In most cases, such violations can be aggressively prosecuted without requiring victim testimony, which protects victims from being retraumatized and increases the rate of successful prosecutions.

STOP Program subgrantees have used funds to improve data collection systems for seamless access to information about protection orders. Others have addressed the issues of protection order enforcement in training and in the development of protocols. Policies addressing protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection order enforcement, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and policies against mutual restraining orders were developed and/or implemented by 238 subgrantees.

STOP funding has allowed us the ability to have one staff member specialize in the civil court system and how it can best be used as a remedy for victims. We have served a record number of women receiving orders of protection, and the percentage of those returning for full orders remains high at 87 percent. Before an advocate was in the courthouse to assist women, less than 25 percent returned for their hearings.

—*Haven House, Inc., Missouri*

The VAWA funding has allowed our officers to increase our service rate in peace/protection orders, thereby lessening the threat of further abuse by the respondent. We have also doubled our numbers of arrest from 64 in 2003 to 128 in 2004. Most of these arrests stem from violent attacks on the petitioners by the respondent.

—*Baltimore City Sheriff's Department*

Sexual Assault and Stalking

Over time, STOP-funded programs have expanded their focus and services beyond serving domestic violence victims and responding only to domestic violence (see “Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Funds” on page 15). A number of initiatives have contributed to this shift:

- OVW’s requirement that sexual assault coalitions and advocacy organizations be included in the process of developing the STOP implementation plan.
- STOP Program funding of SANE training and programs to address stalking.
- Training that has helped increase understanding of the intersection of domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking.
- Policies and protocols that have led to better responses and improved services to victims of sexual assault and stalking.

Notwithstanding these efforts and changes, it remains true that crimes of sexual assault and stalking have not received the same level of recognition and response as have crimes of domestic violence. This applies both to society at large and to the systems (criminal justice, social services, etc.) designed to respond to violent acts. There continue to be low rates of reporting of sexual violence and stalking, low charging rates for prosecution of these crimes, and high dismissal rates where charges are brought. Congressional leaders recognized these challenges when they included the following specific purpose areas in the STOP Program (42 U.S.C. 3796gg):

- Training of sexual assault forensic medical examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, [and] prevention.
- Providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault.
- Programs to address 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'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 often were retraumatized by their experiences in hospitals. Triage usually left victims waiting hours for a forensic exam. Physicians often were 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 SANEs and SARTs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care provided to 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 (Crandall and Helitzer, 2003; Campbell, Patterson, and Lichty, 2005).

STOP Program funding has enabled the Sex Abuse Treatment Center to provide the needed crisis intervention services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The project made a Sexual Assault Response Team . . . available on-call around the clock to provide the crisis support services specifically needed by the sexual assault victim. These included crisis stabilization and counseling, legal systems advocacy, an acute forensic examination to provide the victim [with] the necessary medical assessment and treatment, and the collection and preservation of forensic evidence [in case] . . . the victim [should] decide to file a criminal complaint.

—*Oahu Crisis Services, Hawaii*

The [STOP Program] funding allows GNESEA [Georgia Network To End Sexual Assault] to conduct training for nurses who want to become Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners [SANEs]. This training is a specialty for nurses, expanding their skills to conducting forensic exams, collecting DNA to be used in [the] prosecution of perpetrators. SANE training is not offered in any other setting in Georgia. The funding enables us to continue to offer this training. The nurses have to take vacation time to attend this 40-hour track, and without the funding for training fees, they would also incur those costs in addition to lodging, meals, and travel.

—*Georgia Network To End Sexual Assault*

Six percent of all subgrantees (145 of more than 2,400 subgrantees) reported that they used funds for SANE training. Numerous states used STOP Program funds to support staff positions for SANEs.³⁰ More significantly, in terms of the Program's broader impact, funds supported training for 3,200 nurse examiners. In addition to the nurse examiners, an unknown number of additional medical personnel also received

³⁰ There was no specific staff category for a sexual assault nurse examiner on the STOP Annual Progress Report form, so subgrantees reported this in "other." Subgrantees also reported funding 481 "program coordinator" FTEs; programs serving 80 percent or more sexual assault victims accounted for 112 of those program coordinator FTEs. A significant number of these positions may have been personnel coordinating SANE programs and/or training for nurse examiners.

this training. They would have been reported under the category “health professionals,” which includes both doctors and nurses.

Sexual assault victims made up 13.4 percent of all victims served with STOP Program funds in 2004. Although it is not possible to know exactly what services were provided to sexual assault victims, subgrantees did report that 22,071 victims were accompanied to the hospital; those hospital visits are most often for forensic exams. In addition to providing services to sexual assault survivors, 700 subgrantees—an impressive 60 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. More than 300 sexual assault organizations—273 programs and 37 sexual assault coalitions—received STOP Program funds in 2004. Felony sexual assault charges made up 4 percent of all new charges filed during 2004 by STOP Program-funded prosecutors. Of those that were disposed of during 2004, 63 percent resulted in convictions. This conviction rate compares favorably with the conviction rates for domestic violence misdemeanors (62 percent) and domestic violence felonies (67 percent).

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 also sexually assaulted by that partner (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). This helps to explain the low percentage—2.2 percent—of stalking victims reported as receiving services funded under the STOP Program; 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 being victims of more than one crime.³¹ The 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 number of acts necessary to constitute the crime of stalking, and in their threat and fear requirements.

Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported filing a total of 4,159 new stalking charges in 2004, which constituted 2 percent of all new charges. One quarter of those charges were for felony stalking. The conviction rates for ordinance, misdemeanor, and felony-level stalking charges disposed of during 2004 were 63 percent, 70 percent, and 72 percent, respectively. Training was provided by 520 subgrantees; the training included an overview of stalking and information about the dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

A [STOP Program-funded] . . . court project . . . dealt specifically with stalking victims who wished to file petitions to obtain protection orders. The program coordinator guided petitioners through the filing process and assisted them in obtaining emergency hearings with judicial officers. The program coordinator also provided civil stalking protection order training to local police officers and attorneys.

—STOP Administrator, Ohio

³¹ Subgrantees were instructed to report an unduplicated count of victims and to select only one primary victimization for each victim served during calendar year 2004. Given the results of the NVAW survey, it is safe to assume that a significant number of domestic violence and sexual assault victims were also victims of stalking, even though they were not reported as stalking victims on the STOP Annual Progress Report form.

Historically Underserved Populations

Rates of victimization are not uniform across ethnic, racial, geographical, and other groups. Although national surveys generally do not include enough representatives of all the distinct categories of women across the United States to generate rates for all demographic groups, certain identifiable groups appear to be at greater risk than others of victimization by domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These populations include American Indians/Alaska Natives, women living in rural jurisdictions, older adults, women who are disabled, people of color, other racial minorities, immigrants, and refugees. These populations often face unique challenges and barriers to receiving assistance and support. The portions of VAWA addressing the STOP program, and OVW in its administration of this grant program 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 delivery of services (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) to underserved populations, addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims, and assisting victims in immigration matters.

Of the STOP Program subgrantees providing victim services in 2004, 96 percent reached underserved victims. 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 approximately 13,000 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. Approximately 800 subgrantees—69 percent of all subgrantees offering training—provided training on issues specific to underserved populations. More than half of the 622 subgrantees using funds for policy development established and/or implemented policies regarding appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and their subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims in underserved populations and to improve their responses to the needs of these victims.

Lideres Campesinas has been able to develop training curricul[a] . . . to train farmworker women as trainers and advocates of domestic violence and sexual assault victims in 10 communities around the state. These women now serve as the key individuals and are able to . . . help other women facing domestic violence and/or sexual assault. At the same time, Lideres Campesinas has . . . developed networks with service providers and law enforcement

—*Organizacion En California De Lideres Campesinas*

American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indian and Alaska Native women report the highest rates of rape and physical assault (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). For sexual assault, their average annual rate is 3.5 times higher than the rate for non-Indians (Lee, Thompson, and Mechanic, 2002). 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 (Tyiska, 1998). Complicating efforts to protect these victims 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.

Eight subgrantees stated that tribal coalitions or tribal governments were receiving STOP Program funding.³² Eighty-eight subgrantees reported that their projects were focused specifically on tribal populations. More than 7,600 (1.5 percent) of the victims served with STOP Program funds were reported as American Indian or Alaska Native. Training on issues specific to victims in this group was provided by 128 subgrantees, and more than 1,000 tribal coalition and tribal government staff were trained with STOP funds.

Peaceful Relations was able to provide continuous victim services in 2004 in spite of decreases [in the] . . . level of federal funding. Victims of domestic violence continued to be able to receive services from providers who are members of their own tribe, who speak in their own language, and who are accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for inperson crisis intervention.

—*Pleasant Point Tribal Government, Maine*

[STOP Program] funding . . . has allowed our program to provide safety and viable options to victims . . . of violence. Local law enforcement has seen an increase in persons being charged and adjudicated in part [due] to the specialized investigator funded under this grant.

—*Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, North Dakota*

Funding has provided . . . avenues [for] . . . tribal regional . . . strategic planning in the development . . . of victim/services; tribal, county, state, and national system collaborations and data collection; the promotion and development of a resource collection system addressing domestic abuse; and batterer's accountability education and awareness.

—*American Indians Against Abuse, Inc./Coordinated Community Response, Wisconsin*

Victims with Disabilities and Victims 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 disabilities are far greater than for those who are currently not disabled, suggesting that offenders specifically target the most vulnerable. An early study suggested that women with disabilities were one and one-half times more likely to have been sexually abused than women without disabilities (Doucette, 1986). After reviewing numerous studies, Stimpson and Best (1991) suggested that more than 70 percent of women with a wide variety of disabilities have been victims of violent sexual encounters at some time in their lives.

³² 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 separately.

Law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and courts may not be accustomed to working with women who have cognitive impairments (such as limitations in learning, social skills, and intellect), making criminal investigation and prosecution procedures challenging (Cole et al., 1991; Valenti-Hein and Schwartz, 1993). 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 deal effectively with the unique vulnerabilities to abuse in disability-specific contexts (Nosek et al., 2001).

There is a consensus that family members, including spouses, are responsible for most (up to 90 percent) of elder abuse, excluding self-neglect (Tatara et al., 1998). Similarly, studies of elder sexual abuse suggest that most victimizers are family members (Ramsey-Klawnsnik, 1991; Teaster et al., 2000). These studies agree that nearly all reported perpetrators were male, and most victims were female.

Although intimate partner violence is covered by states' general domestic and family violence statutes, and sexual assaults 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 largely have failed to develop responses tailored to the needs of elder victims. Even battered women shelters may not be able to accommodate older victims.

The STOP [Program]. . . funding has allowed Guma' Mami to improve and expand services focused on individuals with disabilities and the elderly. Guma' Mami has increased the awareness in the community that individuals with disabilities and elderly women are just as vulnerable to domestic violence. Our organization also continues to . . . educat[e] these individuals about the various types of domestic violence and the services offered to victims. The work that we continue to accomplish reinforces the community's awareness that individuals with disabilities and the elderly who are victims [of violence] cannot be ignored.

—*Guma' Mami, Inc., Guam*

Richmond [VA] is initiating an exchange with the deaf and hard of hearing, those with mobility limitations, and those impacted by mental health disabilities to further understand the implications of domestic violence and sexual assault. Staff modeled appropriate accommodation techniques in meetings by utilizing fully accessible facilities; revising curricula, registration, and handouts; making arrangements to assist effective communication; and developing guides for trainers. The project is also testing the capacity of member programs to respond to these populations by making sure their TTY equipment is functioning.

—*The Disability Outreach Project of Virginians Against Domestic Violence*

The STOP Program grant allows police-based victim services programs, which deal with large numbers of crime victims, to refer older domestic violence victims for intensive and sustained case management services. This program would not have survived without this grant.

—*Wilmington Police Department, Delaware*

[The] . . . funding has allowed Dawn Center to more specifically focus on the needs of elderly victims and generate community awareness of elder abuse through community education and awareness media. Dawn Center

offers a support group for elder victims of domestic and sexual violence and . . . abuse.

—*Florida Coalition Against Domestic Violence*

STOP subgrantees reported serving approximately 26,000 victims with disabilities and more than 17,000 victims over the age of 60—4.1 percent and 3.4 percent, respectively, of all victims served.³³ More than 11 percent of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims of sexual assault or domestic violence. STOP Program subgrantees used their funds to provide training and develop and implement policies 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 was provided by 404 subgrantees, and nearly 3,300 staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations received STOP Program-funded training. Policies addressing the needs of victims who are elderly or who have disabilities were developed or implemented by 184 subgrantees.

California Coalition Against Sexual Assault's (CALCASA's) Rape Crisis Center Technical Assistance project has become increasingly effective and efficient, due in part to the growth of their Rape Prevention Resource Center. Library holdings increased by 78 percent, from just over 4,000 items in Fiscal Year 1998 to more than 7,100 items in Fiscal Year 2003. Sexual assault materials in Braille, closed-captioned videos, and resources in Hmong are examples of hard-to-find items gathered from across the country . . . [that] are currently available to providers and save individual projects the expense of creating them on their own.

—*California Coalition Against Sexual Assault*

Women Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Although violence against women is universal, the trauma of sexual and domestic violence often is intensified for women who also face problems associated with immigration and acculturation. Although some cultures teach respect for women, other cultures devalue women's roles, increasing the likelihood of victimization. Cultural background can also shape how women experience and respond to violence. Immigrant and refugee women often are isolated because of their immigration/refugee experience, language barriers, legal status, lack of education, and the lack of job skills necessary for working in the United States. 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. When they do seek assistance, resources such as legal services, housing, and health care can be difficult to obtain. Homicide data from New York City found that immigrant women are overrepresented among female victims of male-partner-perpetrated homicide (Frye, 1999).

