



United States Department of Justice

Office on Violence Against Women

Working Together to End the Violence

S•T•O•P Program

Services • Training • Officers
• Prosecutors

2012 Report
Part A

Contents

Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program.....	3
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds	6
Eligibility Requirements.....	7
Reporting Requirements	8
Reporting Methods	9
STOP Program 2008: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds	11
Sources of Data	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees.....	12
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed	14
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds	15
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects	16
Effectiveness of the STOP Program.....	17
Coordinated Community Response.....	17
Training.....	22
Victim Services	27
Underserved Populations	30
American Indians and Alaska Natives.....	32
Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Older Victims/survivors.....	35
Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees	38
Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas.....	40
The Criminal Justice Response	42
Law Enforcement.....	43
Prosecution.....	50
Courts	56
Probation Supervision	60
Sexual Assault.....	63
Stalking	71
Remaining Areas of Need	74
STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments.....	84
Training.....	85
Coordinated Community Response.....	86
Policies.....	88
Products.....	88
Data Collection and Communication Systems	89
Specialized Units.....	90
System Improvement	91
Victim Services	92

Demographics of Victims/survivors Served	93
Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors	95
Protection Orders	96
Criminal Justice	97
Law Enforcement	97
Prosecution	98
Courts	99
Probation	100
Batterer Intervention Programs.....	102
References	103
Appendix A 2008	111
Appendix B 2008	119

List of Tables

Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2008	11
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2008	14
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2008.....	15
Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2008.....	16
Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2008	22
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2008—selected professional positions	26
Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2008	28
Table 8. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded courts in 2008	60
Table 9. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2008	63
Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2008.....	84
Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2008.....	85
Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2008.....	86
Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2008.....	88
Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2008.....	89
Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2008.....	89
Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2008.....	90
Table 17. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2008.....	91
Table 18. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2008.....	91
Table 19. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2008.....	91

Table 20. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008, by level of service and type of victimization	92
Table 21. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2008, by type of victimization	93
Table 22. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees.....	93
Table 23. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008.....	94
Table 24. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2008	95
Table 25. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008	95
Table 26. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2008	97
Table 28. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related cases by STOP Program funded prosecutors in 2008	99
Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2008.....	100
Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008, by type and number of contacts.....	101
Table 31. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008.....	101
Table 32. Outcomes of participants in batterer intervention programs.....	102
Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2008.....	112
Table A1. Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2008.....	113
Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2008.....	114
Table A3. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific, community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2008.....	116
Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2008	121
Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2008.....	123
Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008	125
Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008	128
Table B5. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2008	130

Acknowledgments

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

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

Bea Hanson
Acting Director
Office on Violence Against Women
U.S. Department of Justice

Introduction

The *STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2012 Report*¹ is submitted to fulfill a statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide a biennial report to Congress on the STOP Program, including how funds were used and an evaluation of the effectiveness of funded programs. Part A of this report is based on data submitted by STOP administrators and STOP subgrantees and reflects STOP awards made and STOP-funded activities during calendar year 2008.

The section titled “Background” (page 3) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program—its goals, the allocation and distribution of STOP Program funds, states’ eligibility, and reporting requirements and methods.² “STOP Program 2008: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during 2008—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities undertaken. “Effectiveness of the STOP Programs” (page 17) describes key activities conducted with STOP Program funds, discusses why they are important, and provides examples of specific STOP-funded programs and initiatives taking part in those activities. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 84) presents the data reported by subgrantees in more detail. Finally, Appendix A and Appendix B present data on the numbers and amounts of awards in the mandated allocation categories (such as victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and courts) and the number and characteristics of victims/survivors served on a state-by-state basis.

More extensive discussion of the prevalence of violence against women and what research and practice have shown to be effective strategies for responding to violence can be found in the *2012 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs under the Violence Against Women Act*.

¹ The STOP Report previous to this one, called the *STOP Program 2010 Report*, was based on 2007 STOP Program data and was submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2010; this 2012 report is based on 2008, 2009, and 2010 data and is submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2012. Part A of this report is based on 2008 data only. Previously, STOP data had been reported on an annual basis. Part A is the last time STOP data will be presented for 1 year only. Part B of this report is based on 2009 and 2010 data, which represents the first time STOP data has been reported biennially. Part B will thus bring this report into conformance with VAWA 2005, which was amended to require biennial rather than annual reporting for the STOP Program.

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

Background

Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program

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

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

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

³ VAWA 2005 added three new purpose areas to the STOP Program, which are included as the last three bullets in this list. In calendar year 2008, STOP subgrantees began reporting for the first time that their activities addressed these new purpose areas. Prior to that, the reporting form did not allow them to do so.

significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving violent crimes against women, including crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence

- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing stalking
- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes in dealing with violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence
- ▶ Supporting formal and informal statewide, multidisciplinary efforts, to the extent not supported by state funds, to coordinate the response of state law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, victim services agencies, and other state agencies and departments to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence
- ▶ Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault
- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and others to address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such violence or assault and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to such older and disabled individuals
- ▶ Providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters
- ▶ Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives, while supporting complementary new initiatives and emergency services for victims and their families
- ▶ Supporting the placement of special victim assistants (to be known as “Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants”) in local law enforcement agencies to serve as liaisons between victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and personnel in local law enforcement agencies in order to improve the enforcement of protection orders

Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants shall have expertise in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and may undertake the following activities:

- ▶ Notifying persons seeking enforcement of protection orders as to what responses will be provided by the relevant law enforcement agency

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

The emphasis of the STOP Program continues to be on the implementation of comprehensive strategies addressing violence against women that are sensitive to the needs and safety of victims⁴ and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States carry out these strategies by forging lasting partnerships between the criminal justice system and victim advocacy organizations and by encouraging communities to look beyond traditional resources to new partners, such as faith-based and community organizations, to respond more vigorously to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes.

For fiscal year 2008, states were encouraged to develop and support projects to:

- ▶ Implement community-driven initiatives, utilizing faith-based and community organizations to address the needs of underserved populations

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

as defined by VAWA, including people with disabilities and elder victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking

- ▶ Address sexual assault and stalking through service expansion, development and implementation of protocols, training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to violence against women
- ▶ Enhance or strengthen statewide collaboration efforts among law enforcement, prosecution, nonprofit/nongovernmental victim service providers, and courts in addressing violence against women

Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

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

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

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

The statute requires each state to distribute STOP Program funds as follows: 25 percent for law enforcement, 25 percent for prosecution; 30 percent for victim services, of which at least 10 percent shall be distributed to culturally-specific,

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

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

community-based organizations; and 5 percent for state and local courts, including juvenile courts. The use of the remaining 15 percent is discretionary, within parameters defined by the statute (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive STOP Program funds, states must meet all application requirements and certify that they are in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA. First, the state's laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence to incur costs related to prosecution; or victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to obtaining protection orders; and, second, the state 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 demonstrate the need for grant funds, how they intend to use the funds, the expected results, and the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)). VAWA 2005 added the requirement that states provide documentation showing that

tribal, territorial, State or local prosecution, law enforcement, and courts have consulted with tribal, territorial, State, or local victim service programs during the course of developing their grant applications in order to ensure that proposed services, activities, and equipment acquisitions are designed to promote the safety, confidentiality, and economic independence of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence (42U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)).

Within 120 days of receiving a STOP Program grant, states are required to submit implementation plans describing their identified goals and how funds will be used to accomplish these goals.⁷ States that have previously submitted a 3-year plan must certify how, or whether, the previous plan has changed. States are required to consult with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. States are strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes.

The implementation plans describe how states will:

- ▶ Give priority to areas of varying geographic size with the greatest evidence of need, based on the current availability of existing domestic violence and

⁷ Beginning in fiscal year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting 3-year implementation plans and annual updates.

sexual assault programs in the population, and geographic area to be served in relation to the availability of such programs in other such populations and geographic areas

- ▶ Determine the amount of subgrants based on the population and geographic area to be served
- ▶ Distribute monies equitably on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of varying geographic size
- ▶ Recognize and address the needs of underserved populations and ensure that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally-specific services and activities for underserved populations are distributed equitably among those populations

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

Reporting Requirements

VAWA 1994 required that the Attorney General provide an annual report to Congress on the STOP Program no later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year for which grants are made. Amendments made by VAWA 2005 required that future reports be submitted no later than 1 month after the end of each even-numbered fiscal year (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-3(b)). The statute requires that the report include the following information for each state receiving funds:

- ▶ the number of grants made and funds distributed
- ▶ a summary of the purposes for which those grants were provided and an evaluation of their progress
- ▶ 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
- ▶ an evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded with STOP Program monies (42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3(b))

In VAWA 2000, Congress broadened existing reporting provisions to require the Attorney General to submit a biennial report to Congress on the effectiveness of activities of VAWA-funded grant programs (Public Law No. 106-386, section 1003 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p)). In response to this statutory mandate, and as part of a broader effort to improve measurements of program performance, OVW worked

with the Violence Against Women Act's Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School) to develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness and new progress report forms for all VAWA grant programs administered by OVW, including the STOP Program.

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

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

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

Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the STOP Program administrator and subgrantee report forms in early 2005, and worked with Muskie School staff on revisions to the forms to reflect VAWA 2005 changes. Throughout this period, the Muskie School has provided ongoing, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms.⁸ Administrators submit annual STOP Administrators reports

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

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

STOP Program 2008: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,261 subgrantees from all 50 states, all 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by the 56 STOP administrators, about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar year 2008. Under a cooperative agreement with OVW, the Muskie School has analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators' Report.⁹

How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program requires that each state distribute its funds according to a specific formula: at least 25 percent each for law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent for victim services, of which at least 10 percent shall be distributed to culturally-specific, community-based organizations; and 5 percent for state and local courts (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).¹⁰ Table 1 shows the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories.

Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2008

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	241	6,530,435	5
Law enforcement	960	28,572,253	24
Prosecution	837	28,273,921	23
Victim services	1,402	43,171,742	36

⁹ These two report forms replaced the Subgrant Award Performance Report forms (SAPRs) originally designed by the Urban Institute in cooperation with the National Institute of Justice. State administrators and subgrantees reported on their activities on the SAPRs from 1998 through 2003. The data derived from the SAPRs formed the basis of the 2000, 2002, and 2004 STOP Program Reports. This 2012 STOP Program Report is the fifth report to contain data generated from the Annual STOP Administrators' Report and the STOP subgrantee Annual Progress Report. The two forms can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulaform.htm>.

¹⁰ STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim witness specialists in those agencies.

Table 1. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2008

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Administration	NA	6,164,901	5
Discretionary ¹¹	239	8,184,560	7
Total	3,679	120,897,812	100

NA = not applicable

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

VAWA 2005 requires states to apply at least 10 percent of the mandated 30 percent they must award to victim services to culturally-specific, community-based organizations in an effort to ensure

recognition and meaningful response to the needs of underserved populations and ensure that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally-specific services and activities for underserved populations are distributed equitably among those populations (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).

In 2008, 53 states made 243 awards totaling \$11,142,813 to culturally-specific community-based organizations; this accounted for 25.8 percent of all funds awarded for victim services.¹²

How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

The majority (95 percent) of the subgrantee agencies and organizations used STOP Program monies to fund staff positions, most often professional positions providing direct services to victims/survivors. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims/survivors represent

¹¹ Examples of awards reported in this category include fatality review, forensic examination training, training to victim services and criminal justice personnel in assisting victims/survivors from underserved populations, support for new projects by tribal organizations, coordinated community response (CCR), and batterer intervention programs (BIPs).

¹² Detailed information regarding amounts of awards/percentages to culturally-specific, community-based organizations on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A Table A3.

54 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.¹³ By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 9 percent of FTEs, and prosecutors represent 10 percent.

Another way of looking at the distribution of STOP Program funds is to consider the percentage of subgrantees reporting that funds were used for specific categories of activities.¹⁴ Sixty-nine percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims/survivors, 46 percent to provide training, 21 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 13 percent for law enforcement activities, 13 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

In 2008, STOP Program funds were used to carry out the program's fundamental activities of offering victim services, providing training, and supporting law enforcement and prosecutors.

Services: A total of more than 461,700 victims/survivors received services supported by STOP Program funds (of more than 470,500 victims/survivors who sought services). The majority were white (56 percent), female (91 percent), and between the age of 25 and 59 (66 percent). Subgrantees also reported that 21 percent of the victims/survivors they served were black or African-American and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.¹⁵ Twenty-six percent of the victims/survivors served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims/survivors used victim advocacy (214,400), crisis intervention (203,700), and criminal justice advocacy (149,100) in greater numbers than any other services.¹⁶ In addition, more than 278,300 hotline calls were received from primary victims/survivors.

Training: From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about violence against women. The fact that well over one-quarter of all people trained with STOP Program funds (more than 77,000 individuals) were law enforcement officers reflects the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Health and mental health professionals comprised the next largest category, with more

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

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

¹⁵ These percentages are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom race/ethnicity was known. This may represent an undercounting of the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for nearly 10 percent of victims/survivors was reported as unknown for this reporting period. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect race/ethnicity information, as it could prevent victims/survivors from seeking further help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims/survivors presents a barrier to service, could violate confidentiality, or jeopardize a victim's safety, service providers are advised not to collect it.

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

than 24,000 trained. A total of more than 263,600 people were trained with STOP Program funds in 2008.

Officers: Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 83,000 calls for assistance, to investigate more than 85,000 incidents of violence, and to serve nearly 15,000 protection orders. STOP-funded officers arrested nearly 29,000 predominant aggressors and made fewer than 1,000 dual arrests.

Prosecutors: STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of approximately 113,700 cases, 76,000 (67 percent) of which resulted in convictions.

Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

Subgrantees reported using STOP Program funds for 14 statutory purposes. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area during calendar year 2008. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services projects.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2008

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Victim services projects	1,586	70
Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	801	35
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	547	24
Specialized units (law enforcement, judges, court personnel, prosecutors)	533	24
Support of statewide, coordinated community responses	370	16
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	309	14
Stalking initiatives	291	13
Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives ¹⁷	275	12
Development of data collection and communication systems	234	10
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	222	10

¹⁷ Three additional purposes (see pages 3–5 for a complete listing of the statutory purpose areas) authorized under VAWA 2005 were included on the revised STOP subgrantee reporting form and were reported on for the first time in calendar year 2008.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2008

Purpose area	Subgrantees (N =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	146	6
Addressing the needs and circumstances of American Indian tribes	73	3
Supporting the placement of special victim assistants ¹⁷	35	2
Training, victim services, and protocols addressing domestic violence committed by law enforcement ¹⁷	21	1

NOTE: Each subgrantee was able to select all purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar year 2008. Thus, the total number of purpose areas is greater than the total number of subgrantees.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Of all the types of agencies or organizations that received STOP Program funds, domestic violence programs were the most frequently reported recipients. Dual programs (e.g., programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault) were the next most frequently reported STOP Program funding recipients, followed by law enforcement and prosecution agencies. Table 3 presents a complete list of the types of organizations receiving funding, as reported by subgrantees.

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2008

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence program	512	22.6
Dual program	444	19.6
Law enforcement	358	15.8
Prosecution	339	15.0
Sexual assault program	180	8.0
Advocacy organization	51	2.3
Unit of local government	42	1.9
Government agency	40	1.8

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2008

Type of agency	Subgrantees (N =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Sexual assault state coalition	40	1.8
Court	38	1.7
Domestic violence state coalition	31	1.4
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	27	1.2
Dual state coalition	21	.9
University/school	15	.7
Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program	9	.4
Tribal government	5	.2
Tribal coalition	1	<.1
Other	108	4.7

NOTE: Of the organizations listed above, 40 reported that they were faith-based and 169 reported that they were culturally-specific, community-based organizations.

Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

In 2008, the percentage of projects focused solely on domestic violence/dating violence was 33 percent, and the percentage addressing domestic violence/dating violence and/or sexual assault or stalking was 54.6 percent (Table 4). The combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking was 12 percent.

Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2008

Type of victimization	Subgrantees (N =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence/dating violence only	754	33.3
Sexual assault only	252	11.1
Stalking only	7	.3
Domestic violence/dating violence and sexual assault	322	14.2
Domestic violence/dating violence and stalking	84	3.7
Sexual assault and stalking	14	.6

Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2008

Type of victimization	Subgrantees (<i>N</i> =2,261)	
	Number	Percent
Domestic violence/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking	828	36.6

Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes the activities carried out with STOP Program funds, with a focus on the specific areas listed in the statute. It discusses why the activities are important and how they contribute to the goals of VAWA by improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Program-wide accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, as are specific STOP-funded projects that demonstrate effective practices. (For a more detailed presentation of data reflecting the aggregate activities of all STOP Program-funded projects, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments,” page 84.)

Coordinated Community Response

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

A Georgia study examined the impact of a CCR on the criminal justice system response in two counties, particularly the effect of the CCR intervention on legal sanctions imposed on batterers. The CCR activities included participation on a

community task force on family violence, training task force members to implement the CCR, implementation of a BIP, extensive training of law enforcement agencies in each county, and a public awareness campaign. Researchers found statistically significant changes in systemic responses post-CCR, such as increases in the number of arrests in both counties and a higher prosecution rate in one county. Researchers determined that more men were sentenced to probation and BIPs, and fewer received a fine in the county that had increased its rate of prosecuting domestic violence offenders. The total amount of fines did increase, but there were no differences in the numbers of convicted offenders who received jail time or in the amount of jail time (Salazar, Emshoff, Baker, & Crowley, 2007).

A reexamination of data from 10 CCR projects funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified several factors at individual CCR sites that were associated with higher rates of victim/survivor contact with intimate partner violence (IPV)¹⁸ services. These factors included developing goals and selecting priorities based on community needs, coordinating services, and disseminating information on the prevalence of IPV in the community (Klevens, Baker, Shelley, & Ingram, 2008).

Traditionally, CCR has referred to the criminal justice system and organizations serving victims/survivors, but the concept of “community” may be expanded to include employers, churches, community groups, families, social groups, and neighbors.

The following subgrantees’ CCR efforts exemplify this broadening of the network of agencies and community partners responding to violence against women:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The coordinated community response team continues to expand its membership. Human resource staff from a local business now attend the CCR meetings and have become aware of the dynamics of domestic violence and its effect on employees in the workplace. As a result of this awareness, the business is revising its personnel practices to accommodate victims of violence.

—Grant County Prosecutor's Office, Washington State

¹⁸ “Intimate partner violence” and “domestic violence” are used interchangeably in this report to mean violence that is committed by intimate partners.

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The first call responders component of this grant has resulted in identifying local agencies, businesses, and organizations that may be the first people that victims have contact with. Through regular contacts, information, and training, the First Call Responders have increased the safety net for victims. The annual Faith-Based Breakfast is a good example of this component. It has grown every year and referrals and requests for additional presentations have also increased. The breakfast increased the help available for victims through networking. In order to provide comprehensive services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, the program works to enlist the cooperation of many agencies in the community. . . . YWCA Sexual Assault Safe House has a good working relationship with Castle Rock Medical Center in Green River, the District Court, the Western Wyoming Community College extension in Green River, employment services, the local clergy, and many businesses and organizations.

—*Sweetwater County YWCA Support and Safe House, Wyoming*

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

Two STOP administrators describe the impact of STOP funding on coordination and collaboration in responses to violence against women in their states:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Beyond providing necessary salary contributions to continue crucial services for victims/survivors, the STOP Program funding has been instrumental in creating and maintaining a strong collaborative relationship between STOP team agencies. As a result of the mandated coordinating team meetings, a majority of projects report more consistent responses to victims and enhanced cross-system problem solving. For example, when one county first received funding, they were having trouble trying to coordinate responses among the various law enforcement agencies in their jurisdiction. The coordinating team developed county-wide policies, which promoted more reliable and consistent responses for violence-against-women cases. As a by-product of the policy development, the team members began to grasp an understanding for the other components' positions, which evolved into a spirit of cooperativeness that was not present before.