VAWA 2000 attempted to remove barriers to seeking help for these victims by including the provision of assistance in immigration matters among the purpose areas authorized by the STOP Program. Subgrantees reported serving more than 20,000

³³ Because data is collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims were both disabled and over the age of 60. Also, the report form used to collect data for this report used the category 60+. The next breakdown was 25–59.

victims who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers. These victims represent 3.2 percent of all victims served. Training on issues specific to these victims was provided by 251 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 often are more serious 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 183 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 and/or translate 396 products into 30 different languages.

The Political Asylum Project of Austin's Program Representing Immigrant Survivors of Abuse (PRISA) trained 1,536 law enforcement officers and saw a 125 percent increase in referrals from law enforcement in Fiscal Year 2002, from 16 to 36. From Fiscal Year 2000 to Fiscal Year 2003, PRISA served 957 clients and currently receives 100 percent approval for VAWA self-petitions submitted, allowing immigrant victims of domestic violence to live and work legally in the United States.

—PRISA, Austin, Texas

D.O.V.E. [Discovering Opportunity Via Escape] Center in St. George serves Washington County, a 10,000-square-mile area in which there are 10,000 Latinos, 90 percent of whom speak little or no English. Since hiring a mobile crisis team advocate with VAWA funds, response time to victims in crisis has dropped from 45 minutes to 15 minutes. After a new law enforcement protocol was put in place this year, call-outs went up 62 percent, from 53 in the first 6 months of 2004 to 138, and protection orders rose 61 percent, from 12 in the first half of 2004 to 31. Crime victims reparations increased 100 percent in the first 6 months.

—D.O.V.E. Center, Utah

Legal Services Corporation (LSC) restrictions prohibit Southern Arizona Legal Aid (SALA) from providing services to undocumented immigrant victims of domestic violence unless those services are funded by sources other than LSC. Without STOP Program . . . funding, we would be able to represent only those immigrant DV [domestic violence] survivors who already have some kind of application pending with . . . U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and who also have a . . . spouse, child, or parent [who is a U.S. citizen]. From January through December 2004, SALA represented . . . [more than] 200 indigent immigrant DV survivors in filing successful self-petitions, applications for employment authorization, battered-spouse waivers, applications for U-visa interim relief, or applications for adjustment of status. Most of them would have had no access to representation without SALA's STOP grant-funded program. We provided legal advice to . . . [more than] 100 more immigrant DV survivors who otherwise would not have had access to legal advice.

—Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc.

Victims 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, smaller, specific studies found higher rates in rural communities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006). A comparison of women patients at

family practice clinics in the Midwest, for example, found that women in rural settings reported having violent partners at twice the rate—25 percent as compared with 12 percent—as those in larger, mid-sized communities (Elliot, 1997). Two studies of adult sexual victimization found that sexual assault rates were higher in certain rural counties (Lewis, 2003; Ruback and Ménard, 2001). Studies on sexual assault and domestic violence in rural areas offer other important findings on related issues such as the victim-offender relationship, reporting, and funding. These studies confirm the important influence the victim-offender relationship has on whether incidents of violence are reported; they argue that lower reporting rates in rural areas are due to the closeness of the victim-offender relationship, which in turn has to do with the geographical isolation and the resulting physical and emotional dependency of the victim on the offender. They found that rural counties had higher rates of victimization, but urban counties had higher rates of reporting (Ruback and Ménard, 2001).

When victimized in a rural community, victims often find that opportunities for medical, legal, or emotional services are very limited, or even nonexistent. Their economic situation and physical isolation may further limit their options. Strong community ties in rural areas mean that a victim is more likely to be acquainted with the perpetrator and service providers than in urban settings. Finally, rural culture tends to be close-knit, self-contained, and unlikely to turn to “outsiders” for assistance. Together, these characteristics result in low rates of reporting, limited opportunities for victim services, and difficulties for service providers. A victim of sexual or domestic violence in a rural community is not likely to report to police or to locate or access services (Lewis, 2003).

The prevalence of firearms makes violence against women more lethal in rural areas. Women who have been physically abused by current or former intimate partners were found to be at a fivefold risk of being murdered by that partner when the partner owned a firearm (Campbell et al., 2003). Other research has shown that firearm ownership among young men in rural communities may be as much as three times higher than it is in urban communities (Weisheit and Wells, 1996).

More than 145,000 victims—or 23 percent of all victims served with STOP Program funds during 2004—were reported as living in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country). Training on issues specific to victims who live in rural areas was provided by 471 subgrantees. Programs seeking to reach and to serve rural victims must work harder to inform them about services and to deliver those services. Developing effective community partnerships is critical to accomplishing these goals.

These monies supported [an] . . . outreach coordinator [position] for a six-county service area. A goal of this grant was to increase the number of referrals. In 2003, we served a total of 220 victims. In 2004, this number increased to 562 . . . [because of] the development of a more effective team to promote and deliver services to victims in rural areas and [to] women who did not have knowledge [about] or access to services before.

—*Monroe County Commissioners, Iowa*

STOP . . . [Program] funding has partially funded a full-time position in a rural county with a prior history of inconsistent law enforcement response and a growing Hispanic population. We have been able to establish effective partnerships within the community, which has resulted in more victims seeking services. Crisis Intervention Service has also recently enhanced protocol in this county to include immediate advocate response to victims of domestic violence following an arrest.

—*Crisis Intervention Service, Iowa*

STOP [Program] funds were used to provide direct services in most areas of the state, including most or all of the highly populated as well as the rural regions of Kansas. Several victim advocates target rural communities providing outreach to victims in collaboration with local law enforcement.

—*STOP Administrator, Kansas*

A majority of the projects (8 of 14) addressed rural areas of the state, and one specifically focused on cultural outreach to underserved victims of domestic violence in a targeted rural area.

—*STOP Administrator, Hawaii*

78 percent of the STOP dollars fund programs in rural areas; 33 rural programs were funded.

—*STOP Administrator, Oklahoma*

[The state] . . . Attorney General's office has received VAWA funds to be dedicated for a prosecutor to provide prosecutorial assistance for domestic violence and sexual assault cases in rural communities.

— *STOP Administrator, Nebraska*

Legal Aid provides legal support services for victims in the rural Appalachian area of the state.

—*STOP Administrator, Kentucky*

STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the STOP Program in all states, territories, and the District of Columbia. STOP Program staff provide training, victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, court services, and probation to increase victim safety and offender accountability (table 12).

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for staff: 2,307 (94 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 12. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program

Staff	Number	Percent
All staff	3,844	100.0
Victim advocate	1,093	28.4
Law enforcement officer	511	13.3
Program coordinator	481	12.5
Prosecutor	377	9.8
Counselor	281	7.3
Support staff	210	5.5
Legal advocate	197	5.1
Administrator	168	4.4
Civil attorney	108	2.8
Victim-witness specialist	103	2.7
Trainer	95	2.5
Paralegal	51	1.3
Probation officer	49	1.3
Court personnel	31	0.8
Information technology specialist	17	0.4
Other	72	1.9

Training

STOP Program subgrantees provide coalition members, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, court personnel, mental health specialists, and other professionals with training regarding issues of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking (table 13). Subgrantees train professionals to improve their response to victims and to increase offender accountability.

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for training: 1,153 (47 percent of all subgrantees).
- Total number of people trained: 303,306.
- Total number of training events: 19,098.

Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds

People trained	Number	Percent
All people trained	303,306	100.0
Law enforcement officers	105,566	34.8
Multidisciplinary group	44,423	14.6
Health professionals	20,761	6.8
Domestic violence program staff	13,051	4.3
Volunteers	12,142	4.0
Faith-based organization staff	11,369	3.7
Social service organization staff	10,208	3.4
Court personnel	8,943	2.9
Attorneys/law students	8,655	2.9
Mental health professionals	7,424	2.4
Sexual assault program staff	6,910	2.3
Government agency staff	6,883	2.3
Prosecutors	6,842	2.3
Community advocacy organization staff	6,774	2.2
Correction personnel	6,401	2.1
Victim-witness specialists	4,271	1.4
Sexual assault forensic examiners	3,191	1.1
Immigrant organization staff	2,588	0.9
Elder organization staff	2,032	0.7
Legal services staff	1,510	0.5
Batterer intervention program staff	1,312	0.4
Disability organization staff	1,246	0.4
Domestic violence coalition staff	1,109	0.4
Tribal government/tribal government agency	852	0.3

Table 13. People trained using STOP Program funds (continued)

People trained	Number	Percent
Sexual assault coalition staff	376	0.1
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	224	0.1
Tribal coalition staff	193	0.1
Other	8,050	2.7

The most common topics of training events were overviews of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault; advocate response; law enforcement response; safety planning; domestic violence statutes/codes; confidentiality; 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 of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking (table 14). STOP Program subgrantees interact closely with other community agencies or organizations; these CCR activities include providing victim/survivor referrals to, receiving victim/survivor referrals from, engaging in consultation with, providing technical assistance to, and/or attending meetings with other agencies or organizations.

Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Batterer intervention program	184	326	390	142	390	261
Community advocacy organization	83	154	264	37	350	180
Corrections	163	350	461	95	438	309
Domestic violence organization	914	535	312	371	733	391
Faith-based organization	86	221	450	20	277	279
Court	760	628	249	234	456	321
Law enforcement	910	622	264	337	706	370
Prosecutor 's office	604	556	330	281	587	358
Government agency	239	334	343	55	242	225
Health/mental health organization	295	630	511	86	577	356

Table 14. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies (continued)

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Legal services organization	328	542	439	74	401	303
Sexual assault organization	355	401	440	182	513	336
Social service organization	474	644	330	124	644	326
Tribal government/tribal government agency	13	38	136	4	64	77
Other	54	87	63	26	138	75

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 (table 15).

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: 622, or 25 percent of all subgrantees.

Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols

Policy/protocol	Subgrantees using funds (N = 622)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations	319	51
Mandatory training	291	47
Protection order	238	38
Providing information to victims about victim services	224	36
Confidentiality	208	33
Informing victims about Crime Victims Compensation and Victim Impact Statements	200	32
Appropriate response to victims who are elderly or have disabilities	184	30

Products

STOP Program subgrantees develop and/or revise a variety of products for distribution, including brochures, manuals, training curricula, and training materials (table 16). The purpose of the products is to provide standardized information to professionals, organizations, and victims about sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking, and about services available for victims.

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for products: 647 (26 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 16. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution

Product	Number developed or revised	Number used or distributed
All products	2,351	1,516,518
Brochures	827	1,003,416
Manuals	233	97,021
Training curricula	312	46,126
Training materials	487	92,666
Other	492	277,289

STOP Program subgrantees developed or revised products in 30 languages:

Amharic	German	Portuguese
Arabic	Hindi	Russian
American Sign Language (ASL)	Hmong	Somali
Bosnian	Inupiat	Spanish
Braille	Japanese	Swahili
Cambodian	Khmer	Tai Dam
Cape Verdean	Korean	Thai
Chinese	Kurdish	Urdu
Creole	Lao	Vietnamese
French	Nuer (Sudanese)	Yupik

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 (tables 17 and 18). These systems link police, prosecution, and the courts for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions.

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: 382 (16 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 17. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems

Activity	Subgrantees using funds (N = 382)	
	Number	Percent
Develop/install/expand data collection/communication systems	212	55
Link existing data collection/communication systems	59	15
Share information with other community partners	173	45
Manage data collection and communication	218	57
Purchase computers/other equipment	123	32

Table 18. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems

Purpose	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	223
Arrests	175
Protection orders	168
Incident reports	150
Violation of protection orders	147
Prosecutions	145

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 (table 19).

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for specialized units: 672 (27 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 19. Use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	52	26	13	4
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	301	324	44	33
Train a specialized unit	78	46	9	7
Other	10	11	4	2

System Improvement

To more effectively respond to the needs of victims of sexual assault, domestic 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 (table 20).

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for system improvement: 370 (15 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 20. Use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	120	61	56	34	21
Interpreters	103	29	25	16	9
Language lines	28	3	4	1	1
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	21	14	8	5	3
Safety audits	16	11	9	7	5
Security personnel or equipment	28	29	8	5	6
Translation of forms and documents	106	23	22	10	2
Other	56	39	29	26	18

Victim Services

Communities with demonstrable success in reducing domestic homicide use comprehensive approaches to domestic violence (U.S. Department of Justice, 2005). For many victims, leaving the community does not necessarily guarantee safety; leaving often requires giving up support systems that are essential to the victim's emotional, financial, and psychological survival. A one-dimensional focus on leaving as a solution to domestic violence does not take into account the areas of a woman's life that are unaffected by the violence, or relationships that women do not want to leave behind (Krenek, 2000). Therefore, an array of victim services is fundamental to an effective community response to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking.

During the 12-month report period, a total of 1,646 individual subgrantees (67 percent of all subgrantees) used funds for victim services. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to more than 627,299 victims (97 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence. Only 3 percent of victims seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See tables 21 and 22 for information on the level of service provided and the types of victims served by subgrantees, and table 23 for the most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served.)