—*STOP administrator, Pennsylvania*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Coordinated community response has advanced system change work in Wisconsin. Communities working in conjunction with consultants develop and carry out strategic planning, develop work plans, and create change within the consensus . . . process. The model has been extremely successful in building new teams and revitalizing teams that have become stagnant. SART [Sexual Assault Response Team] work is progressing in a similar manner.

— *STOP administrator, Wisconsin*

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

Though it does not describe itself as a SART, this subgrantee has used STOP Program funds to build an exceptionally effective coordinated response to sexual assault in its community:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

We are thrilled to be supported by these funds and have seen the results when cases go to court and convictions are strong because the evidence, investigation, and victim are supported by this multidisciplinary approach. We are proud to have an upwards of 90 percent conviction rate on sexual assault cases in Erie County. We know that the [cause] of this is the collaborative efforts of the Rape Crisis Center, law enforcement, the medical community, and the district attorney's office. We support each other's role in the process of helping victims of rape and sexual assault, and as [a] result we see victims become survivors, we see perpetrators held accountable, and our community safety improves [with] convictions [of] these offenders. We still have work to do, as do all communities, but feel we have seen extensive improvement in the few years we have been funded by the STOP funds.

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

The collaborative nature and wide-ranging impact of STOP Program-funded SARTs and DARTs are represented in the following example:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The Florida Council Against Sexual Violence (FCASV) has developed a sexual assault response team/sexual assault interagency council (SART/SAIC) training project that assists communities in developing a coordinated community response to sexual assault crime in Florida. This STOP-funded project seeks a multi-disciplinary approach to combating sexual assault crimes against teenage girls and women. Victim advocates, SANE nurses, law enforcement, and prosecution agencies work in collaboration to provide optimal services to sexual assault victims, and to hold offenders accountable for crimes against women.

Through a strong collaborative partnership with law enforcement, FCASV has been instrumental in establishing sexual assault response teams throughout Florida, with a particular focus on rural populations. The STOP-funded projects [give] rural communities the opportunity to develop a coordinated community response to sexual assault crimes in rural areas, where response time is normally slower due to demographics and personnel required to cover larger distances for victim response.

—STOP administrator, Florida

All STOP subgrantees are required to report on the frequency of their contact with community partners, on a case- and victim-level as well as on a systems-level. Significant numbers of subgrantees reported daily contact regarding victims/survivors and/or cases with the following organizations: law enforcement agencies (915, or 41 percent of all subgrantees reporting contact), domestic violence organizations (877, or 39 percent), courts (737, or 33 percent), and prosecutors (572, or 25 percent).¹⁹ These interactions may have involved referrals (e.g., law enforcement referring a victim/survivor to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the court for a protection order) or consultations between victim services and law enforcement (e.g., sharing information on behalf of a victim/survivor about an offender's actions or whereabouts). Significant numbers of subgrantees also reported having daily or weekly interactions with social services, health and mental health, legal services, and sexual assault organizations.

In addition to collaborating with other organizations in their responses to specific victims/survivors and specific crimes, subgrantees also work with community partners on task forces and workgroups and in other meetings on local, regional, and state levels. These groups often develop protocols that set out how participant organizations or agencies will respond in a coordinated fashion to ensure victim safety and offender accountability and remove barriers in the justice, victim

¹⁹ More complete data on CCR activities can be found in Table 12.

services, and other systems. Ideally, participants are decisionmakers, able to direct the implementation of protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration among their agencies. The data in Table 5 reflect the number of specific community agencies and organizations with which STOP Program subgrantees met on a weekly or monthly basis to address systems-level issues in 2008.

Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2008

Agency/organization	Number of subgrantees
Domestic violence organization	1,114
Law enforcement	1,069
Prosecutor's office	908
Social service organization	800
Sexual assault organization	749
Health/mental health organization	737

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

Training

As communities have developed coordinated response initiatives, the need for quality training and cross-training has become evident. The STOP Program, like every other OVW grant program, supports training professionals to improve their response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The statutory purpose areas for the STOP Program specifically set out training for criminal justice personnel (law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and other court personnel), including those in specialized units, and sexual assault forensic examiners. Funds for training may be distributed to organizations on the state or local level.

In the following example, a STOP administrator describes how funds were used to provide training to criminal justice and victim services professionals in Iowa:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

One unique and successful aspect of the structure of STOP-funded programs in Iowa is the funding of several statewide programs that provide technical assistance and training to subgrantees at the local level across the state. Four examples of statewide STOP-funded programs are the Court Improvement Project in the Iowa court administrator's office, the STOP Program in the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy, violence prevention coordinator in the Iowa Department of Public Health, and the STOP Program-funded prosecutor in the Iowa attorney general's office. The Court Improvement Project has the capacity to provide training to judges throughout the state and provide technical assistance. The Iowa Law Enforcement Academy STOP Program provides training to new law enforcement recruits at the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA), as well as training and technical assistance to local law enforcement agencies throughout the state. The Violence Prevention Coordinator in the Department of Public Health manages the Domestic Violence Death Review and provides technical assistance and training to medical personnel. The STOP Program-funded prosecutor at the Iowa attorney general's office prosecutes violence against women cases at the state level, as well as providing training and technical assistance to local prosecution agencies. . . . All law enforcement, prosecution, and victim service agencies across our state benefit from having these positions available to provide training and technical assistance. This allows the STOP funds utilized in our state to reach all agencies instead of only a few. . . .

—STOP administrator, Iowa

After victim services, training is the most frequent activity conducted by STOP Program subgrantees: 1,031 subgrantees (46 percent) used their STOP Program funds to provide training. A total of 263,644 professionals were trained through the STOP Program in 2008. Significantly, more than a quarter (29 percent) of those trained with STOP Program funds were law enforcement officers. As first responders, law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping victims/survivors safe and ensuring offender accountability. Ongoing training for law enforcement is essential due to high rates of attrition, emerging knowledge about violence against women, and as best practices develop and change over time.

Another example of the necessity for training arose from mandatory arrest policies in some jurisdictions that resulted in dual arrests—i.e., the arrests of both victims and batterers—and an increase in the number of women arrested. A New York City-based study looked at these and other unintended consequences of its mandatory arrest statute and found that “further training and better supervision is required for responding officers to better implement the requirement of the [mandatory arrest] law” (Frye, Haviland, & Rajah, 2007). To avoid inappropriate arrests of victims/survivors who have inflicted wounds on their violent partners in an attempt to protect themselves, a former police officer, now a leading trainer on law

enforcement response to domestic violence, recommends that police officers receive training on identifying defensive wounds, such as bite wounds to the chest or arms. According to O'Dell, such training may result in a decrease in the number of victims/survivors who are illegally arrested (O'Dell, 2008).

STOP Program funds also supported training for health and mental health professionals. Research has documented the critical importance of training of healthcare providers on domestic violence (Thompson et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 1998). These professionals become involved in the lives of victims/survivors at critical times; therefore, it is important that they understand domestic violence and sexual assault and provide appropriate treatment, support, and referral to other services. Training also alerts health care professionals about certain actions that can be harmful to victims/survivors (for example, engaging in marriage counseling with a controlling batterer and a victim, blaming the victim/survivor for her injuries, or recommending that the victim/survivor leave the batterer without understanding the dangers that may present). These professionals may not be aware of or recognize the tactics of intimidation and manipulation employed by batterers or the increased danger victims/survivors face when attempting to leave or when newly separated from abusive partners (Fleury, Sullivan, & Bybee, 2000). Medical personnel who have not received specialized training may also inadvertently retraumatize rape and domestic violence victims.

Training health care providers in screening for and identifying domestic violence among their patients is a critical step in improving safety for victims/survivors. One study found that only 6 percent of physicians ask their patients about possible domestic violence, even though 88 percent of them knew that they had female patients who had experienced abuse (Elliott, Nerney, Jones, & Friedmann, 2002). Another study measuring the attitudes and values of 752 health providers before and after a 3-hour domestic violence training program found that after the training, providers reported feeling they were better able to identify and assist victims/survivors, they were more comfortable making referrals, and they saw a greater role for themselves and the health care system in stopping domestic violence (Hamberger et al., 2004). STOP Program subgrantees trained 24,172 health and mental health professionals; this was the second highest specific category of professionals trained in 2008.²⁰

²⁰ This number combines the two reported categories of "health professionals" and "mental health professionals" from the subgrantee reporting form.

The following subgrantees used STOP Program funds to train SANEs, emergency medical staff, and other system-based and community-based partners to improve the response to sexual assault:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding allows our SART to function as a team. Individual, separate services could be provided to victims of sexual assault. It is, however, the funding of the team coordinator position which supports cohesive and coordinated victim services. Without this funding, disjointed and ineffective services would be provided to victims of sexual assault. Trainings and current practice updates would not be as accessible to the victim services providers without the coordinator providing this information to team members. A sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) is the coordinator for the SART. As a SANE, the coordinator provides current standards of practice and trainings to the other team SANEs and medical staff in the hospital emergency trauma centers. Forty-hour SANE training programs are also provided by the coordinator to nurses desiring to become SANEs. Trained R.N.s and SART members provide an improved quality of care to victims of sexual assault. Without STOP Program funding, these services would not be provided.

—University of Iowa College of Nursing: Johnson County Sexual Assault

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed us to train and equip a cadre of forensic sexual assault nurse examiners, or SANEs, many of whom have gone on to be certified through the grant by the International Association of Forensic Nurses. After three years, these nurses have become a staple in investigation and prosecution in west Tennessee. Identifying and corroborating evidence documented and collected has skyrocketed. Many have now testified in court proceedings with great results. Victims who have been examined by our SANE nurses are overwhelmingly pleased with the professional manner in which they have been treated. It has allowed us to train law enforcement and courts to work with the SANE and the evidence they collect/document. It has allowed us to train law enforcement in Jackson and throughout rural west Tennessee to better collect and preserve potential identifying and corroborating evidence in sexual assault investigations. It has allowed us to co-train and cross-train with victim advocates and victim service providers to insure we each understand the other's role. It has allowed us to build on the existing relationships that we have with victim services to form comprehensive sexual assault response teams with other grant-supported victim advocacy and victim legal services in our community. We utilize this grant for training resources for our collaborative partners and nurses, law enforcement, and advocacy from all over west Tennessee and often from north Mississippi and middle Tennessee as well.