- Number of individual grantees using funds for victim services: 1646 (67 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 21. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees, 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	645,070	100	543,973	100	86,864	100	14,233	100
Served	583,443	90	491,072	90	79,248	91	13,123	92
Partially served	43,856	7	36,764	7	6,256	7	836	6
Not served	17,771	3	16,137	3	1,360	2	274	2

NOTES: Partially served victims received some, but not all, of the services they sought through STOP Program funds. Some of these victims may have received other requested services from other agencies.

Table 22. Victims receiving full or partial service from STOP Program subgrantees, by type of victimization

Type of victimization	Victims served	
	Number	Percent
All victimization	627,299	100.0
Domestic violence	527,836	84.1
Sexual assault	85,504	13.6
Stalking	13,959	2.2

Table 23. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served

Reason	Subgrantees reporting
Did not meet eligibility or statutory requirements	257
Services not appropriate for victim/survivor	255
Program reached capacity	187
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims with mental health problems	158
Transportation problems	155
Conflict of interest	140
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims with substance abuse problems	131
Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor	130
Geographic or other isolation of victim/survivor	122
Need not documented	100

Demographics of Victims Served

Of the more than 627,299 victims served during the 12-month report period, those who were served or partially served were most likely to be white (57.5 percent), female (89.6 percent), ages 25–59 (61.4 percent), and victimized by a current or former spouse or intimate partner (68.7 percent) (tables 24 and 25).

Table 24. Demographic characteristics of victims served

Characteristic	Victims receiving services	
	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity		
Black/African American	115,721	22.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	7,622	1.5
Asian	9,150	1.8
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	2,806	0.6
Hispanic/Latino	93,011	18.4
White	291,501	57.5
Unknown	120,532	na
Gender		
Female	520,347	89.6
Male	60,455	10.4
Unknown	46,497	na
Age		
0–17	43,088	8.5
18–24	135,628	26.7
25–59	311,446	61.4
60+	17,100	3.4
Unknown	120,037	na
Other		
Disability	25,855	4.1
Limited English proficiency	39,883	6.4
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	20,176	3.2
Resident of rural area	145,165	23.1

na = not applicable

NOTES: STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 627,299 victims. Because some victims identify with more than one race/ethnicity, data reported may be higher than the total number of victims served. Due to a prorating formula used to adjust demographic data when secondary victims have been misreported and no data are provided on the gender of those victims, the percentage of female victims reported may be lower and the percentage of male victims higher than actual numbers would reflect.

Table 25. Victim's relationship to offender

Relationship to offender	All victimizations (n = 489,312)		Domestic violence (n = 522,173)		Sexual assault (n = 597,499)		Stalking (n = 624,238)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	336,355	68.7	310,938	59.5	17,128	2.9	8,289	1.3
Other family or household member	70,841	14.5	55,385	10.6	14,687	2.5	769	0.1
Dating relationship	74,477	15.2	63,664	12.2	7,134	1.2	3,679	0.6
Acquaintance	33,086	6.8	9,378	1.8	20,744	3.5	2,964	0.5
Stranger	10,126	2.1	2,458	0.5	7,230	1.2	438	0.1
Other	3,116	0.6	2,118	0.4	993	0.2	5	0.0
Unknown	137,987	na	105,126	na	29,800	na	3,061	na

na = not applicable

NOTE: The total number in each victimization category is the total number of victims who received STOP Program services (627,299) less the number in that category for whom the relationship to the offender is unknown. Because victims may have been abused by more than one offender, data reported may be higher than the total number of victims served.

Types of Services Provided to Victims

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking (table 26). These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (assistance navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Safety planning, referrals, and information are routinely provided to victims as needed.

Table 26. Services provided by STOP Program subgrantees

Type of service	Victims served (N = 627,299)	
	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	278,301	44
Hotline calls	220,590	35
Crisis intervention	214,661	34
Criminal justice advocacy	195,093	31
Civil legal advocacy	163,069	26
Counseling/support group	149,160	24
Victim witness notification	149,026	24
Shelter (includes transitional housing)	26,168	4

Table 26. Services provided by STOP Program subgrantees (continued)

Type of service	Victims served (N = 627,299)	
	Number	Percent
Hospital response	22,071	4
Civil legal assistance	21,208	3
Other	14,325	2

NOTE: Detail does not add to total because an individual victim/survivor may receive more than one service.

Number of victims receiving shelter services:

- 24,996 victims and 23,931 family members received a total of 855,505 emergency shelter bed days.
- 1,172 victims and 1,104 family members received a total of 250,522 transitional housing bed days.

Protection orders:

- Of the protection orders for which victim advocates provided assistance, 159,878 were granted.

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 influence whether victims will report sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking offenses, and whether appropriate evidence will be collected to enable prosecutors to bring successful cases. Law enforcement's approach to violence against women must be proactive and rigorous. Arrest, accompanied by a thorough investigation and meaningful sanctions, demonstrates to offenders that they have committed a serious crime and communicates to victims that they do not have to endure an offender's abuse. It has been suggested that "good police work, starting with arrest, may be the first step in preventing domestic violence and reducing overall abuse. It may be that every domestic violence arrest, starting with the simple misdemeanor, is a homicide prevention measure" (Klein, 2004, p. 113).

Table 27 summarizes STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2004.

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: 371 (15 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 27. Law enforcement activities funded by STOP Program

Activity	Subgrantees responding	Total activities
Calls for assistance	234	133,692
Incident reports	282	128,667
Cases/incidents investigated	323	106,249
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	247	54,073
Arrests of predominant aggressor	257	43,826
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	166	33,928
Protection orders issued	141	20,316
Enforcement of warrants	164	11,309
Arrests for violation of protection order	209	5,631
Arrests for violation of bail bond	66	2,932
Dual arrests	132	1,509
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	42	302

NOTE: Of the protection orders for which law enforcement personnel provided assistance, 32,501 were granted.

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. “Rigorous criminal prosecution” that includes “early and repeated contacts with victims, providing them access to supportive, protection, legal, and other resources, inform and reassure victim regularly throughout the course of a prosecution, and increase the likelihood of conviction and reduce recidivism” (Klein, 2004, p. 143). Close cooperation between law enforcement, victim advocates, and specialized prosecution units; specialized training for prosecutors; and vertical prosecution all have contributed to higher prosecution and conviction rates (Klein, 2004).

Table 28 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking charges during 2004.

- Number of individual subgrantees using funds for prosecution: 352 (14 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 28. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking charges

Charge	New charges filed		Charges disposed	Dispositions resulting in convictions	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
All charges	209,374	100	152,562	97,633	64
Misdemeanor domestic violence	123,431	59	100,746	62,726	62
Felony domestic violence	28,099	13	13,184	8,782	67
Violation of protection order	17,124	8	11,317	8,296	73
Domestic violence ordinance	13,891	7	11,362	6,656	59
Felony sexual assault	8,832	4	3,260	2,833	87
Violation of probation/parole	8,398	4	4,254	2,672	63

NOTES: 352 subgrantees (14%) used funds for prosecution. Of the protection orders for which prosecution personnel provided assistance, 50,993 were granted. Five tribal grantees referred 511 cases to a federal or state entity for prosecution. Detail does not add to total because not all charges 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 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 type 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. The data in table 29 reflect the consequences imposed for violations of court orders.

- Number of individual grantees using funds for court: 32 (1 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders

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 = 741)	305	41	186	25	116	16	46	6	88	12
New criminal behavior (N = 172)	2	1	149	87	19	11	2	1	0	0
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 236)	45	19	99	42	41	17	0	0	51	22
Other (N = 853)	69	8	567	66	211	25	2	<1	4	<1

Judicial Monitoring

- 3,239 offenders were monitored.
- 8,031 judicial review hearings were held.
- 17,335 civil protection orders were granted by STOP Program-funded courts.

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 (table 30). If a probationer violates any terms of his or her probation, the probation 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 (table 31). As arrests of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking offenders have increased, probation and parole have adopted policies and practices specifically targeted to offenders who commit violent crimes against women.

In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. A total of 1,937 victims received 7,283 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program.

Total number of cases: 7,652.

- Offenders completing probation without violations: 1,198 (73 percent of those completing probation).
- Offenders completing probation with violations: 453 (27 percent).
- Number of individual grantees using funds for probation: 26 (1 percent of all subgrantees).

Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program subgrantees, by type and number of contacts

Type of contact	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	5,016	47,480
Telephone	2,638	15,700
Unscheduled surveillance	1,109	4,560

Table 31. Disposition of probation violations

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 = 167)	9	5	88	53	27	16	13	8	30	18
New criminal behavior (N = 247)	10	4	179	72	33	13	6	2	19	8
Failure to attend batterer intervention program (N = 418)	137	33	205	49	47	11	3	1	26	6
Other (N = 740)	69	9	578	78	29	4	27	4	37	5

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

References

- Allen, N., Bybee, D., and Sullivan, C. 2004. Battered Women's Multitude of Needs: Evidence Supporting the Need for Comprehensive Advocacy. *Violence Against Women* 10(9):1015–1035.
- Belknap, J., Graham, D., Hartman, J., Lippen, V., and Sutherland, J. 1999. Predicting Court Outcomes in Intimate Partner Violence Cases: Preliminary Findings. *Domestic Violence Report* 5(1):1–16.
- Bryson, A.J. 2004. A Tide of Violence. *Deseret Morning News* (Salt Lake City, UT), 16 August, p.A01.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2006. *A National Crime Victimization Survey, 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., and 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.
- Campbell J.C., et al. 2003. Risk Factors for Femicide in Abusive Relationships: Results from a Multisite Case Control Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 93(7):1089–1097.
- Cole, M.G., Fenton, F.R., Engelsmann, F., and Mansouri, I. 1991. Effectiveness of Geriatric Psychiatry Consultation in an Acute Care Hospital: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of American Geriatric Society* 39(12):1183–1188.
- Crandall, C., and Helitzer, D. 2003. *Impact Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program*. Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque SANE Collaborative.
- Davis, R., Smith, B., and Nickles, L. 1998. The Deterrent Effect of Prosecuting Domestic Violence Misdemeanors. *Crime and Delinquency* 44(3):434–442.
- Doucette, J. 1986. *Violent Acts Against Disabled Women*. Toronto, Canada: Disabled Women Network.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D.S., and Rosenfeld, R. 2003. Do Domestic Violence Services Save Lives? *National Institute of Justice Journal* 250:20–25.
- Editors. 2004. Officials Push Domestic Violence Initiatives. *Albuquerque Journal*, 15 November, p. A10.

Elliot, J. 1997. Domestic Violence Among Family Practice Patients in Midsized and Rural Communities. *Journal of Family Practice* 44(4):391–400.

Elman, A. 2005. *Confronting the Sexual Abuse of Women with Disabilities*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWnet Applied Research Forum. Available at:

http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_SVDisability.pdf.

Finn, P. 1991. Civil Protection Orders: A Flawed Opportunity for Intervention. In *Women Battering: Policy Responses*, edited by M.K. Steinman. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co., pp.155–190.

Florida Department of Law Enforcement. 2005. Florida Statistical Analysis Center, County and Jurisdictional Domestic Violence Offenses Data, 1996–2005. Available at: http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/fsac/Crime_Trends/download/excel/dvoff_jur02.xls.

Ford, D., and Regoli, M. 1993. *The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment, Final Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Frye, V., Wilt, S., and Schomberg, D. 2000. *Female Homicide in New York City: 1990–1997*. New York, NY: New York City Department of Health, Office of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, Domestic Violence Research and Surveillance Unit.

Gallagher, M. 2005. 8 of 10 Assault Cases Dismissed. *Albuquerque Journal*, 1 May.

Gondolf, E.W., Fisher, E., and McFerron, J.R. 1990. The Helpseeking Behavior of Battered Women: An Analysis of 6,000 Shelter Interviews. In *The Victimology Handbook: Research Findings, Treatment and Public Policy*, edited by E. Viano. New York, NY: Garland.

Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans. 2004. *Guam's FY 2004–2007 Multi-Year Strategy for Drug Control, Violence Prevention, and System Improvement*.

Gwinn, C., and Strack, G. 2006. *Hope for Hurting Families: Creating Family Justice Centers Across America*. Volcano, CA: Volcano Press.

Holt, V.L., Kernic, M.A., Lumley, T., Wolf, M.E., and Rivara, F.P. 2002. Civil Protection Orders and Risk of Subsequent Police-Reported Violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 288:589–594.

Keilitz, S. 2001. *Specialization of Domestic Violence Case Management in the Courts: A National Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/186192.pdf>.

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., Crow, A., and DeMichele, M. 2005. *Evaluation of the Rhode Island Probation Specialized Domestic Violence Supervision Unit*. American Probation and Parole Association and BOTEC Analysis Corporation (National Institute of Justice Study).

Krenek, K. 2000. *The Battered Women's Movement—Transforming Our Vision to Meet Women's Needs: Reflections on Wisconsin's Experience*. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.

Lee, R., Thompson, V., and Mechanic, M. 2002. Intimate Partner Violence and Women of Color: A Call for Innovations. *American Journal of Public Health* 92 (4).

Lewis, S. H. 2003. *Sexual Assault in Rural Communities*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Available at:
http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main_Doc.php?docid=419.

Maxwell, C., Garner, J., and Fagan, J. 2001. *The Effects of Arrest on Intimate Partner Violence: New Evidence from the Spouse Assault Replication Program*. Research in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

New Mexico Female Intimate Partner Violence Death Review Team. 1998. *Getting Away with Murder: A Report of the New Mexico Female Intimate Partner Violence Death Review Team*. Albuquerque, NM: Center for Injury Prevention Research and Education, Department of Emergency Medicine, University of New Mexico School of Medicine.

Nosek, M., Foley, C., Hughes, R., and Howland, C. 2001. Vulnerabilities for Abuse Among Women with Disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability* 19(3):177–189.

Owens, S. 2004. Domestic Violence Cases Fuel Dispute. *Orlando Sentinel*, 26 November, p. B1.

Ramsey-Klawnsnik, H. 1991. Elder Sexual Abuse: Preliminary Findings. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect* 3(3):73–90.

Ruback, B.R., and 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.

Sheppard, M. 1999. *Evaluating Coordinated Community Responses to Domestic Violence*. Enola, PA: National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, VAWnet Applied Research Forum. Available at: http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_ccr.pdf.

- Sherman, L., and Berk, R. 1984. The Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest on Domestic Assault. *American Sociological Review* 49:261–272.
- Stimpson, L., and Best, M. 1991. *Courage Above All: Sexual Assault Against Women With Disabilities*. Toronto: Disabled Women’s Network.
- Sullivan, C., and Bybee, D. 2000. *Using a Longitudinal Data Set to Further Understanding of the Trajectory of Intimate Violence Over Time*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Tatara, T., Kuzmeskos, L., Duckhorn, E., Bivens, L., Thomas, C., Gettig, J., Jay, K., Hartley, A., Rust, K., and Cross, J. 1998. *The National Elder Abuse Incident Study, Final Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Administration on Aging.
- Teaster, P., Roberto, K., Duke, J., and Myenonghwan, 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., and Gibbs, D. 1998. Severity of Dispositions and Domestic Violence Recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency* 44(3):388–395.
- Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N. 1998. *Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Research in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Tyiska, C. 1998. *Working With Victims of Crime with Disabilities*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2005. *Responding to Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking: Report of the National Advisory Committee on Violence Against Women*. Available at: <http://www.usdoj.gov/ovw/nac/welcome.html>.
- Valenti-Hein, D., and Schwartz, L. 1993. Witness Competency in People With Mental Retardation: Implications for Prosecution of Sexual Abuse. *Sexuality and Disability* 11(4):287–294.
- Weisheit, R., and Wells, L. 1996. Rural Crime and Rural Policing: Implications for Theory and Research. *Crime and Delinquency* 42:379–397.

Appendix A

Appendix table A1.1. Federal fiscal year STOP Program allocations by state 1999–2004

State	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Unknown ^a
Alabama	10,240,144	NA	2,159,000	1,871,000	2,150,144	2,138,000	1,922,000	NA
Alaska	2,320,000	NA	NA	751,000	785,000	784,000	NA	NA
American Samoa	427,460	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	427,460	NA
Arizona	6,658,000	NA	NA	NA	2,308,000	2,294,000	2,056,000	NA
Arkansas	6,744,550	NA	1,392,700	1,273,000	1,454,450	1,370,700	1,253,700	NA
California	10,929,751	NA	NA	312,751	NA	NA	10,617,000	NA
Colorado	4,172,000	NA	NA	NA	2,092,000	2,080,000	NA	NA
Connecticut	4,924,800	NA	NA	NA	1,700,500	1,691,000	1,533,300	NA
Delaware	1,745,000	NA	NA	NA	874,000	871,000	NA	NA
District of Columbia	3,818,000	NA	699,000	751,000	800,000	798,000	770,000	NA
Florida	5,747,748	NA	NA	NA	2,827,967	2,919,781	NA	NA
Georgia	12,805,000	NA	NA	2,867,000	3,461,000	3,438,000	3,039,000	NA
Guam	1,300,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	654,000	646,000	NA
Hawaii	2,785,841	NA	NA	896,000	971,841	918,000	NA	NA
Idaho	981,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	981,000	NA
Illinois	23,376,000	NA	5,098,000	4,131,000	4,941,000	4,906,000	4,300,000	NA
Indiana	7,887,000	NA	NA	NA	2,725,000	2,751,000	2,411,000	NA
Iowa	4,707,000	NA	NA	NA	1,622,000	1,614,000	1,471,000	NA
Kansas	2,775,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,449,700	1,326,200	NA
Kentucky	11,684,000	2,106,000	2,004,000	1,754,000	2,013,000	2,002,000	1,805,000	NA
Louisiana	10,262,000	NA	2,164,000	1,870,000	2,157,000	2,144,000	1,927,000	NA
Maine	974,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	974,000	NA
Mariana Islands	423,390	NA	NA	NA	423,390	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	7,047,433	NA	NA	NA	2,434,433	2,436,000	2,177,000	NA
Massachusetts	5,294,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,802,000	2,492,000	NA
Michigan	8,096,000	NA	NA	NA	4,062,000	4,034,000	NA	NA
Minnesota	6,649,000	NA	NA	NA	2,305,000	2,291,000	2,053,000	NA
Mississippi	4,583,000	NA	NA	1,405,000	1,593,000	1,585,000	NA	NA
Missouri	7,277,010	NA	NA	2,189,010	2,552,000	2,536,000	NA	NA
Montana	853,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	853,000	NA
Nebraska	1,190,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,190,000	NA	NA
Nevada	4,883,000	NA	NA	1,118,000	1,291,000	1,285,000	1,189,000	NA
New Hampshire	2,060,000	NA	NA	NA	1,032,000	1,028,000	NA	NA
New Jersey	10,167,000	NA	NA	NA	3,542,000	3,518,000	3,107,000	NA
New Mexico	4,500,000	NA	NA	1,059,000	1,177,000	1,172,000	1,092,000	NA
New York	26,660,050	7,537,300	7,053,750	NA	NA	6,450,300	5,618,700	NA
North Carolina	9,723,146	NA	NA	NA	3,386,000	3,363,000	2,974,146	NA
North Dakota	1,510,390	NA	NA	NA	NA	771,400	738,990	NA
Ohio	17,766,000	NA	4,780,000	3,878,000	4,570,000	4,538,000	NA	NA
Oklahoma	6,600,000	NA	1,680,000	1,503,000	1,713,000	1,704,000	NA	NA
Oregon	5,164,719	NA	NA	NA	1,783,000	1,773,719	1,608,000	NA
Pennsylvania	8,420,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,263,000	4,157,000	NA
Puerto Rico	9,295,000	NA	1,977,000	NA	1,930,000	3,654,000	1,734,000	NA
Rhode Island	2,841,000	NA	NA	NA	966,000	963,000	912,000	NA
South Carolina	3,795,000	NA	NA	NA	2,001,000	NA	1,794,000	NA
South Dakota	3,844,650	NA	722,000	756,200	800,850	798,950	766,650	NA
Tennessee	7,455,000	NA	NA	NA	2,588,000	NA	NA	4,867,000
Texas	22,465,000	NA	NA	NA	7,865,000	7,807,000	6,793,000	NA
Utah	3,951,000	NA	NA	1,213,000	1,372,000	1,366,000	NA	NA
Vermont	1,592,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	811,000	781,000	NA
Virgin Islands	1,911,000	NA	NA	635,000	638,000	638,000	NA	NA
Virginia	5,653,000	NA	NA	2,600,000	NA	3,053,000	NA	NA
Washington	9,831,000	NA	NA	2,249,000	2,633,000	2,616,000	2,333,000	NA
West Virginia	4,725,000	NA	NA	1,127,000	1,232,000	1,227,000	1,139,000	NA
Wisconsin	9,217,000	NA	NA	2,118,000	2,463,000	2,448,000	2,188,000	NA
Wyoming	1,512,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	768,000	744,000	NA
Total	364,219,982	9,643,300	29,729,450	38,326,961	89,235,575	107,713,550	84,704,146	4,867,000

NA = not available

^a Data supplied by STOP administrators did not identify fiscal year.

Appendix table A1.2. Funding returned unused by subgrantees: 1999–2004

State	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Unknown ^a
Alabama	174,227	NA	89,919	34,591	23,512	23,617	2,588	NA
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	167,897	NA	NA	NA	167,897	NA	NA	NA
Arkansas	306,351	NA	45,684	148,165	70,439	42,063	NA	NA
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Colorado	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Connecticut	3	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	99,806	NA	NA	NA	99,806	NA	NA	NA
Georgia	111,103	NA	NA	21,182	18,430	71,491	NA	NA
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	19,272	NA	NA	16,400	2,866	6	NA	NA
Idaho	7,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,000	NA
Illinois	4,548,432	NA	NA	117,741	692,064	1,861,972	1,876,655	NA
Indiana	22,798	NA	NA	NA	3,378	19,420	NA	NA
Iowa	35,042	NA	NA	NA	35,042	NA	NA	NA
Kansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kentucky	184,058	22,190	15,024	19,355	18,225	109,264	NA	NA
Louisiana	23,081	NA	16,865	6,216	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mariana Islands	20,546	NA	NA	NA	20,546	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	98,764	NA	NA	NA	11,262	87,502	NA	NA
Massachusetts	295,459	NA	NA	NA	NA	295,459	NA	NA
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	117,684	NA	NA	NA	28,625	89,059	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	135,889	NA	NA	15,875	15,413	104,601	NA	NA
Montana	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	169,986	NA	NA	866	74,155	64,965	30,000	NA
New Hampshire	28,587	NA	NA	NA	6,092	22,495	NA	NA
New Jersey	55	NA	NA	NA	55	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	4	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	NA
New York	244	NA	NA	NA	NA	244	NA	NA
North Carolina	1,474	NA	NA	NA	1,474	NA	NA	NA
North Dakota	50,935	NA	NA	NA	NA	9,861	41,074	NA
Ohio	323,942	NA	10,608	52,492	260,842	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	9,434	NA	1	1	9,397	35	NA	NA
Oregon	146,004	NA	NA	NA	48,559	97,445	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	121,385	NA	NA	NA	121,385	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	112,900	NA	NA	NA	11,000	NA	NA	101,900
Texas	537,655	NA	NA	NA	124,769	353,283	59,603	NA
Utah	35,332	NA	NA	10,395	2,496	22,441	NA	NA
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	93,651	NA	NA	93,651	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
West Virginia	72,089	NA	NA	2,653	69,436	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	166,552	NA	NA	1,236	48,050	117,026	240	NA
Wyoming	456,031	NA	NA	NA	NA	259,980	196,051	NA
Total	8,693,673	22,190	178,101	540,820	1,985,217	3,652,231	2,213,214	101,900

NA = not available

^a Data supplied by STOP administrators did not identify fiscal year.

Appendix table A1.3. Funding awarded to subgrantees: 1999–2004

State	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Unknown ^a
Alabama	1,808,957	NA	8,853	2,610	29,395	141,353	1,626,746	NA
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	384,714	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	384,714	NA
Arizona	2,088,501	NA	NA	NA	167,897	1,894,493	26,111	NA
Arkansas	1,389,257	NA	NA	NA	40,211	479,760	869,286	NA
California	10,244,492	NA	NA	200,000	NA	NA	10,044,492	NA
Colorado	3,921,800	NA	NA	NA	1,987,400	1,934,400	NA	NA
Connecticut	1,599,601	NA	NA	NA	431,362	523,700	644,539	NA
Delaware	560,652	NA	NA	NA	45,000	515,652	NA	NA
District of Columbia	3,001,812	NA	166,012	624,700	760,000	758,100	693,000	NA
Florida	5,523,300	NA	NA	NA	2,767,550	2,755,750	NA	NA
Georgia	691,228	NA	NA	366,229	95,633	163,372	65,994	NA
Guam	1,170,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	588,600	581,400	NA
Hawaii	909,716	NA	NA	16,200	584,903	308,613	NA	NA
Idaho	974,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	974,000	NA
Illinois	21,746,900	NA	4,843,100	3,924,450	4,693,950	4,415,400	3,870,000	NA
Indiana	2,499,142	NA	NA	NA	NA	90,305	2,408,837	NA
Iowa	1,566,323	NA	NA	NA	25,840	143,033	1,397,450	NA
Kansas	1,268,930	NA	NA	NA	NA	125,409	1,143,521	NA
Kentucky	10,802,653	2,105,630	1,981,300	1,674,158	1,905,390	1,421,425	1,714,750	NA
Louisiana	1,625,601	NA	21,831	65,342	176,499	1,121,437	240,492	NA
Maine	930,567	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	930,567	NA
Mariana Islands	402,220	NA	NA	NA	402,220	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	2,078,888	NA	NA	NA	53,973	1,665,429	359,486	NA
Massachusetts	4,970,987	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,627,507	2,343,480	NA
Michigan	3,796,243	NA	NA	NA	1,265,414	2,530,829	NA	NA
Minnesota	2,100,758	NA	NA	NA	247,421	1,296,184	557,153	NA
Mississippi	2,731,687	NA	NA	430,179	1,428,079	873,429	NA	NA
Missouri	2,367,371	NA	NA	200,072	314,023	1,853,276	NA	NA
Montana	767,700	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	767,700	NA
Nebraska	1,071,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,071,000	NA	NA
Nevada	1,050,793	NA	NA	NA	74,048	46,746	929,999	NA
New Hampshire	978,627	NA	NA	NA	453,432	525,195	NA	NA
New Jersey	3,589,706	NA	NA	NA	538,759	2,955,014	95,933	NA
New Mexico	994,775	NA	NA	15,862	36,127	177,002	765,784	NA
New York	5,739,800	66,000	99,000	NA	NA	NA	5,574,800	NA
North Carolina	3,440,005	NA	NA	NA	396,816	274,498	2,768,691	NA
North Dakota	1,885,194	NA	NA	NA	NA	909,904	975,290	NA
Ohio	4,738,856	NA	244,189	177,123	297,751	4,019,793	NA	NA
Oklahoma	1,631,322	NA	14,386	36,421	79,013	1,501,502	NA	NA
Oregon	1,584,829	NA	NA	NA	48,559	165,364	1,370,906	NA
Pennsylvania	4,471,789	NA	NA	NA	NA	743,498	3,728,291	NA
Puerto Rico	4,884,409	NA	135,598	NA	1,365,506	3,376,208	7,097	NA
Rhode Island	1,899,225	NA	NA	NA	229,425	963,000	706,800	NA
South Carolina	1,735,985	NA	NA	NA	121,385	NA	1,614,600	NA
South Dakota	640,631	NA	31,433	95,682	209,587	264,522	39,407	NA
Tennessee	2,633,000	NA	NA	NA	247,800	NA	NA	2,385,200
Texas	17,481,690	NA	NA	NA	3,252,235	7,438,771	6,790,684	NA
Utah	1,325,926	NA	NA	54,118	659,482	612,326	NA	NA
Vermont	696,701	NA	NA	NA	NA	33,000	663,701	NA
Virgin Islands	463,537	NA	NA	173,489	30,305	259,743	NA	NA
Virginia	2,835,350	NA	NA	35,651	NA	2,799,699	NA	NA
Washington	2,248,315	NA	NA	NA	10,991	503,895	1,733,429	NA
West Virginia	1,254,228	NA	NA	NA	33,388	1,141,110	79,730	NA
Wisconsin	2,734,709	NA	NA	37,232	242,340	1,535,379	919,758	NA
Wyoming	1,030,709	NA	NA	NA	NA	259,980	770,729	NA
Total	166,965,111	2,171,630	7,545,702	8,129,518	25,749,109	59,804,605	61,179,347	2,385,200

NA = not available

^a Data supplied by STOP administrators did not identify fiscal year.