—Jackson Police Department, Tennessee

A study involving 134 victims/survivors who participated in 21 separate focus groups found that because older victims/survivors of domestic violence often are socialized to have generational and religious beliefs regarding marriage and its dissolution, they are most inclined to discuss domestic abuse with clergy, if they choose to discuss it at all (Beaulaurier, Seff, Newman, & Dunlop, 2007). Thus, clergy members are in a critical position to respond to the needs of domestic violence victims/survivors and refer them to appropriate support and services. While participants reported that religious faith played an important role in their decisions to stay in or leave abusive relationships, none said they were referred by their clergy for social services related to the abuse or violence. This study illustrates the importance of training clergy, pastoral counselors, and other faith-based organization staff on the dynamics of domestic violence and on services and resources available to older victims/survivors. More than 7,000 faith-based organization staff received STOP Program-funded training during 2008.

Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2008—selected professional positions²¹

Position	People trained (N =263,644)	
	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	77,529	29.4
Victim advocates (governmental and nongovernmental)	26,858	10.2
Health/mental health professionals	24,172	9.2
Social service organization staff	13,154	5.0
Court personnel	9,626	3.7
Educators	8,107	3.1
Faith-based organization staff	7,341	2.8
Advocacy organization staff	6,582	2.5
Corrections personnel	5,890	2.2
Attorneys/law students/legal services	5,673	2.2
Sexual assault forensic examiner	5,034	1.9

NOTE: A number of categories above combine professional categories from the STOP Program subgrantee reporting form: health/mental health professionals combines the two reported categories of health and mental health professionals; victim advocates combines governmental and nongovernmental victim advocates and victim assistants; nongovernmental advocacy staff combines staff from advocacy, disability, elder, and immigrant organizations; and attorneys/law students/ legal services staff combines the categories attorneys/law students and legal services staff. For a complete listing of all individual categories of people trained as they appear on the reporting form, see Table 11.

²¹ The non-specific category “multidisciplinary” technically had the second-highest number of people reported as trained and is not included in Table 6; this category is chosen when subgrantees do not know the specific professions of people who received training.

Victim Services

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

Early studies of shelters for battered women found that the majority of victims returned to their abusers after leaving the shelters. Victims who had resources such as housing, childcare, transportation, and employment were less likely to reconcile with batterers (Gondolf, Fisher, & McFerron, 1990). Subsequent studies of shelter residents indicated that if they were connected to supportive services and assistance, most did not return to their abusers and experienced less revictimization (Andrew Klein, 2005).

It is essential that advocacy and other human services programs recognize the need for a comprehensive response to the needs of victims/survivors. Research indicates that women who work with advocates are more effective at accessing community resources. Many victims require a variety of services that must be accessed through several community agencies. Victims/survivors who receive comprehensive advocacy and services are better able to achieve safety, autonomy, healing, and economic security than women who do not receive such support and services (Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004).

Services provided to a victim whose case is being prosecuted may influence that victim's participation in the criminal process. A study in a specialized municipal court that examined 384 domestic violence cases found that a victim's cooperation after arrest, when combined with the services of a court advocate, strongly predicted the victim's cooperation at the point of case disposition (Camacho & Alarid, 2008).

²² See footnotes 3 and 17. The last two areas of victim services activities are included in the new purpose areas authorized for the STOP Formula Program by VAWA 2005.

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 461,734 victims/survivors in 2008. Of those, 85.3 percent were victims of domestic violence or dating violence, 12.2 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.5 percent were victims of stalking.²³ These victims/survivors received a wide range of services, including victim/survivor advocacy (assistance with obtaining services or resources, including material goods and services, health care, education, finances, transportation, childcare, employment, and housing), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification regarding perpetrator release from custody and information on all phases of the criminal case. Subgrantees also routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and other information to victims/survivors as needed.

Table 7. Individuals receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2008

Type of service	Individuals served
Victim advocacy ²⁴	214,359
Crisis intervention	203,701
Criminal justice advocacy	149,115
Civil legal advocacy ²⁵	115,540
Counseling/support group	108,827
Civil legal assistance ²⁶	24,875

NOTES: Each victim/survivor is reported only once in each category of service, regardless of the number of times that service was provided to the victim/survivor during the reporting period. Only the most frequently reported categories are presented; for a complete listing of categories of services provided to victims/survivors, see Table 25.

Victim advocates and others providing STOP Program-funded services to victims/survivors may be located in a nongovernmental community-based agency,

²³ The overall number of victims/survivors served represents an unduplicated count; this means that each victim/survivor is counted only once by each subgrantee, regardless of the number of times that victim/survivor received services during calendar year 2008. Because victims/survivors can only be counted once, they must be reported under only one primary victimization. It is not uncommon for victims/survivors to experience more than one type of victimization (e.g., domestic violence and stalking, or domestic violence and sexual assault), but that fact is not reflected in the reported percentages of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, and stalking victims/survivors served.

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

²⁵“Civil legal advocacy” is providing assistance to victims/survivors with civil legal issues and is generally provided by a victim advocate or legal advocate.

²⁶“Civil legal assistance” is the provision of civil legal services by an attorney and/or paralegal.

law enforcement agency, prosecutor's office, court, or medical or treatment facility, as illustrated in the following subgrantee examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The court advocate funded by STOP funds provides a critical service to victims in the community. She attends all protective order hearings and provides safety planning, advocacy, information, referrals, and support. Outcome measures are used to determine the effectiveness of the services. [A total of] 373 victims were provided assistance in filing for protective orders. Of those, 66 percent said they felt getting a protective order would make them safer; 93 percent felt the advocate provided valuable assistance and made the process easier; 51 percent said they felt getting a protective order was a step towards leaving the abusive relationship.

—*YWCA Enid, Oklahoma*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funds have supported an effective collaborative within the community. Having the wide range of providers working together in the city's Domestic Violence and Stalking Unit [DVU] has essentially created a one-stop location for individuals victimized by an intimate partner. Victims of intimate partner violence do not have to travel to another agency for a shelter—they can have this need met while in the DVU office. Child Protective Services is also ready and available to intervene and assist when the violence extends to children in the family. Law enforcement has developed a greater appreciation and sensitivity to victim services while advocates are less hostile toward law enforcement.

—*Choices, Ohio*

STOP Program subgrantees were able to use funds to expand and enhance services to victims/survivors of sexual assault and human trafficking, as described in the following examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

As a result of STOP Program funding, Sexual Assault Support Services (SASS) was able to provide support and crisis intervention services to an increased number of sexual assault victims seeking assistance. In addition, funding provided the ability to enhance our paid and volunteer pool of individuals staffing our 24-hour hotline and accompanying victims of sexual violence throughout the medical and criminal justice systems.

—*Sexual Assault Support Services, New Hampshire*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

We are funded to provide comprehensive social services to survivors of human trafficking. These services have identified victims, enabled them to report the violence they experienced to law enforcement, facilitated multilevel safety planning, and helped victims holistically repair their lives and heal from the horrendous crimes they have suffered. Many victims received essential services while remaining available to law enforcement to assist in the prosecution of their traffickers. These funds have been essential and truly lifesaving for the victims we have worked with.

—*Urban Justice Center, New York*

Some agencies that provide victim services focus on culturally appropriate, community-based and shelter-based services for victims/survivors of specific ethnicities, as in the following example:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to this grant, despite our efforts (including four fluent or proficient Spanish-speaking legal staff to comprehensively serve Hispanic clients and service-seekers, we had an average waiting list of four- to six-weeks long, and over the summer months, alone, had to turn away 25 Hispanic service-seekers because we did not have the capacity to meet their needs. With STOP funding, Tahirih was able to hire a staff attorney solely dedicated to representing Hispanic clients and conducting training and outreach to professionals working with Hispanic victims to ensure that they are aware of the remedies available to battered immigrant women. During 2008, the STOP attorney represented 36 Hispanic women, allowing Tahirih to serve more Hispanic victims than ever before. In addition, Tahirih was able to increase its overall caseload from 260 total cases litigated in 2007, to 303 cases in 2008—an increase of more than 16 percent. As our current caseload indicates, we continue to experience a high demand for services in the Hispanic community, and STOP's continued support is vital to our continuation of services.

—*The Tahirih Justice Center, Virginia*

Underserved Populations

Violence against women affects all populations in all areas of the United States, but some groups are more vulnerable and experience higher rates of violence than others (Field & Caetano, 2004). These population groups include American Indians/Alaska Natives, women living in rural areas, older adults, women who are disabled, children and youth, people who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; people of color and other racial minorities, immigrants, and refugees. Victims/survivors from these populations often face distinct challenges and barriers to receiving assistance and support. Further, how these victims perceive and manage their experiences with violence often reflect cultural and social norms,

opportunities, and restrictions (D. W. Campbell, Sharps, Gary, Campbell, & Lopez, 2002).

VAWA and OVW require states to specify in their implementation planning process how they will use STOP funds to address the needs of underserved victims/survivors. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program include specific references to the delivery of services to underserved populations,²⁷ addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors, and assisting victims/survivors in immigration matters.

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

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Except for one grantee, STOP victim services funding was awarded to rural programs. Several of these are community of color programs serving their community (Native American and migrant Hispanic), while the other programs serve a broad range of rural domestic violence and sexual assault victims, including diverse communities of color. Rural Minnesota has become increasingly more diverse in the past seven years, with pockets of Somali, Hmong, Hispanic, African American, and Southeast Asian populations spread throughout rural areas. The one urban grantee (based in St. Paul) works with women escaping prostitution. This program is staffed primarily from the African-American community and serves women from various communities of color, locally and from around the world, including sexually trafficked victims from Africa and Asia.

— *STOP administrator, Minnesota*

Of all subgrantees providing services in 2008, 99 percent provided services to victims/survivors in at least one of the underserved categories.²⁸ Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to 9,575 victims/survivors who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; 88,253 victims/survivors who were black or African-American; 74,415 victims/survivors who were Hispanic or Latino; 7,945 victims/survivors who were Asian; 13,838 victims/survivors age 60 or older; 24,392 victims/survivors with disabilities; 37,462 victims/survivors with limited English proficiency; 23,171 victims/survivors who

²⁷ VAWA 2005 at Section 40002(a)(32) defines "underserved populations" as including "populations underserved because of geographic location, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to be underserved by the Attorney General or by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate."

²⁸ It is not possible to report the overall percentage of victims/survivors receiving services from one or more of the underserved populations because victim data were reported in the aggregate and individual victims/survivors may be reported in a number of the underserved categories.

"Underserved" categories referred to include the following: people of races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the Office of Management and Budget), individuals more than 60 years old, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.

were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and 119,685 victims/survivors in rural areas.²⁹

In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (e.g., brochures, manuals, training curriculums, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims/survivors. Training was provided to 5,888 staff members of advocacy organizations for older, disabled, and immigrant populations. These nongovernmental, community-based groups are often in the best position to reach specific underserved populations and assist with referrals to appropriate services and agencies.

Training on issues specific to underserved populations was provided by 767 subgrantees—74 percent of all subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, 264 subgrantees—56 percent of subgrantees using STOP funds for policy development—established and/or implemented policies on appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and their subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims/survivors in underserved populations and to improve state and subgrantee responses to the needs of these victims.

American Indians and Alaska Natives

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

For sexual assault, the average annual rate is 3.5 times higher for Indians than for non-Indians (Greenfield & Smith, 1999). American Indian and Alaska Native women also are more likely to suffer physical injuries in addition to the sexual assault (50 percent) when compared with non-Native women (30 percent) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

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

²⁹ For more detailed demographic information on victims/survivors served by all states, see Table 23; for demographic information on victims/survivors served by individual states see Tables B3 and B4 in Appendix B.

criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in these communities.

A STOP administrator describes the impact of funding to the American Indian community:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

[The] American Indian Women Domestic Violence Assistance Program . . . targets Native American women in California by implementing culturally sensitive projects aimed at addressing and impacting the issues of domestic violence in the Native American community. Three agencies receive funding to provide cultural competency training and community outreach, advocacy services, counseling, assistance with restraining orders, and emergency shelter services to victims. The program received \$333,250 in [STOP] 2008 funding during the reporting period. . . . American Indian sexual assault and domestic violence victims in California are severely underserved due to the lack of conveniently located or culturally sensitive services. The victims lack information regarding the dynamics of sexual assault and domestic violence, and in some cases, there are weak linkages between tribal communities and non-tribal criminal justice and victim service systems. This program funds four agencies to develop and implement projects aimed at addressing and impacting the issues of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking among American Indian women. Projects provide outreach services and training regarding the dynamics of sexual assault and domestic violence to victims. They may also provide direct services through licensed therapists or refer victims to service providers.

—STOP administrator, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The Rhode Island (RI) Indian Council did not have any domestic violence program in place prior to this grant funding. This program has allowed the agency to develop a program by working with other agencies that have existing programs in place. With the Native community, there is a tremendous mistrust of non-Native people. This project has allowed for the development of staff who are Native Americans to be able to speak with victims of domestic violence. It has also allowed the RI Indian Council to compile statistics on the frequency, amount, and nature of domestic violence within our community. All these activities have proven invaluable in the agency's drive to identify victims of domestic violence, as well as working to strengthen laws on the issue. By doing these in a cultural way, it has opened doors for many Native people to come to the sessions we conduct and seek assistance.

—Rhode Island Indian Council, Inc.

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed us to try the model of having village advocates in two Alaska (AK) Native Villages to see if we could assist victims more readily by having a local person working with us towards that end. We know that it is important to work with the villages and help them come up with their own solutions —we are primarily informational and [provide] awareness resources. The village advocates are a liaison between the outreach coordinator and the community so the outreach coordinator can be more productive when she travels to those villages and have a local person assist with the timing and location of trainings and events. The village advocate also facilitates a regular women's gathering so that women gain trust, support each other, and learn more about interpersonal violence in a safe manner. This funding has also supported travel to and from the villages for both staff and victims. Victims are offered one-way travel to shelter if they feel they need to leave for safety reasons. Staff travel out of the villages for training and into the villages to train the community.

—Sitkans Against Family Violence, Alaska

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Having the safe home open in the community has allowed victims to have a choice to stay on the island. The victim does not have to leave her family and friends, and, thus, can retain her safety net and her support system. Staying on the island gives victims the opportunity to access food, housing, medical, employment, and other options locally rather than in a busy and unknown urban hub.

—Tribal Government of St. Paul Island, Alaska

Fifteen subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding identified themselves as tribal sexual assault and/or domestic violence programs, tribal coalitions, or tribal governments.³⁰ Sixty-seven subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited approximately 205 unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals made up 2.3 percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2008, with 9,575 victims/survivors receiving services. Training on issues specific to victims/survivors who are American Indian or Alaska Native was provided by 149 subgrantees, and approximately 1,174 tribal government/tribal government agency staff members were trained with STOP funds.

³⁰ The Grants to Tribal Governments Program provides funding to tribal governments and agencies and is separate from the STOP Program. Activities supported by that grant program are reported in the 2010 and 2012 biennial reports.

Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Older

Victims/survivors

Over 306 million Americans live with a wide array of physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2011). Victimization rates for women with disabilities are far greater than for those who are not disabled, suggesting that offenders specifically target the most vulnerable. According to the Committee on Law and Justice (2001), studies show that 39 percent to 85 percent of women with disabilities experience some type of physical or emotional abuse at the hands of an intimate partner or caregiver. A study of 5,326 women revealed that the 26 percent of women who reported having some type of disability were more than four times as likely to have been sexually assaulted within the past year as were women without disabilities (Martin et al., 2006). Examination of data from the 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) Survey, which included 356,112 male and female subjects, revealed that disabled females were nearly 3 times more likely to be threatened by violence, 2.5 times more likely to be physically abused, and more than 12 times more likely to experience unwanted sex when compared with all other populations (D. L. Smith, 2008).

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

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

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

Subgrantees from Arkansas and Utah discuss the critical nature of the advocacy they provide to victims/survivors who are D/deaf or hard of hearing and victims/survivors who have disabilities, and the importance of having advocates who are informed both about the barriers these victims face and in dealing with domestic violence and sexual assault:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our project's intent has been to utilize the co-advocacy model as a method of victim services. This model utilizes staff from the two fields (victim services and disability) in order to provide the best possible services to a victim of crime who has a disability. It relies on the skills of both professionals and the support of the agencies at which they are employed. This effort often includes both support to the person with a disability who is a victim, and training, technical assistance, and support for the staff from the other program involved in service delivery. The philosophies of the independent living movement for people with disabilities and the DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] survivor movement are relatively aligned and compatible. Each assigns self-determination to the survivor and acknowledges the survivor is the expert [in] their personal situation. The co-advocacy model helps to educate about these similarities. Sometimes this co-advocacy is done in person, and sometimes it is done through technical assistance calls from domestic violence or sexual assault advocates.

—University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Partners for Inclusive Communities

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

[The] STOP Program has provided support for victims by having trained advocates accompany Deaf and hard-of-hearing victims to safe shelter, legal services, medical help, obtaining protective orders, and help applying to public assistance. Often Deaf and hard-of-hearing victims will not seek help due to language and technical barriers when accessing services. Advocate accompaniment has been a critical part of victims who are Deaf and hard of hearing in receiving appropriate and equal services. All of the advocates (volunteer or paid) are fluent in American Sign Language and receive 50 hours of domestic violence training by provided by STOP funds.

—Sego Lily Center for the Abused Deaf, Utah

Approximately 25 percent of persons older than age 65 have been victims of physical, sexual, or psychological violence, and more than half of those have experienced more than one type of violence (Bonomi et al., 2007). Studies of elder sexual abuse suggest that most victimizers are family members (Ramsey-Klawnsnik, 1991; Teaster, Roberto, Duke, & Kim, 2001). These studies agree that nearly all reported perpetrators were male and most victims were female. Only a handful of studies have been conducted examining the relationship between older women and intimate partner violence, but the studies that do suggest that violence against

older women by intimate partners is a significant issue and is often overlooked. In one study, only 3 percent of responding older women indicated that they had ever been asked about physical or sexual violence by their health care providers (Bonomi et al., 2007). According to the National Center on Elder Abuse (2005), data suggest that only 1 in 14 incidents of physical or sexual violence comes to the attention of authorities; victims of these incidents also are less likely to receive services.

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

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

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Montgomery County's STOP grant for underserved elderly victims has enhanced a consistent, cross-system referral policy among community-based organizations and criminal justice agencies. The referral policy was created to ensure elderly can access a range of services regardless of which agency they initially contact. To achieve this end, the project trained Meals on Wheels volunteers on the signs of abuse and safety planning, promoted public awareness through posters at post offices and hair salons, developed promotional announcements prior to the start of movie matinees to help elderly victims identify the signs of abuse and obtain service information, developed a system where protection from abuse orders can be obtained via teleconferencing/Web-conferencing to assist victims who are hospitalized due to their victimizations, explored alternative communication forums for victims who are physically unable to travel to access services (e.g., website chat rooms, Internet cafes, and telephone-based support groups), and hosted a workshop titled "Investigating and Prosecuting Sexual Assault and Abuse Against the Elderly."