Appendix table A2. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to victim services, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	21	NA	1	NA	1	1	18	657,526	NA	2,610	NA	3,028	12,183	639,705
Alaska	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	318,089	NA	NA	28,974	102,609	186,506	NA
American Samoa	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	158,307	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	158,307
Arizona	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	2	894,861	NA	NA	NA	NA	868,750	26,111
Arkansas	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	8	513,456	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,929	433,527
California	40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40	3,338,587	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,338,587
Colorado	68	NA	NA	NA	33	35	NA	1,583,483	NA	NA	NA	795,086	788,397	NA
Connecticut	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	4	682,039	NA	NA	NA	NA	37,500	644,539
Delaware	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	82,814	NA	NA	NA	NA	82,814	NA
District of Columbia	19	NA	NA	3	4	7	5	1,120,350	NA	NA	211,650	320,000	319,200	269,500
Florida	38	NA	NA	NA	16	22	NA	1,675,417	NA	NA	NA	1,241,204	434,213	NA
Georgia	23	NA	NA	15	3	5	NA	321,940	NA	NA	244,826	30,854	46,260	NA
Guam	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	351,001	NA	NA	NA	NA	176,580	174,421
Hawaii	5	NA	NA	1	4	NA	NA	413,106	NA	NA	16,200	396,906	NA	NA
Idaho	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	353,027	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	353,027
Illinois	11	NA	3	2	2	2	2	6,281,915	NA	1,210,776	1,177,334	1,408,185	1,324,620	1,161,000
Indiana	127	NA	NA	NA	44	43	40	3,694,280	NA	NA	NA	1,351,746	1,395,266	947,268
Iowa	38	NA	NA	NA	4	3	31	642,597	NA	NA	NA	7,066	6,678	628,853
Kansas	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	487,772	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	487,772
Kentucky	64	14	10	12	10	8	10	3,577,170	530,683	467,633	515,069	613,696	775,115	674,974
Louisiana	27	NA	1	NA	2	22	2	597,396	NA	21,831	NA	53,413	489,202	32,950
Maine	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	348,062	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	348,062
Mariana Islands	4	NA	NA	NA	4	NA	NA	180,997	NA	NA	NA	180,997	NA	NA
Maryland	48	NA	NA	NA	2	25	21	819,186	NA	NA	NA	27,092	670,615	121,479
Massachusetts	63	NA	NA	NA	NA	32	31	1,448,629	NA	NA	NA	NA	745,885	702,744
Michigan	94	NA	NA	NA	47	47	NA	1,448,213	NA	NA	NA	482,738	965,475	NA
Minnesota	38	NA	NA	NA	9	17	12	668,678	NA	NA	NA	134,074	316,926	217,678
Mississippi	38	NA	NA	NA	20	18	NA	674,065	NA	NA	NA	595,753	78,312	NA
Missouri	37	NA	NA	3	9	25	NA	956,683	NA	NA	79,177	181,707	695,799	NA
Montana	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	232,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	232,000
Nebraska	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	NA	321,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	321,300	NA
Nevada	22	NA	NA	NA	2	1	19	348,086	NA	NA	NA	22,056	5,000	321,030
New Hampshire	6	NA	NA	NA	4	2	NA	317,380	NA	NA	NA	239,198	78,182	NA
New Jersey	23	NA	NA	NA	NA	23	NA	1,107,354	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,107,354	NA
New Mexico	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	15	364,878	NA	NA	NA	NA	18,994	345,884
New York	58	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58	1,989,805	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,989,805
North Carolina	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	132,077	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	132,077
North Dakota	38	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	19	465,117	NA	NA	NA	NA	235,018	230,099

Appendix table A2. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to victim services, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004 (continued)

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Ohio	53	NA	3	7	1	42	NA	1,869,533	NA	65,206	69,913	21,576	1,712,838	NA
Oklahoma	29	NA	12	1	NA	16	NA	493,473	NA	7,092	9,530	NA	476,851	NA
Oregon	39	NA	NA	NA	1	1	37	690,986	NA	NA	NA	18,037	13,452	659,497
Pennsylvania	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	48	2,114,058	NA	NA	NA	NA	359,390	1,754,668
Puerto Rico	37	NA	8	NA	8	21	NA	1,430,988	NA	135,577	NA	226,328	1,069,083	NA
Rhode Island	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	772,375	NA	NA	NA	NA	403,015	369,360
South Carolina	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	568,306	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	568,306
South Dakota	81	NA	NA	NA	27	27	27	166,364	NA	NA	NA	NA	126,957	39,407
Tennessee	31	NA	NA	NA	2	3	26	961,100	NA	NA	NA	3,800	49,100	908,200
Texas	88	NA	NA	NA	29	32	27	5,973,137	NA	NA	NA	1,894,313	2,096,504	1,982,320
Utah	14	NA	NA	NA	6	8	NA	384,274	NA	NA	NA	174,130	210,144	NA
Vermont	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	7	266,551	NA	NA	NA	NA	33,000	233,551
Virgin Islands	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	244,461	NA	NA	NA	NA	244,461	NA
Virginia	42	NA	NA	NA	NA	42	NA	932,783	NA	NA	NA	NA	932,783	NA
Washington	52	NA	NA	NA	1	19	32	835,588	NA	NA	NA	640	260,840	574,108
West Virginia	22	NA	NA	NA	NA	22	NA	418,652	NA	NA	NA	NA	418,652	NA
Wisconsin	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	4	634,596	NA	NA	NA	NA	441,924	192,672
Wyoming	24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24	212,040	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	212,040
Total	1,732	14	38	45	296	700	639	58,536,908	530,683	1,910,725	2,352,673	10,526,232	21,111,067	22,105,528

NA = not available

Appendix table A3. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to law enforcement, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	8	NA	NA	1	NA	2	5	503,174	NA	NA	8,853	NA	64,217	430,104
Alaska	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	227,505	NA	NA	110,135	88,713	28,657	NA
American Samoa	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	95,517	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95,517
Arizona	6	NA	NA	NA	1	5	NA	613,312	NA	NA	NA	138,867	474,445	NA
Arkansas	14	NA	NA	NA	1	4	9	529,575	NA	NA	NA	15,736	170,007	343,832
California	26	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	25	2,682,518	NA	NA	200,000	NA	NA	2,482,518
Colorado	21	NA	NA	NA	12	9	NA	991,057	NA	NA	NA	504,087	486,970	NA
Connecticut	7	NA	NA	NA	5	2	NA	427,312	NA	NA	NA	363,862	63,450	NA
Delaware	6	NA	NA	NA	1	5	NA	167,251	NA	NA	NA	15,825	151,426	NA
District of Columbia	7	NA	1	1	2	2	1	945,762	NA	166,012	187,750	200,000	199,500	192,500
Florida	29	NA	NA	NA	9	20	NA	616,067	NA	NA	NA	532,060	84,007	NA
Georgia	7	NA	NA	1	2	4	NA	77,045	NA	NA	19,702	7,941	49,402	NA
Guam	12	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	6	292,499	NA	NA	NA	NA	147,150	145,349
Hawaii	4	NA	NA	NA	3	1	NA	229,033	NA	NA	NA	98,980	130,053	NA
Idaho	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	205,293	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	205,293
Illinois	36	NA	19	10	4	3	NA	2,920,940	NA	1,210,775	945,103	602,364	162,698	NA
Indiana	49	NA	NA	NA	17	16	16	1,290,962	NA	NA	NA	352,986	250,261	687,715
Iowa	22	NA	NA	NA	1	3	18	446,203	NA	NA	NA	318	96,523	349,362
Kansas	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	7	454,939	NA	NA	NA	NA	125,409	329,530
Kentucky	48	13	10	6	9	5	5	3,637,494	689,296	608,430	536,603	659,995	623,385	519,785
Louisiana	22	NA	NA	NA	3	9	10	429,829	NA	NA	NA	77,449	201,308	151,072
Maine	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	220,275	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	220,275
Mariana Islands	2	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	100,556	NA	NA	NA	100,556	NA	NA
Maryland	32	NA	NA	NA	NA	17	15	413,935	NA	NA	NA	NA	324,861	89,074
Massachusetts	56	NA	NA	NA	NA	28	28	1,193,595	NA	NA	NA	NA	607,975	585,620
Michigan	96	NA	NA	NA	48	48	NA	1,093,147	NA	NA	NA	364,382	728,765	NA
Minnesota	33	NA	NA	NA	3	17	13	532,432	NA	NA	NA	26,253	347,066	159,113
Mississippi	22	NA	NA	8	12	2	NA	715,897	NA	NA	223,729	390,269	101,899	NA
Missouri	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	NA	606,679	NA	NA	NA	NA	606,679	NA
Montana	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	213,700	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	213,700
Nebraska	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	NA	267,750	NA	NA	NA	NA	267,750	NA
Nevada	13	NA	NA	NA	2	1	10	292,070	NA	NA	NA	15,882	8,663	267,525
New Hampshire	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	NA	247,061	NA	NA	NA	NA	247,061	NA
New Jersey	15	NA	NA	NA	6	9	NA	697,427	NA	NA	NA	170,870	526,557	NA
New Mexico	10	NA	NA	NA	2	2	6	288,787	NA	NA	NA	36,127	57,138	195,522
New York	43	1	3	NA	NA	NA	39	1,659,465	66,000	99,000	NA	NA	NA	1,494,465
North Carolina	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	818,796	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	818,796
North Dakota	51	NA	NA	NA	NA	28	23	507,303	NA	NA	NA	NA	227,719	279,584

Appendix table A3. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to law enforcement, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004 (continued)

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Ohio	31	NA	7	NA	6	18	NA	1,178,049	NA	98,548	NA	141,637	937,864	NA
Oklahoma	23	NA	8	1	1	13	NA	414,010	NA	4,339	8,226	1,718	399,727	NA
Oregon	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	9	340,905	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,699	311,206
Pennsylvania	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	48	1,082,988	NA	NA	NA	NA	184,108	898,880
Puerto Rico	4	NA	NA	NA	1	2	1	1,333,296	NA	NA	NA	458,375	867,824	7,097
Rhode Island	10	NA	NA	NA	5	5	NA	453,322	NA	NA	NA	229,425	223,897	NA
South Carolina	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	403,650	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	403,650
South Dakota	4	NA	NA	1	3		NA	104,954	NA	NA	7,755	97,199	NA	NA
Tennessee	31	NA	NA	NA	9	9	13	1,006,000	NA	NA	NA	170,600	347,400	488,000
Texas	64	NA	NA	NA	12	28	24	4,676,506	NA	NA	NA	750,962	2,047,196	1,878,348
Utah	14	NA	NA	NA	4	10	NA	345,376	NA	NA	NA	94,249	251,127	NA
Vermont	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	195,850	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	195,850
Virgin Islands	1	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	150,812	NA	NA	150,812	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	22	NA	NA	NA	NA	22	NA	686,969	NA	NA	NA	NA	686,969	NA
Washington	39	NA	NA	NA	2	6	31	606,191	NA	NA	NA	10,223	100,489	495,479
West Virginia	28	NA	NA	NA	8	20	NA	309,365	NA	NA	NA	24,088	285,277	NA
Wisconsin	13	NA	NA	NA	2	9	2	556,467	NA	NA	NA	106,900	382,747	66,820
Wyoming	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	8	238,343	NA	NA	NA	NA	70,036	168,307
Total	1,183	14	48	32	199	481	409	41,735,215	755,296	2,187,104	2,398,668	6,848,898	14,375,361	15,169,888