—STOP administrator, Pennsylvania

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence to create an outreach program geared specifically to persons age 50 years and older. We have been able to meet with elderly clients in their own setting such as church groups, the senior center, senior housing, and civic clubs where they can disclose their situations in a nonthreatening environment. We can assure confidentiality so victims feel comfortable opening up to our staff and volunteers about their situations. The monthly, and sometimes weekly, lunches at the Senior Resource Center have allowed our staff direct access to victims who otherwise would not seek services because of fear, lack of information, or mistrust. With STOP funding we have been able to educate hospital personnel, probation, churches, and women's groups about our services. We have been able to assure victims they are not alone, not "crazy", do not deserve the violence, [and that] it is not their fault [and] there is help, to reduce their shame. We have encouraged the 55 persons who disclosed abuse to report it. Staff designed individual safety plans for each victim. We have increased awareness about elder abuse in the community, brought the problem out into the light for discussion, and educated the public about the need to identify victims, advocate for them, and support them through whatever process they choose to get safe.

—*Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence, Indiana*

Because of the distinct challenges and barriers faced by victims/survivors with disabilities and older victims/survivors, it is critical to direct funding to programs that will focus their efforts on responding to their needs, as the STOP Program does. Fifteen percent (298) of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault. Overall, STOP subgrantees reported providing victim services to 24,392 victims/survivors with disabilities and 13,838 victims/survivors over the age of 60—5.3 percent and 3.4 percent, respectively, of all victims served.³¹ STOP Program subgrantees provided training and developed or implemented policies designed to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of the criminal justice system's response and the provision of services to older and disabled victims/survivors. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 447 subgrantees to other professionals; those professionals included 4,078 staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities were developed or implemented by 169 subgrantees.

Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Language barriers, isolation, immigration status, and traditional values increase the vulnerability to abuse of immigrant women and intensify their need to rely significantly on their abusers (Bhuyan, Mell, Senturia, Sullivan, & Shiu-Thornton, 2005). Lack of education and job skills necessary for working in the United States

³¹ Because data are collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims/survivors were both disabled and over the age of 60. The highest age category on the reporting form is 60+; the next lower category is age 25–59.

may deepen that isolation and dependency. Immigrant women, especially those who are undocumented, may be afraid to seek help following victimization. They may not know what their rights are and that services to help exist. Domestic violence is thought to be even more prevalent and severe among immigrant women than among U.S. citizens (Anderson, 1993; Raj & Silverman, 2002). Homicide data from New York City revealed that immigrant women were disproportionately represented among female victims of intimate partner homicides (Frye, Hoselin, Waltermaurer, Blaney, & Wilt, 2005).

Women refugees arrive from home countries where they have been victims of war, genocide, gang rape by military personnel or combatants, starvation, religious persecution, stalking, and intimate partner violence (Ganeshpanchan, 2005) (Runner, Yoshihama, & Novick, 2009). Victimization by intimate partners, racist, or faith-intolerant neighbors, detention personnel, and others is not uncommon for refugee women. Few service providers and legal system have the knowledge and skills to assist these victims/survivors (Runner et al., 2009).

Subgrantees maximize the value of limited STOP Program funds by increasing the knowledge and capacity of their communities to respond and provide services to immigrant and refugee victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has partially funded a full-time staff attorney dedicated to meeting the needs of immigrant victims of domestic violence and crime. We have increased the availability of services, information, and training to victims, as well as to shelter services, domestic violence organizations, mental health providers, prosecutors, public defenders, law guardians, and court personnel. Domestic violence programming has become an integral part of the work that we do with undocumented immigrants. We have created a space in New Jersey for domestic violence professionals to find answers to questions on complicated immigration issues and a responsive referral source for victims to obtain quality legal consultations and representation where needed.

—*American Friends Service Committee, New Jersey*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

As a result of this funding, our agency has been able to expand our service offerings to the limited English-proficient population in our service area through trainings, collaborations, and cooperative agreements with bilingual counselors to provide individual counseling; educational institutions to provide free English classes that include childcare and transportation to victims/survivors, and social service agencies to identify and minimize cultural barriers within their systems. Our agency strongly advocates for victim's/survivor's rights with regard to immigration issues and works cooperatively with regional immigration consultants, attorneys, and agencies to assist our participants with VAWA self-petitions and U-visa applications and certifications.

—*Georgia Mountain Women's Center, Georgia*

VAWA 2000 attempted to remove barriers for victims/survivors seeking help by including assistance in immigration matters among the purpose areas authorized by the STOP Program. Subgrantees reported serving 23,171 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 5 percent of all victims served. Training on issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by 315 subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims/survivors face are complex, and the consequences of reporting domestic violence incidents are often more serious for them than for other victims/survivors. Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services specifically designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by 137 STOP Program subgrantees and included interpreters, language lines, and the translation of forms, documents, and informational materials into languages other than English. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to develop, translate, and distribute at least 364 unique products in 22 different languages.³²

Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas

While national data suggest that women in urban areas are victimized at higher rates than women in rural areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006) two studies found that sexual assault rates were higher in some rural counties (Lewis, 2003; Ruback & Ménard, 2001). Rates of reporting victimization, however, were higher in urban counties (Ruback & Ménard, 2001). Research also indicates that women in rural areas report higher levels of stalking and violence and are more likely to experience a partner isolating them from family or friends and limiting their access to money (Logan, Shannon, & Walker, 2005).

Cultural factors such as patriarchal attitudes, lack of anonymity, fear of familial disapproval, and an ethic of self-reliance may prevent women living in rural areas from seeking safety (Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007; Grama, 2000; Hunnicutt, 2007; M. R. Lee & Stevenson, 2006; Lewis, 2003). Geographic isolation

³² For a listing of the specific languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 89, the Products section of "STOP Aggregate Accomplishments."

combined with inadequate transportation and lack of telephone service make leaving a batterer, particularly in the midst of a crisis, nearly impossible (Grama, 2000). Victims/survivors seeking services in rural communities may find that medical, legal, and social services are limited or nonexistent (Eastman et al., 2007; Grama, 2000; Logan, Walker, Cole, Ratliff, & Leukefeld, 2003).

The use of firearms against women seems to be more prevalent in rural communities than in urban communities (Grama, 2000). The percentage of all homicides involving intimate partners is higher in rural than in urban areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006; Gallup-Black, 2005).

The following subgrantees discuss how they have used STOP Program funds to address the unique and critical needs of victims/survivors in rural areas:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our service area is huge (approximately the size of the state of Ohio) with no connecting roads, 33 widely scattered villages—many of which have fewer than 100 people, and only a third have any resident law enforcement. As a result, victims of violence living in small isolated villages do not utilize the court system for protection orders. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense to get a PO [protection order] when you may have to wait for days for a state trooper to fly into the village to serve it, only to fly right back out again, leaving you without protection and the offender with a piece of paper in their hand. Instead, we have to develop and maintain alternative measures for gaining safety for victims. This is one of the reasons that village-based advocates are so critical—they are effective in organizing and informing providers, elders, traditional councils, and other village leaders so that they have the tools to craft effective, village-specific interventions and responses for victims of violence.

—*Safe & Fear-Free Environment, Inc., Alaska*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

VARN/DVVAP [Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevadans/Domestic Violence Victim's Assistance Project] is currently the only legal aid program in most, if not all of Nevada's rural counties, providing free, comprehensive civil legal services to DV[domestic violence] victims. We know from firsthand experience that without our services there would be no assistance of this type in these remote areas. Consequently, VARN/DVVAP is overwhelmed with requests for help for victims of domestic violence. As with many rural states, the lack of funding resources and absence of programs such as VARN's means fewer victims are receiving essential and often lifesaving services. VARN is acutely aware of the severity of the unmet legal needs of families living with violence, and it is DVVAP's goal and sole purpose to help fill this need. As a result of STOP program funding, DVVAP has been able to continue providing civil legal aid services to victims of domestic violence, enabling them to gain freedom from the physical, mental, and emotional abuse of their abuser, thereby providing protection and a renewed sense of hope for productive lives.

—*Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevadans (VARN), Nevada*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our STOP program subgrant allows us to provide supervised visitation and exchange services to our county and area residents. This type of program is very important as it provides a safe, secure environment to exchange children. Safeguards are in place to minimize the opportunity of a perpetrator to continue to harass and threaten his victim when she is ordered to provide their children for visitation. Such services also protect the children (secondary victims) by minimizing parental discord that occurs around visits and exchanges. As the only program of its kind in this rural area, it is extremely important to continue funding and offering this service for the safety of domestic violence victims and their children.

—*Athens County Commissioners, Ohio*

STOP Program funds were used to provide services to 119,685 victims/survivors who were reported as residing in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country) during 2008; this represents more than a quarter of all victims/survivors served. Training in issues specific to victims/survivors who live in rural areas was provided by 451 subgrantees (44 percent of those using funds for training).

The Criminal Justice Response

The STOP Program statute says that STOP funds may be used to develop, train, or increase the number of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges and other court personnel that focus on violent crimes against women, including the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault. These usually are considered specialized units in law enforcement and prosecution, and specialized domestic violence courts or dockets in the judicial system. A total of 533 STOP subgrantees (24 percent of all

subgrantees) reported using funds to support specialized units of law enforcement/officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors specifically dedicated to violent crimes against women. The statute further authorizes funds to be used to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecution policies specifically addressing violent crimes against women, including domestic violence and sexual assault. A total of 547 STOP subgrantees (24 percent) reported using funds for this purpose. Finally, funds may be used for data and communication systems that link police, prosecutors, and courts to assist them with identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women. STOP funds were used for that purpose by 234 subgrantees (10 percent).

Law Enforcement

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

Specialized Units

The availability of physical evidence is often crucial to the successful disposition of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases. Specialized police domestic violence units have been shown to collect evidence in a much higher percentage of cases than traditional patrol units (Friday et al., 2006). Evidence collected by specialized units is also more likely to be useful for prosecution (Townsend, Hunt, Kuck, & Baxter, 2005), leading to higher rates of prosecution, conviction, and sentencing (Jolin, Feyerherm, Fountain, & Friedman, 1998).