NA = not available

Appendix table A4. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to prosecution, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	9	NA	NA	NA	1	1	7	648,257	NA	NA	NA	26,367	64,953	556,937
Alaska	2	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	138,838	NA	NA	30,491	108,347	NA	NA
American Samoa	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	95,517	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95,517
Arizona	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	6		474,175	NA	NA	NA	NA	474,175	NA
Arkansas	8	NA	NA	NA	1	5	2	346,226	NA	NA	NA	24,475	229,824	91,927
California	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29	3,010,921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,010,921
Colorado	24	NA	NA	NA	12	12	NA	988,259	NA	NA	NA	504,624	483,635	NA
Connecticut	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	422,750	NA	NA	NA	NA	422,750	NA
Delaware	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	206,863	NA	NA	NA	NA	206,863	NA
District of Columbia	8	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	779,750	NA	NA	187,750	200,000	199,500	192,500
Florida	46	NA	NA	NA	20	26	NA	1,926,777	NA	NA	NA	840,823	1,085,954	NA
Georgia	6	NA	NA	3	1	1	1	121,480	NA	NA	40,031	14,067	1,388	65,994
Guam	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	292,500	NA	NA	NA	NA	147,150	145,350
Hawaii	4	NA	NA	NA	1	3	NA	218,985	NA	NA	NA	40,425	178,560	NA
Idaho	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	178,061	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	178,061
Illinois	30	NA	14	7	6	2	1	4,447,810	NA	1,210,775	924,009	1,173,488	307,193	832,345
Indiana	82	NA	NA	NA	29	28	25	2,005,806	NA	NA	NA	766,128	649,914	589,764
Iowa	15	NA	NA	NA	2	1	12	407,650	NA	NA	NA	18,456	39,832	349,362
Kansas	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	268,403	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	268,403
Kentucky	58	12	11	9	9	9	8	3,826,316	732,126	674,535	582,829	630,871	650,922	555,033
Louisiana	14	NA	NA	1	1	9	3	500,336	NA	NA	4,950	45,637	393,279	56,470
Maine	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	220,275	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	220,275
Mariana Islands	2	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	100,556	NA	NA	NA	100,556	NA	NA
Maryland	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	9	413,473	NA	NA	NA	NA	311,570	101,903
Massachusetts	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	8	1,296,875	NA	NA	NA	NA	711,255	585,620
Michigan	96	NA	NA	NA	48	48	NA	1,058,445	NA	NA	NA	352,815	705,630	NA
Minnesota	28	NA	NA	NA	4	18	6	458,597	NA	NA	NA	44,967	361,786	51,844
Mississippi	15	NA	NA	1	10	4	NA	665,294	NA	NA	75,486	370,874	218,934	NA
Missouri	10	NA	NA	NA	2	8	NA	587,434	NA	NA	NA	80,225	507,209	NA
Montana	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	232,388	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	232,388
Nebraska	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	15	NA	267,750	NA	NA	NA	NA	267,750	NA
Nevada	8	NA	NA	NA	1	1	6	243,496	NA	NA	NA	32,570	22,998	187,928
New Hampshire	9	NA	NA	NA	4	5	NA	328,923	NA	NA	NA	128,971	199,952	NA
New Jersey	17	NA	NA	NA	7	9	1	1,010,774	NA	NA	NA	291,232	623,609	95,933
New Mexico	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	177,948	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	177,948
New York	29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29	1,398,470	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,398,470
North Carolina	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	935,296	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	935,296
North Dakota	41	NA	NA	NA	NA	20	21	567,799	NA	NA	NA	NA	268,322	299,477
Ohio	39	NA	7	2	4	26	NA	1,335,872	NA	80,435	67,169	47,771	1,140,497	NA

Appendix table A4. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to prosecution, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004 (continued)

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Oklahoma	12	NA	4	1	NA	7	NA	422,315	NA	2,364	15,252	NA	404,699	NA
Oregon	15	NA	NA	NA	1	2	12	405,120	NA	NA	NA	8,931	38,155	358,034
Pennsylvania	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	48	1,072,249	NA	NA	NA	NA	182,282	889,967
Puerto Rico	3	NA	NA	NA	1	2	NA	1,326,199	NA	NA	NA	458,375	867,824	NA
Rhode Island	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	429,097	NA	NA	NA	NA	223,897	205,200
South Carolina	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7	496,414	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	496,414
South Dakota	18	NA	NA	NA	9	9	NA	199,900	NA	NA	NA	62,335	137,565	NA
Tennessee	10	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	8	566,700	NA	NA	NA	50,300	NA	516,400
Texas	78	NA	NA	NA	12	35	31	4,742,415	NA	NA	NA	606,960	2,179,478	1,955,977
Utah	8	NA	NA	NA	6	2	NA	255,067	NA	NA	NA	203,493	51,574	NA
Vermont	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	195,250	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	195,250
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	18	NA	NA	1	NA	17	NA	740,894	NA	NA	35,651	NA	705,243	NA
Washington	40	NA	NA	NA	1	5	34	622,637	NA	NA	NA	308	63,472	558,857
West Virginia	20	NA	NA	NA	1	19	NA	324,900	NA	NA	NA	7,500	317,400	NA
Wisconsin	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	2	561,159	NA	NA	NA	NA	264,299	296,860
Wyoming	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	3	182,638	NA	NA	NA	NA	140,001	42,637
Total	1,063	12	36	28	201	434	352	45,148,299	732,126	1,968,109	1,963,618	7,241,891	16,451,293	16,791,262

NA = not available

Appendix table A5. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to court, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	106,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	106,900	NA
Alaska	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	37,240	NA	NA	NA	37,240	NA	NA
American Samoa	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	21,373	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,373
Arizona	3	NA	NA	NA	1	2	NA	106,153	NA	NA	NA	29,030	77,123	NA
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	504,308	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	504,308
Colorado	7	NA	NA	NA	4	3	NA	200,652	NA	NA	NA	100,171	100,481	NA
Connecticut	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	67,500	NA	NA	NA	67,500	NA	NA
Delaware	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	45,000	NA	NA	NA	45,000	NA	NA
District of Columbia	4	NA	NA	1	1	1	1	155,950	NA	NA	37,550	40,000	39,900	38,500
Florida	4	NA	NA	NA	2	2	NA	350,732	NA	NA	NA	153,463	197,269	NA
Georgia	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	101,208	NA	NA	7,940	26,946	66,322	NA
Guam	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	58,499	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,430	29,069
Hawaii	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	48,592	NA	NA	NA	48,592	NA	NA
Idaho	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	42,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	42,300
Illinois	8	NA	NA	3	3	2	NA	491,102	NA	NA	183,491	170,934	136,677	NA
Indiana	8	NA	NA	NA	2	3	3	349,998	NA	NA	NA	56,448	173,031	120,519
Iowa	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	69,873	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69,873
Kansas	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	57,816	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	57,816
Kentucky	3	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	1	82,431	NA	NA	35,432	NA	NA	46,999
Louisiana	2	NA	NA	1	NA	1	NA	98,040	NA	NA	60,392	NA	37,648	NA
Maine	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	44,055	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44,055
Mariana Islands	2	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	20,111	NA	NA	NA	20,111	NA	NA
Maryland	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	4	99,215	NA	NA	NA	NA	83,936	15,279
Massachusetts	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	250,124	NA	NA	NA	NA	133,000	117,124
Michigan	54	NA	NA	NA	27	27	NA	196,440	NA	NA	NA	65,480	130,960	NA
Minnesota	6	NA	NA	NA	1	3	2	116,939	NA	NA	NA	12,427	87,120	17,392
Mississippi	1	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	62,064	NA	NA	62,064	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	2	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	51,374	NA	NA	48,964	2,410	NA	NA
Montana	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	40,385	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,385
Nebraska	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	NA	53,550	NA	NA	NA	NA	53,550	NA
Nevada	3	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	28,625	NA	NA	NA	3,540	2,085	23,000
New Hampshire	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	85,263	NA	NA	NA	85,263	NA	NA
New Jersey	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	158,310	NA	NA	NA	NA	158,310	NA
New Mexico	4	NA	NA	1	NA	2	1	127,132	NA	NA	15,862	NA	75,870	35,400
New York	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	280,935	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	280,935
North Carolina	2	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	353,397	NA	NA	NA	329,623	23,774	NA
North Dakota	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	109,811	NA	NA	NA	NA	58,521	51,290
Ohio	15	NA	NA	4	5	6	NA	355,402	NA	NA	40,041	86,766	228,595	NA
Oklahoma	5	NA	1	1	3	NA	NA	81,297	NA	591	3,412	77,294	NA	NA
Oregon	8	NA	NA	NA	1	4	3	147,818	NA	NA	NA	21,591	84,058	42,169

Appendix table A5. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to court, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004 (continued)

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)							
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	
Pennsylvania	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	202,493	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	202,493	
Puerto Rico	2	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	182,827	NA	NA	NA	91,675	91,152	NA	
Rhode Island	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	85,821	NA	NA	NA	NA	44,781	41,040	
South Carolina	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	80,730	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	80,730	
South Dakota	2	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	50,378	NA	NA	8,327	42,051	NA	NA	
Tennessee	5	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	3	99,000	NA	NA	NA	23,000	NA	76,000	
Texas	7	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	3	1,272,453	NA	NA	NA	NA	657,312	615,141	
Utah	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	120,620	NA	NA	54,118	58,002	8,500	NA	
Vermont	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	39,050	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	39,050	
Virgin Islands	1	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	30,305	NA	NA	NA	30,305	NA	NA	
Virginia	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	141,049	NA	NA	NA	NA	141,049	NA	
Washington	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	184,079	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,094	104,985	
West Virginia	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	57,056	NA	NA	NA	NA	57,056	NA	
Wisconsin	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	50,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	50,000	NA	
Wyoming	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	23,180	NA	NA	NA	NA	23,180	NA	
Total	221	NA	1	18	67	92	43	8,170,055			591	557,593	1,724,862	3,129,784	2,757,225

NA = not available

Appendix table A6. STOP Program amount allocated to administration, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	120,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	120,000
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	42,746	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	42,746
Arizona	237,621	NA	NA	NA	138,728	98,893	NA
Arkansas	139,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	139,300
California	530,850	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	530,850
Colorado	250,200	NA	NA	NA	104,600	145,600	NA
Connecticut	71,235	NA	NA	NA	71,235	NA	NA
Delaware	43,550	NA	NA	NA	NA	43,550	NA
District of Columbia	156,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,800	77,000
Florida	1,605,915	NA	NA	NA	60,417	1,545,498	NA
Georgia	151,950	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	151,950
Guam	130,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	65,400	64,600
Hawaii	200,350	NA	NA	47,200	51,150	102,000	NA
Idaho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	1,629,100	NA	254,900	206,550	247,050	490,600	430,000
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Iowa	73,550	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	73,550
Kansas	34,529	NA	NA	NA	NA	34,529	NA
Kentucky	387,480	42,608	81,552	52,620	60,390	60,060	90,250
Louisiana	107,200	NA	NA	NA	NA	107,200	NA
Maine	97,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	97,900
Mariana Islands	10,544	NA	NA	NA	10,544	NA	NA
Maryland	286,861	NA	NA	NA	NA	286,861	NA
Massachusetts	289,620	NA	NA	NA	NA	140,100	149,520
Michigan	125,736	NA	NA	NA	38,133	87,603	NA
Minnesota	230,006	NA	NA	9	64,217	134,512	31,268
Mississippi	91,752	NA	NA	619	12,821	78,312	NA
Missouri	97,780	NA	NA	63,000	34,780	NA	NA
Montana	85,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	85,300
Nebraska	229,700	NA	NA	NA	NA	119,000	110,700
Nevada	106,440	NA	NA	NA	NA	106,440	NA
New Hampshire	154,400	NA	NA	NA	51,600	102,800	NA
New Jersey	61,450	NA	NA	NA	NA	61,450	NA
New Mexico	73,724	NA	NA	NA	8,528	65,196	NA
New York	624,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	624,300
North Carolina	138,841	NA	NA	NA	NA	123,314	15,527
North Dakota	83,810	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,800	43,010
Ohio	226,900	NA	NA	NA	NA	226,900	NA
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	117,510	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,950	112,560
Pennsylvania	127,274	NA	NA	NA	NA	127,274	NA
Puerto Rico	188,667	NA	21	NA	96,500	92,146	NA
Rhode Island	158,610	NA	NA	NA	NA	67,410	91,200
South Carolina	179,400	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	179,400
South Dakota	88,596	NA	NA	NA	42,150	6,096	40,350
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	817,179	NA	NA	NA	NA	458,281	358,898
Utah	63,857	NA	NA	63,857	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	78,100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78,100
Virgin Islands	95,550	NA	NA	31,750	31,900	31,900	NA
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	145,000	NA	NA	3,000	101,000	41,000	NA
West Virginia	79,730	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79,730
Wisconsin	218,800	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	218,800
Wyoming	75,600	NA	NA	NA	NA	38,400	37,200
Total	11,361,313	42,608	336,473	468,605	1,225,743	5,213,875	4,074,009