Specialized law enforcement units may consist of just one dedicated staff person, but can nonetheless have a significant impact on victim safety and offender accountability. STOP funds provided to the following subgrantees have been used for specialized detectives and law enforcement officers who share their knowledge with others in their departments and engage in victim-centered policing:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Currently the STOP grant funds only the detective. Victims have benefited by having a detective assigned to these types of cases because that detective has become very familiar with how the cases should be handled and is able to share his or her expertise with the entire sheriff's department as well as with other local law enforcement agencies that call for advice on how to handle their own cases. During 2007 and 2008, with STOP grant funding, the SCSO (Saline County Sheriff's Office) Domestic Violence Unit has continued to work closely with the prosecuting attorney's office and the judges. The unit also works closely with all of the smaller police agencies within Saline County.

—Saline County Sheriff, Arkansas

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The entire department has a greater understanding of the issues since we have established the domestic violence unit. The fact we now have domestic violence investigation kit bags with cameras, domestic violence forms, and victim support materials, most likely would not have happened without the grant. The department's attitude has improved toward providing services, and most importantly, referral services to the advocate who takes over when the policing portion would normally end. The domestic violence unit is also a source of pride for the unit workers.

—New Britain Police Department, Connecticut

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

By having a specialized law enforcement officer that devotes his full attention to domestic violence, we have been able to slow the progression of domestic violence in Stone County. Victims of domestic violence know that they have resources available to them and someone to speak for them in their time of need.

—Stone County Sheriff, Arizona

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed our agency to take the lead in providing needed training to law enforcement in our area. We would never have the resources to do this without grant funding. We have also been able to reach out to rural and tribal agencies to provide training they may not otherwise be able to get due to lack of training funds. In Nevada, rural agencies have some real challenges in investigating and enforcing cases related to domestic violence and sexual assault. Those agencies have huge jurisdictions, covering hundreds of miles. They have few resources and usually do not have the luxury of having two officers available to respond to calls. Backup could be an hour away. At our 2008 training, we received this note on the back of an evaluation form: "Three of my officers who attended (ranging from 3 to 15 years experience) all came up and volunteered to me on break that they lucked out this year because the sections of training covered this year were very interesting and held their attention."

*—Board of Regents for the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of
University Police Services*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The training was developed through a conjunction of rape crisis programs and law enforcement, and designed to prepare law enforcement officers to better respond to victims of sexual assault, titled "Sexual Violence: Building a Strong Case from the First Response." The STOP grant project director served as co-trainer with local police trainers to provide training to veteran police officers as part of the in-service trainings of the Massachusetts Municipal Police Training Committee. Over 100 officers participated in this training during 2008. This training program has enabled us to connect more directly with law enforcement and has resulted in an upsurge of the number of sexual assaults being brought to the attention of the still informal sexual assault response team. It is now a matter of course that a person reporting a sexual assault is brought to the hospital and a SANE nurse, an Independence House advocate, and law enforcement all come together to provide and encourage the victim to utilize all the services available.

—Independence House, Inc., Massachusetts

Police/Advocate Response

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

domestic violence, compared to more than 40 percent of the victims who received the standard law enforcement response (Casey et al., 2007).

STOP subgrantees are also engaging in this practice with success:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed crisis response advocates to provide on-scene services with law enforcement to sexual assault and domestic violence victims. Prior to the STOP grant funding, Amberly's Place was not open, and crisis response services did not exist in Yuma County. . . . As a result of the STOP grant, victims have access to a crisis response advocate on-scene 24/7. Due to the large turnover rate in law enforcement, new officers are responding to domestic violence calls with limited training and experience on the dynamics of domestic violence and the cycle of abuse. The on-scene crisis response advocate is available to guide the officer through the cycle of abuse as well as identifying the primary aggressor.

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

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

—City of Los Angeles, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Before we received STOP Program funding, we could not site a domestic violence/sexual assault counselor advocate within our police department to provide more immediate intervention and help after police respond to a call relating to domestic violence. Often, the victim will feel she has no options and is pressured to return to a dangerous situation. With STOP Program funding, we now have a part-time civilian advocate from our local domestic violence/sexual assault agency working in our department and with our officers to provide immediate follow-up to victims to provide support and information and advocacy to help them escape and be safe.

—Pittsfield Police Department, Massachusetts

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The OVW advocate works closely with law enforcement and has developed a protocol that whenever law enforcement responds to a domestic or sexual violence call, the Avenues advocate is notified. We have seen this program continue to grow over the years that we have had STOP funding. This project is providing women with an advocate who assists them in completing and filing orders of protection, attends criminal and civil court hearings, provides transportation to court, social services, and other appointments, and assists them in finding safe, adequate, and affordable housing.

—*Avenues, Inc., Missouri*

Spectrum of Law Enforcement Responsibilities

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has provided the county with the ability to serve all emergency protective orders in a fast and efficient manner. Prior to this funding, nearly 70 percent of the county's orders were not served in an appropriate time frame, if served at all. By providing funding for an officer whose sole purpose is to serve these orders throughout the county, the 70 percent number has been decreased to 20 percent. For the victim, having these orders served in a timely manner alleviates some of the stress of waiting and wondering if the order will ever be served. Because this may be the first time that a victim has entered into the criminal justice system, it also establishes the opportunity to build a rapport with law enforcement and enables officers to provide referrals for additional service, if the victim should request. In addition to providing the victim with the comfort of knowing that an order has been served in a reasonable time frame, this funding has also assisted in preventing the court system from being backlogged with unserved orders.

—*City of Williamsburg, Kentucky*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Officers arrived at the residence of the victim and discussed safety plans with her. Officers also provided information relating to services available in the community. In addition, officers inquired from the victim if any violations of conditions of release or of protection from abuse orders had occurred. If the victim disclosed that contact had been made, then the officers completed an affidavit for an arrest warrant if the perpetrator was not located and arrested. Before leaving the area, the officers also interviewed neighbors and other community members to determine if the abuser had been in the area. If, during the investigation, it is determined that a violation of a court order had occurred, then they followed the protocol of arresting the individual. When applicable, in addition to follow-up with the victims, officers made contact with the perpetrator and conducted random searches of his person, residence, and/or vehicle for bail prohibitions, such as alcohol/drugs and dangerous weapons. If a violation was discovered, the perpetrator was arrested for the violation(s).

—Biddeford Police Department, Maine

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

With STOP Program funding, Lexington County has been consistent and aggressive with enforcement of no contact orders. The CDV [criminal domestic violence] investigator has been able to monitor defendants under the no contact bond violation. We have program coordination for monitoring weekend jail defendants. In the past, there was no way to track those who were sentenced to weekend jail time. The STOP funding has also provided funds to train the CDV investigator for technology surveillance. Intensive enforcement has resulted in more guilty pleas which has resulted in greater judicial efficiency. Fewer cases are pending as jury trial requests.

—Lexington County Sheriff's Office, South Carolina

STOP Program funds also are used to provide training, develop consistent policies and protocols, and participate in CCR activities:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has given Oregon State Police/Law Enforcement Data Systems the ability to do research with each county throughout Oregon to determine: what process and forms each county is using for protection orders so that we can increase consistency of process and forms, what understanding does each county have regarding how to fill out the protection order forms and how to enter the information into the Law Enforcement Data System, what options the victim has when they fill out protection orders, how courts interpret the different types of relief that the victim is asking for in the protection order and the Oregon statutes that support such relief, how law enforcement interprets the type of relief ordered by the judge in a protection order, and how to support that relief. Without STOP Program funding, we would have never had the ability to do the needed research to determine where we are as a state for the above mentioned areas, as well as developing protocols, procedures, processes, and gathering best practices to come up with solutions to the issues and to help build consistency in processes and practices.

—Oregon State Police, Law Enforcement Data Systems

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

By designating a DVSA [domestic violence/sexual assault] detective to review all cases that are DVSA-related, it ensures that reports of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking contain the necessary components. If a report is lacking, the detective can obtain the necessary information and fully investigate the crime reported, and also use the instance as an opportunity to educate and retrain officers on the policies and procedures of law enforcement. Funding has also allowed for training and collaboration, so that law enforcement officers and other important community members can be knowledgeable about domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, trauma, and victimology, and respond to these issues appropriately and effectively. Collaboration with the local homeless shelters and social service agencies provides an increase in opportunity for cross-referrals, support, and coordination of services. Providing a coordinated, compassionate, and appropriate response for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking increases the chances of offender accountability. Victims can feel safer coming forward in reporting crimes, obtaining services, and following through with the criminal justice system. Victims that have taken advantage of the services available in Petaluma's DVSA unit and Petaluma's larger community response often state that they feel better equipped to move on with their lives and provide a safer environment for their children. By providing these services, we help victims break the cycle of violence.

—City of Petaluma, California

During calendar year 2008, 298 subgrantees (13 percent of all subgrantees reporting) used STOP Program funds for activities that were conducted by law enforcement personnel with a total of 246 FTEs.³³ Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2008 received 82,708 calls for assistance from sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking victims/survivors. They responded and prepared incident reports in 85,609 cases, investigated 88,216 cases, made 28,883 arrests of predominant aggressors and 997 dual arrests, and referred 36,426 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served 14,849 protection/restraining orders, arrested offenders for 3,604 violations of protection orders, and enforced 7,854 warrants.³⁴

In addition to traditional law enforcement activities, subgrantees also engaged in activities designed to improve law enforcement response and arrests of offenders: 284 used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; 666 provided training on law enforcement response and 322 specifically addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 102 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor; and 67 developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

Prosecution

Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking presents many challenges. Funding from OVW has been instrumental in addressing these challenges by improving knowledge and providing needed resources to prosecution offices across the country. Prosecutions of crimes against women too often fail without thorough police investigation and detailed reports, expertise on violence against women, staff members to supplement the information provided by law enforcement, reasonable caseloads, technology to enhance investigations and the presentation of evidence, resources to employ experts for evidence analysis, and expert testimony.

Prosecutors without the proper knowledge may fail to identify stalking and intimate partner sexual assault and may not devise specialized policies to guide prosecution of violence against women (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without the necessary resources, prosecutors often charge offenders with misdemeanors because felony trials are labor- and cost-intensive (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without an adequate staff to prosecute violations of conditions on sentences, in either judicial monitoring or probation revocation proceedings, prosecutors do not vigorously prepare nor do they seek serious sanctions (Friday et al., 2006).