NA = not available

Appendix table A7. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to other, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	14,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	14,000
Arizona	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	708,158	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	708,158
Colorado	6	NA	NA	NA	3	3	NA	158,349	NA	NA	NA	83,432	74,917	NA
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Georgia	2	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	53,730	NA	NA	53,730	NA	NA	NA
Guam	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	175,501	NA	NA	NA	NA	88,290	87,211
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	59,220	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59,220
Illinois	76	NA	33	15	15	13	NA	3,056,701	NA	1,210,774	576,772	646,915	622,240	NA
Indiana	25	NA	NA	NA	11	7	7	200,285	NA	NA	NA	103,136	69,607	27,542
Iowa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kentucky	35	11	10	4	5	3	2	2,471,821	563,395	522,089	319,302	311,055	437,072	318,908
Louisiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mariana Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maryland	21	NA	NA	NA	1	13	7	333,079	NA	NA	NA	26,881	274,447	31,751
Massachusetts	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	4	780,764	NA	NA	NA	NA	429,392	351,372
Michigan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	17	NA	NA	NA	3	3	11	324,110	NA	NA	NA	29,701	183,285	111,124
Mississippi	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	197,039	NA	NA	68,900	71,183	56,956	NA
Missouri	4	NA	NA	2	1	1	NA	165,201	NA	NA	71,932	49,680	43,589	NA
Montana	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	49,227	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49,227
Nebraska	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	160,650	NA	NA	NA	NA	160,650	NA
Nevada	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	7	168,515	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,000	160,515
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	8	NA	NA	NA	2	6	NA	615,841	NA	NA	NA	76,657	539,184	NA
New Mexico	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	36,030	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,000	11,030
New York	10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	379,125	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	379,125
North Carolina	9	NA	NA	NA	2	2	5	1,200,439	NA	NA	NA	67,193	250,724	882,522
North Dakota	33	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	17	235,164	NA	NA	NA	NA	120,324	114,840
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oklahoma	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	220,223	NA	NA	NA	NA	220,223	NA

Appendix table A7. Number of awards and STOP Program amount allocated to other, by state and fiscal year: 1999–2004 (continued)

State	Number of awards							Amount allocated (\$)						
	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Oregon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Puerto Rico	17	NA	NA	NA	1	16	NA	422,432	NA	NA	NA	34,253	388,179	NA
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	3	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	1	186,885	NA	NA	NA	121,385	NA	65,500
South Dakota	3	NA	1	1	1	NA		119,035	NA	31,433	79,600	8,002	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	6	NA	NA	NA	3	3	NA	220,586	NA	NA	NA	129,606	90,980	NA
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virgin Islands	3	NA	NA	1	1	1	NA	37,959	NA	NA	22,677	NA	15,282	NA
Virginia	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	336,655	NA	NA	NA	NA	336,655	NA
Washington	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
West Virginia	5	NA	NA	NA	1	4	NA	64,525	NA	NA	NA	1,800	62,725	NA
Wisconsin	26	NA	NA	2	5	8	11	932,487	NA	NA	37,232	135,440	396,409	363,406
Wyoming	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	4	106,253	NA	NA	NA	NA	117	106,136
Total	390	11	44	28	58	139	110	14,189,989	563,395	1,764,296	1,230,145	1,896,319	4,894,247	3,841,587

NA = not available

Appendix table A8. Percentage distribution of allocation by type of victimization

State	Sexual assault (%)	Domestic violence (%)	Stalking (%)	Total (%)
Alabama	17	83	0	100
Alaska	40	50	10	100
American Samoa	45	45	10	100
Arizona	16	80	4	100
Arkansas	19	76	5	100
California	38	54	8	100
Colorado	25	73	2	100
Connecticut	30	70	0	100
Delaware	25	75	0	100
District of Columbia	16	71	13	100
Florida	14	86	0	100
Georgia	22	77	1	100
Guam	20	80	0	100
Hawaii	22	76	2	100
Idaho	15	80	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	35	60	5	100
Iowa	25	72	3	100
Kansas	17	80	3	100
Kentucky	25	65	10	100
Louisiana	22	72	6	100
Maine	24	76	0	100
Maryland	15	80	5	100
Massachusetts	23	76	1	100
Michigan	25	70	5	100
Minnesota	49	49	2	100
Mississippi	43	54	3	100
Missouri	10	89	1	100
Montana	20	75	5	100
Nebraska	15	84	1	100
Nevada	14	84	2	100
New Hampshire	25	70	5	100
New Jersey	80	20	0	100
New Mexico	38	56	6	100
New York	40	58	2	100
North Carolina	15	80	5	100
North Dakota	10	89	1	100
Northern Mariana Islands	15	80	5	100
Ohio	13	81	6	100
Oklahoma	27	73	0	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100
Pennsylvania	37	60	3	100
Puerto Rico	2	97	1	100
Rhode Island	35	60	5	100
South Carolina	40	55	5	100
South Dakota	24	75	1	100
Tennessee	7	90	3	100
Texas	20	76	4	100
Utah	20	77	3	100
Vermont	10	85	5	100
Virgin Islands	40	55	5	100
Virginia	16	80	4	100
Washington	28	70	2	100
West Virginia	13	80	7	100
Wisconsin	45	54	1	100
Wyoming	15	80	5	100

Appendix B

Appendix table B1.1. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state

State	Victims seeking services							Victims receiving services for			
	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services		Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	34	21	9,767	9,322	262	183	9,584	8,139	1,084	361	
Alaska	7	3	214	143	33	38	176	111	64	1	
American Samoa	8	3	135	135	NA	NA	135	126	9	NA	
Arizona	25	18	4,730	4,359	297	74	4,656	4,334	280	42	
Arkansas	29	19	5,467	5,467	NA	NA	5,467	5,144	279	44	
California	113	71	20,035	18,782	1,207	46	19,989	11,688	8,160	141	
Colorado	70	61	20,178	18,576	346	1,256	18,922	16,577	2,014	331	
Connecticut	4	2	4,935	4,935	NA	NA	4,935	4,736	199	NA	
Delaware	16	13	2,623	2,396	188	39	2,584	1,824	758	2	
District of Columbia	14	11	7,561	6,870	NA	691	6,870	5,513	1,352	5	
Florida	56	33	21,327	20,447	819	61	21,266	18,854	2,019	393	
Georgia	56	36	17,639	14,685	2,126	828	16,811	11,016	5,246	549	
Guam	13	6	620	550	51	19	601	507	88	6	
Hawaii	16	6	1,681	1,602	77	2	1,679	1,007	672	NA	
Illinois	50	28	11,701	10,836	827	38	11,663	9,872	1,770	21	
Indiana	49	31	11,172	9,527	360	1,285	9,887	8,645	951	291	
Iowa	56	33	4,290	4,073	214	3	4,287	3,769	482	36	
Kansas	24	18	11,104	11,034	70	NA	11,104	9,957	645	502	
Kentucky	31	26	13,516	12,269	1,165	82	13,434	12,901	475	58	
Louisiana	87	53	24,165	23,427	490	248	23,917	19,405	3,849	663	
Maine	28	15	3,332	3,027	241	64	3,268	2,991	269	8	
Maryland	64	35	6,283	5,179	724	380	5,903	5,153	737	13	
Massachusetts	64	57	26,011	22,469	3,039	503	25,508	23,336	2,045	127	
Michigan	48	46	28,916	28,422	431	63	28,853	23,307	2,829	2,717	
Minnesota	38	18	924	809	83	32	892	588	276	28	
Missouri	66	38	12,239	10,852	802	585	11,654	9,743	1,077	834	
Mississippi	41	24	7,264	6,625	448	191	7,073	6,438	556	79	
Montana	23	12	2,306	2,306	NA	NA	2,306	1,701	398	207	
Nebraska	15	14	9,404	9,235	152	17	9,387	8,509	834	44	
Nevada	39	26	9,299	8,679	489	131	9,168	7,751	1,132	285	
New Hampshire	22	11	3,535	3,131	333	71	3,464	2,809	527	128	
New Jersey	69	44	14,328	11,979	1,577	772	13,556	11,976	1,553	27	
New Mexico	41	20	2,341	1,823	203	315	2,026	1,775	215	36	
New York	118	95	34,510	29,670	2,873	1,967	32,543	28,687	3,674	182	
North Carolina	52	29	11,290	10,874	309	107	11,183	10,274	879	30	

Appendix table B1.1. Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state (continued)

State	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services for					
	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking	
North Dakota	60	33	1,571	1,524	44	3	1,568	1,274	278	16
Ohio	100	75	46,040	42,567	2,949	524	45,516	37,106	6,747	1,663
Oklahoma	42	18	5,184	4,594	572	18	5,166	4,533	521	112
Oregon	68	60	22,253	20,757	1,012	484	21,769	16,366	4,806	597
Pennsylvania	46	44	36,834	30,058	5,707	1,069	35,765	26,966	8,469	330
Puerto Rico	17	14	9,086	8,907	177	2	9,084	8,740	168	176
Rhode Island	3	3	6,769	6,769	NA	NA	6,769	6,569	178	22
South Carolina	35	26	8,130	7,353	719	58	8,072	7,238	622	212
South Dakota	40	28	1,025	918	11	96	929	857	59	13
Tennessee	48	30	8,716	7,750	836	130	8,586	7,738	798	50
Texas	148	99	59,578	49,867	7,222	2,489	57,089	50,062	6,140	887
Utah	38	30	12,200	9,962	1,554	684	11,516	9,935	1,285	296
Vermont	9	8	2,713	2,706	3	4	2,709	2,269	429	11
Virgin Islands	3	2	326	300	26	NA	326	280	24	22
Virginia	100	66	20,551	18,289	1,466	796	19,755	16,971	2,389	395
Washington	90	63	15,476	13,843	552	1,081	14,395	12,817	1,416	162
West Virginia	31	20	7,344	7,230	84	30	7,314	6,524	606	184
Wisconsin	52	17	6,789	5,941	636	212	6,577	4,134	2,367	76
Wyoming	34	34	9,643	9,593	50	NA	9,643	8,294	805	544
TOTAL	2,450	1646	645,070	583,443	43,856	17,771	627,299	527,836	85,504	13,959

NA = not available

NOTE: Subgrantee data from the state of Idaho was submitted to the Muskie School, rather than to OVW, and was inadvertently destroyed; no backup data was available to recreate the reports. The Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

Appendix table B1.2. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Unknown ^a	Female	Male	Unknown ^a	0–17	18–24	25–29	60+	Unknown ^a
		Asian													
Alabama	2,848	12	21	8	202	4,992	1,531	8,076	612	896	411	2,205	3,534	201	3,233
Alaska	1	74	4	0	2	60	35	168	6	2	9	41	95	3	28
American Samoa	NA	NA	2	131	NA	NA	2	23	NA	112	NA	7	16	NA	112
Arizona	200	302	19	1	1,569	1,965	713	3,776	749	131	212	840	3,076	77	451
Arkansas	1,857	13	37	7	158	3,995	3	4,918	549	NA	121	1,533	3,129	518	166
California	1,996	631	454	47	4,310	5,249	7,437	11,786	798	7,405	1,583	2,113	3,057	108	13,128
Colorado	999	318	169	40	4,717	9,427	3,509	15,386	2,318	1,218	957	3,684	9,249	691	4,341
Connecticut	1,375	NA	24	NA	1,478	1,997	61	3,858	1,070	7	268	1,125	2,888	470	184
Delaware	591	7	19	7	258	1,414	288	2,481	94	9	297	517	1,473	73	224
District of Columbia	3,424	NA	28	NA	1,762	335	1,321	4,492	800	1,578	400	1,429	1,977	59	3,005
Florida	5,105	28	80	81	3,225	6,799	6,089	14,639	2,445	4,182	1,286	3,895	10,068	660	5,357
Georgia	5,073	7	397	1	1,765	5,260	4,446	14,206	2,383	222	1,818	4,030	8,570	184	2,209
Guam	8	NA	32	386	1	15	159	573	23	5	9	73	217	2	300
Hawaii	49	17	261	648	77	292	336	1,649	30	NA	40	281	977	37	344
Illinois	4,565	284	165	25	2,532	7,247	1,993	9,210	1,829	624	1,107	2,722	6,488	414	932
Indiana	1,930	26	36	NA	569	6,315	1,046	8,942	805	140	633	3,310	4,670	134	1,140
Iowa	164	20	13	4	631	3,253	202	3,970	313	4	474	1,205	2,305	75	228
Kansas	1,989	51	131	5	1,102	6,934	898	8,818	1,903	383	772	3,258	5,773	581	720
Kentucky	2,793	18	1,410	3	294	9,309	994	13,168	266	NA	495	3,563	8,825	252	299
Louisiana	8,809	86	81	5	1,113	11,715	2,322	20,008	2,329	1,580	2,084	5,037	13,962	515	2,319
Maine	43	36	8	NA	18	2,021	1,159	3,077	191	NA	124	507	668	36	1,933
Maryland	1,983	8	150	48	819	1,791	1,114	5,202	110	591	172	1,536	3,120	240	835
Massachusetts	1,814	95	484	165	4,381	8,239	10,506	16,706	1,695	7,107	1,295	3,724	9,301	660	10,528
Michigan	11,033	199	179	4	855	12,464	4,185	24,833	3,805	215	3,395	7,309	15,570	868	1,711
Minnesota	120	50	5	154	53	488	63	845	36	11	57	313	498	9	15
Missouri	2,288	41	46	10	288	6,737	2,296	10,019	784	851	390	2,324	6,246	216	2,478
Mississippi	2,762	121	23	9	57	2,967	2,010	5,868	323	882	448	1,742	3,152	114	1,617
Montana	12	290	10	10	56	1,844	90	1,966	306	34	205	855	1,058	65	123
Nebraska	816	114	132	27	937	5,247	2,159	8,461	786	140	630	1,931	4,149	253	2,424
Nevada	1,048	195	207	94	1,690	4,420	2,484	7,720	1,139	309	450	2,104	4,342	280	1,992
New Hampshire	114	3	37	2	174	2,634	530	2,621	636	207	204	1,044	1,830	60	326
New Jersey	2,947	17	430	10	3,473	4,770	1,947	12,696	558	302	503	2,020	7,999	340	2,694
New Mexico	42	237	7	5	953	703	98	1,812	209	5	177	517	1,218	47	67
New York	5,452	182	1,576	25	4,834	11,933	8,813	28,294	3,094	1,155	2,088	5,799	15,972	720	7,964
North Carolina	2,295	74	22	4	1,246	3,605	4,015	8,924	990	1,269	692	3,173	5,547	237	1,534
North Dakota	19	405	3	2	40	1,057	84	1,440	123	5	196	504	820	34	14
Ohio	9,009	31	82	10	991	20,391	15,039	33,690	5,327	6,499	1,778	8,006	17,908	1,401	16,423
Oklahoma	222	685	24	25	379	3,211	932	4,450	371	345	393	1,162	2,935	84	592
Oregon	267	413	119	70	2,872	10,750	7,387	19,654	1,858	257	931	3,234	8,695	768	8,141
Pennsylvania	3,846	50	242	16	3,814	21,483	6,616	32,624	1,925	1,216	2,992	7,881	18,578	973	5,341
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,646	NA	1,438	8,891	NA	193	28	1,452	6,250	173	1,181

Appendix table B1.2. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving services, by state (continued)

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Unknown ^a	Female	Male	Unknown ^a	0–17	18–24	25–29	60+	Unknown ^a
Rhode Island	204	3	27	NA	752	5,423	360	5,042	1,330	397	457	2,780	3,108	253	171
South Carolina	2,725	19	40	7	433	4,407	505	7,097	522	453	156	1,780	5,520	151	465
South Dakota	8	443	NA	NA	14	407	72	764	162	3	153	270	423	36	47
Tennessee	2,504	24	31	2	189	4,916	925	7,560	680	346	631	2,020	5,044	145	746
Texas	11,592	336	411	316	22,755	17,569	4,770	49,675	6,258	1,156	6,578	14,035	31,405	1,399	3,672
Utah	205	389	86	156	2,122	6,992	1,733	8,019	1,082	2,415	340	2,660	4,972	202	3,342
Vermont	34	26	5	10	31	1,457	1,246	2,448	216	45	202	464	1,227	126	690
Virgin Islands	113	NA	46	NA	78	17	72	218	37	71	16	19	188	7	96
Virginia	5,775	17	238	57	1,268	11,325	1,210	17,360	1,950	445	1,133	4,393	12,404	473	1,352
Washington	720	515	511	78	1,992	9,397	1,331	13,020	818	557	15	3,880	8,337	1,135	1,028
West Virginia	318	25	12	4	20	5,608	1,330	6,129	870	315	609	1,467	4,098	225	915
Wisconsin	1,189	229	504	14	366	3,870	405	5,606	812	159	710	1,372	3,679	155	661
Wyoming	426	456	70	73	1,650	6,785	223	7,469	2,130	44	1,964	2,483	4,836	161	199
Total	115,721	7,622	9,150	2,806	93,011	291,501	120,532	520,347	60,455	46,497	43,088	135,628	311,446	17,100	120,037

NA = not available

^a Data supplied by STOP administrators did not identify race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

NOTE: Subgrantee data from the state of Idaho was submitted to the Muskie School, rather than to OVW, and was inadvertently destroyed; no backup data was available to recreate the reports. The Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

Appendix table B1.3. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving services, by state

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	246	96	58	2,504
Alaska	15	17	6	146
American Samoa	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	66	892	697	1,285
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	587	1,323	35	1,433
Colorado	1,429	1,488	565	7,158
Connecticut	201	343	64	12
Delaware	130	219	205	862
District of Columbia	1	189	152	NA
Florida	312	1,744	1,083	3,291
Georgia	427	1,552	2,158	815
Guam	17	16	1	75
Hawaii	22	57	34	482
Illinois	108	254	24	171
Indiana	688	442	83	2,114
Iowa	224	428	233	2,820
Kansas	193	422	98	3,715
Kentucky	404	198	152	3,545
Louisiana	2,118	217	63	9,162
Maine	209	45	17	1,677
Maryland	214	690	387	1,157
Massachusetts	889	3,075	1,661	911
Michigan	1,151	160	32	3,644
Minnesota	34	18	15	227
Missouri	872	205	177	5,297
Mississippi	164	28	6	1,427
Montana	265	NA	2	636
Nebraska	357	524	237	2,822
Nevada	194	554	225	1,249
New Hampshire	47	11	4	307
New Jersey	452	1,170	1,130	651
New Mexico	126	242	186	1,209
New York	1,299	4,323	3,401	6,053
North Carolina	141	1,052	813	3,600
North Dakota	205	8	8	333
Ohio	1,477	567	109	6,138
Oklahoma	94	199	35	3,402
Oregon	1,378	1,552	471	9,653
Pennsylvania	1,965	2,016	1,447	8,928
Puerto Rico	498	NA	NA	75
Rhode Island	1	326	NA	74
South Carolina	367	315	120	3,151
South Dakota	27	4	1	783
Tennessee	316	153	113	3,528
Texas	1,015	8,737	1,886	12,108
Utah	398	1,062	524	2,355
Vermont	345	57	30	1,873
Virgin Islands	13	27	16	84
Virginia	994	873	548	5,471
Washington	1,221	1,131	664	5,094
West Virginia	532	20	7	6,316
Wisconsin	280	595	78	1,059
Wyoming	1,127	247	115	4,283
Total	25,855	39,883	20,176	145,165

NA = not available

NOTE: Subgrantee data from the state of Idaho was submitted to the Muskie School, rather than to OVW, and was inadvertently destroyed; no backup data was available to recreate the reports. The Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.

Appendix table B1.4. Victim's relationship to offender, by state

State	Current/former spouse or	Other family or household	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship	
	intimate partner	member				unknown	Other
Alabama	4,683	579	1,152	207	163	3,177	3
Alaska	87	11	36	18	1	43	NA
American Samoa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	135	NA
Arizona	1,894	351	420	57	141	1,854	NA
Arkansas	4,633	1,298	48	109	40	211	NA
California	2,742	1,277	416	3,513	1,149	11,930	49
Colorado	12,208	1,727	1,682	785	315	3,059	5
Connecticut	2,059	1,656	695	80	8	434	5
Delaware	1,512	212	222	264	99	266	117
District of Columbia	3,722	312	134	115	55	2,531	1
Florida	7,287	1,869	648	1,223	141	10,766	NA
Georgia	6,087	2,782	688	1,823	666	4,865	243
Guam	389	29	134	24	13	123	NA
Hawaii	1,135	238	16	41	20	286	NA
Illinois	4,443	1,753	3,479	229	71	3,017	NA
Indiana	5,873	725	1,707	524	135	1,580	NA
Iowa	3,251	239	199	247	47	399	4
Kansas	7,358	934	1,748	413	135	534	8
Kentucky	10,054	1,658	1,090	221	133	547	1
Louisiana	12,174	1,712	6,148	1,242	1,421	5,800	NA
Maine	3,517	164	27	93	12	55	3
Maryland	2,529	124	886	118	19	940	1,369
Massachusetts	11,194	2,713	3,278	437	133	9,172	86
Michigan	16,640	2,272	5,707	2,226	442	2,504	6
Minnesota	340	129	60	72	80	142	143
Missouri	5,853	1,041	1,104	876	252	3,137	3
Mississippi	3,820	373	1,125	144	48	1,629	35
Montana	1,487	291	93	356	123	121	NA
Nebraska	4,724	736	1,056	876	13	2,588	157
Nevada	3,844	529	516	178	552	3,686	1
New Hampshire	1,773	649	969	209	23	269	34
New Jersey	8,572	1,531	2,342	597	228	1,498	14
New Mexico	1,353	248	261	85	27	89	1
New York	14,811	4,242	5,858	2,782	522	4,987	NA
North Carolina	8,667	2,151	1,858	494	93	273	NA
North Dakota	1,031	239	167	184	35	37	NA
Ohio	19,592	3,593	2,324	2,135	290	18,708	197
Oklahoma	3,952	515	698	224	82	472	1
Oregon	10,236	1,845	2,109	760	150	7,570	336
Pennsylvania	18,665	4,327	3,990	2,087	603	8,356	145
Puerto Rico	6,229	90	279	56	3	2,477	NA
Rhode Island	6,008	288	170	118	19	166	NA
South Carolina	5,946	917	539	284	72	511	1
South Dakota	267	60	48	40	6	563	NA
Tennessee	5,217	595	832	207	123	1,969	NA
Texas	34,233	11,543	7,037	1,883	599	6,321	2
Utah	5,195	2,596	456	625	83	2,845	NA
Vermont	1,639	254	362	148	17	678	59
Virgin Islands	297	NA	12	NA	NA	17	1
Virginia	12,668	1,994	3,197	1,151	280	1,002	77
Washington	10,397	1,423	1,595	538	140	1,547	NA
West Virginia	5,392	1,100	2,317	302	57	766	NA
Wisconsin	3,279	1,295	255	871	159	999	9
Wyoming	5,397	1,612	2,288	795	88	336	NA
Total	336,355	70,841	74,477	33,086	10,126	137,987	3,116

NA = not available

Appendix table B2. Number of awards reported by activities funded per state

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole
Alabama	33	15	8	8	8	11	5	21	10	11	NA	1
Alaska	6	5	1	4	1	1	3	3	1	NA	NA	NA
American Samoa	4	7	5	NA	6	1	6	3	1	1	NA	NA
Arizona	25	12	11	10	5	8	5	18	4	2	NA	1
Arkansas	29	NA	4	NA	NA	11	NA	19	9	3	NA	NA
California	110	35	NA	8	NA	24	NA	71	17	13	1	5
Colorado	68	40	24	13	7	16	17	61	4	8	NA	2
Connecticut	3	2	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	2	NA	1	NA	NA
Delaware	16	7	1	4	3	5	3	13	NA	1	1	2
District of Columbia	13	11	4	8	2	4	1	11	2	2	1	NA
Florida	56	34	19	14	13	30	7	33	15	14	1	NA
Georgia	54	27	18	27	10	17	15	36	6	8	NA	NA
Guam	10	9	1	4	8	1	2	6	1	NA	1	NA
Hawaii	14	5	4	3	2	4	4	6	1	3	NA	NA
Illinois	28	18	4	7	10	15	4	28	8	5	1	3
Indiana	43	27	14	10	7	17	4	31	5	15	NA	NA
Iowa	56	29	15	12	2	24	5	33	12	10	NA	NA
Kansas	23	13	8	2	3	4	5	18	2	5	2	1
Kentucky	31	9	6	7	2	9	7	26	7	3	2	NA
Louisiana	80	32	17	15	19	28	4	53	29	7	1	NA
Maine	28	19	10	9	7	4	2	15	6	1	1	NA
Maryland	58	31	21	23	13	20	13	35	9	6	NA	NA
Massachusetts	64	31	11	17	3	12	9	57	2	2	NA	NA
Michigan	48	30	23	15	16	4	14	46	1	3	NA	1
Minnesota	38	18	16	14	11	4	16	18	3	4	1	NA
Mississippi	40	7	2	5	NA	15	1	24	9	6	NA	NA
Missouri	65	26	12	14	3	20	9	38	14	9	1	NA
Montana	22	6	NA	2	1	4	1	12	2	1	1	1
Nebraska	15	12	8	6	4	5	2	14	3	4	NA	1
Nevada	36	14	10	9	8	11	8	26	2	3	1	1
New Hampshire	21	14	10	10	8	10	3	11	3	6	1	1
New Jersey	59	47	28	21	3	6	13	44	3	3	NA	NA
New Mexico	38	20	17	17	8	10	6	20	4	3	NA	2
New York	116	82	46	51	25	31	20	95	10	22	1	3
North Carolina	48	29	28	21	19	21	14	29	9	9	1	NA
North Dakota	39	13	7	3	9	4	16	33	2	3	NA	NA
Ohio	97	37	21	23	12	34	15	75	18	14	1	NA
Oklahoma	41	14	8	8	3	8	4	18	13	5	2	NA
Oregon	66	22	10	11	2	10	8	60	4	4	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	46	44	23	23	14	36	8	44	31	34	NA	NA
Puerto Rico	16	2	2	2	1	2	1	14	1	1	NA	NA
Rhode Island	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	NA	1	NA	NA
South Carolina	34	14	9	8	4	7	2	26	5	4	1	1
South Dakota	38	8	5	4	3	5	3	28	NA	9	1	NA
Tennessee	48	27	10	19	7	18	2	30	9	6	1	NA
Texas	145	73	35	31	29	63	26	99	20	30	5	NA
Utah	35	23	13	20	5	5	12	30	4	2	1	NA
Vermont	8	4	4	1	NA	6	2	8	5	6	NA	NA
Virgin Islands	2	1	2	1	2	NA	1	2	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix table B2. Number of awards reported by activities funded per state (continued)

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole
Virginia	97	66	32	57	12	36	16	66	15	16	NA	NA
Washington	85	21	5	16	22	7	8	63	8	7	NA	NA
West Virginia	28	17	4	9	6	6	1	20	15	11	NA	NA
Wisconsin	48	30	19	16	11	12	12	17	6	5	NA	NA
Wyoming	33	11	6	4	2	2	4	34	1	NA	1	NA
Total	2,307	1,153	622	647	382	672	370	1,646	371	352	32	26

NA = not available

NOTE: Subgrantee data from the state of Idaho was submitted to the Muskie School, rather than to OVW, and was inadvertently destroyed; no backup data was available to recreate the reports. The Mariana Islands did not submit subgrantee data.