³³ For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see page 97, section on “Law Enforcement”.

³⁴ Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not engage in the other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity was to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on calls received or incidents responded to, unless those activities were also supported by the STOP Program.

Specialized Prosecution

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

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

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

In the following examples, prosecution agencies used STOP funds for specialized prosecutors who review, assess, and make charging decisions; prosecute cases effectively, consistently, and promptly; develop and implement protocols; spend time with victims/survivors; and assist and train other prosecutors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program has allowed one prosecutor to devote an ample amount of time to all domestic violence, sexual assaults, and related cases. This has allowed them to assist in complex felony domestic violence cases district-wide, be an available resource to assist at trials or offer advice to the district's other eleven deputy prosecutors, deal with initial misdemeanor domestic violence citizen complaints, make decisions about case filings, meet with victims, coordinate with victim assistance offices, provide follow-up communications to victims, and educate law enforcement personnel. Without the STOP Program, victims and domestic violence and sexual assault cases would be underserved and would not receive the specialized prosecution and time that they demand.

—13th Judicial District Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Arizona

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Without Stop Program funding, we would not have a three-quarter time VAW [violence against women] prosecutor focusing on violent crimes against women and services to these victims would be greatly diminished. The funding allows us to set the bar higher; it allows us to take these cases to trial. It allows us to create policies and protocols for law enforcement, enhancing their ability to do a thorough investigation. Strong investigation is crucial to the outcome of these cases. If we have a strong case with strong evidence, the less likely we will go to trial. This, in turn, makes it easier on the victim. [The] bottom line is STOP funding allows us to do our jobs better. Before funding, these crimes rarely went to trial, offenders had minimum consequences, and the victim did not receive the quality of services that we have in our office today. Victims and defendants alike know that we are here to do our job and we take it seriously. STOP funding has helped make that possible.

—Kossuth County Attorney's Office, Iowa

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Grant funding has afforded the STOP-funded prosecutor the means to put a sufficient amount of time and energy into case preparation and victim services. In addition to the limited caseload, attorneys in specialized grant-funded units, such as STOP, enjoy the benefit of gaining particular insight and expertise in highly complicated cases. The ability to gain familiarity with complex procedures like sexual assault examinations, DNA analysis, and victim interaction all contribute to successful prosecution. Further, the STOP-funded prosecutor benefits with constant contact and resulting close relationships with peace officers, advocates, service providers, and medical professionals. This, in turn, results in much more efficient communication, investigation, preparation, and prosecution. Finally, tracking data on arrests, charges, prosecution, and convictions are all much easier when cases involving sexual assault or other violence against women are handled by one attorney, and the stats are entered, compiled, and preserved by one IT [information technology] expert.

—County of Yolo, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding has allowed prosecutors and law enforcement to work together to protect the victims of domestic violence. Funds for the specialized unit have enabled two prosecutors to review all domestic violence cases for criteria that suggests the defendant will reoffend, thus, targeting that defendant by providing information to law enforcement. In turn, officers can provide surveillance on the victim's place of work, business, or home. The prosecutors are able to meet in-depth with victims, forming a bond that is necessary to ensure successful prosecution and future safety for the victim.

—Office of the State Attorney, 18th Judicial Circuit, Florida

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding allows the Platte County Prosecutor's Office to increase successful prosecutions of domestic violence cases through prompt case review and consistent implementation of the flexible "no drop" policy. With the addition of the domestic violence prosecutor, the office is able to timely prosecute all viable reported domestic abuse cases to final disposition, either by trial or through a guilty plea. Prompt case review means the domestic violence prosecutor promptly reviews all submitted cases involving domestic violence within 48 hours. Action is taken on the file within 24 hours for suspects held in custody. In cases where a suspect is not held in custody, the domestic violence prosecutor or victim advocate attempts to contact the victim within 24 hours of the receipt of the report and action is taken within 48 hours of speaking with the victim. The consistent application of the flexible "no drop" policy sends a clear message to both abusers and victims that the criminal justice system takes domestic violence against women seriously.

—Platte County, Missouri

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to receiving STOP funding, the Porter County Prosecutor's Office had not been able to dedicate personnel to learning the intricacies of domestic violence cases. This lack of understanding prevented the prosecutors from appropriately addressing the issues of power and control that are the cornerstones of domestic crimes. Now, over a period of 14 years, the office has become a forerunner in the region regarding holding defendants accountable for their actions. Attorneys in neighboring counties routinely comment that "if the client's case had been filed in the next county, he would have been walking out the door as soon as he was booked." We take great pride in knowing that our police officers receive up-to-date training on domestic violence laws, report-writing, and testifying, and that all of that training leads to great, solid cases. Additionally, the funding allows us to maintain a DV [domestic violence] unit where there are two prosecutors that specifically handle the vertical prosecution of these cases.

—Porter County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Kern County is both one of the largest counties in California and a rapidly growing County, as well, in terms of population and its related issues. With just under half the population living outside the Bakersfield Metropolitan area, many people are served by seven separate courts. As a result of this geographic spread, about one-third of the felony domestic violence and sexual assault cases originate in these branch courts. They are usually investigated by smaller police agencies and frequently need more investigative work after filing. Resident branch court deputies, pressured by daily felony and misdemeanor caseloads, find it simply impossible to devote the necessary time to properly prepare these important cases and effectively serve the traumatized and often reluctant victims. The STOP program funding has allowed the Kern County District Attorney's Office to devote a deputy district attorney to vertically prosecute these cases in the branch courts, thus promoting countywide uniformity in sentencing and providing assistance to victims needing services through the victim witness coordinator that works with the assigned deputy DA [district attorney].

—County of Kern, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Centralizing the tracking and prosecution of domestic violence-related cases has allowed the expansion and effectiveness of victims' services, has affected more thorough investigations, more expedient sharing of information by agencies, and a clearer awareness of needs to be addressed. Coordination of prosecutors, police, victims' services, and judges assists in rendering both more effective decisions and better addressing victims' needs. This grant has allowed the district attorney's office to assist in training of police and prosecutors, identifying victims services needs, and [help] with policy implementation. . . Both prosecutorial decisions and sentencing recommendations are more effective.

—Marion County Commission, Alabama

Vertical Prosecution

Vertical prosecution allows the victim/survivor and one consistent prosecutor the opportunity to work together throughout the life of the case. Cook County (Chicago) victims/survivors reported higher satisfaction with the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit—which featured specially trained prosecutors, vertical prosecution, and its own victim advocates—than with the prosecutors who handled domestic violence cases outside the unit. Domestic violence unit victims/survivors also were more likely to appear in court; 75 percent of victims appeared, compared to just 25 percent in non-unit domestic violence cases. This unit also obtained a higher domestic violence conviction rate—71 percent—compared with 50 percent for the rest of the office (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003).

Vertical prosecution is practiced in numerous STOP Program-funded prosecution offices:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

This funding enables us to continue to have two vertical prosecution teams for all domestic violence and intimate partner sexual assault cases. The current funding supports a bilingual advocate and prosecutor who work as a team. A vertical prosecution team consists of one advocate and one prosecutor who follow their caseload from the date a defendant is arraigned through trial or disposition. Vertical prosecution has been a successful tool in keeping victims informed and willing to continue with prosecution, and increases safety. Because the same team of advocate and prosecutor handle the entire case, victims are not re-victimized by having to tell their personal stories each time they come to court to a different staff member. They also know who specifically is handling their case and have direct contact for any questions.

—*Plymouth County District Attorney's Office, Massachusetts*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP program funding has allowed vertical prosecution to occur. Without funding, this office would have to split its domestic violence and sexual assault caseload between 10 different prosecutors and 5 different judges with already overburdened dockets. This was done in the past, and it led to many dismissals, no bills, and not guilty verdicts. With a vertical prosecutor or prosecutors, who only deal with domestic violence and sexual assault cases, our office can put someone in charge of tracking, prosecuting, and convicting just those cases. This has led to increased numbers of successful prosecutions, less recidivism of offenders, and more satisfied victims. During this reporting period, we served over 295 female victims, and prosecuted 158 new domestic violence charges, including 10 homicides, more than a 10 percent increase over the last year, 25 new stalking charges, and 94 new sexual assault charges, at least a 10 percent increase over the past year. Without program funding, this office would not be able to keep track of domestic violence and sexual assault cases with such fervor. With the funding, fewer cases fall by the wayside, fewer cases fall through the cracks, and most cases are made better instead of worse with time and investigation.

—*Board of Mahoning County Commissioners, Ohio*

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received 163,364 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking for charging consideration in 2008, and accepted, on average, 75 percent of those cases for prosecution. STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 34 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors.³⁵

³⁵ This percentage is based on the number of dismissals compared to all other dispositions. Subgrantees were instructed to report only on the disposition of the original case (which is characterized by the most serious offense), not on the dispositions of lesser charges or counts pled to by the offender. For more information on the dispositions of cases, see Table 29.

During calendar year 2008, 292 subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with a total of 267 FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by 290 subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees took the following steps to improve prosecution: 390 provided training on prosecution response, 93 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed victim-witness notification, and 72 addressed policy development and/or implementation regarding protection order violations. The low dismissal rate in STOP Program-funded prosecution agencies may reflect the impact of specialized prosecutors gaining training to develop and implement strategic policies that result in increased offender accountability.

Courts

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

In some jurisdictions, judges have been at the forefront in establishing special coordinating councils for sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases. In an increasing number of jurisdictions, judges have used their administrative role to create specialized domestic violence courts and court dockets with the goals of enhanced coordination, more consistent intervention to protect victims/survivors, and increased offender accountability. Integrated domestic violence courts have also been instituted; these take jurisdiction over criminal, protection order, and select family proceedings (e.g., custody cases) involving the same offender and victim/survivor, so that the same judge presides over all the cases involving the offender and victim/survivor. Specialized domestic violence criminal courts and integrated domestic violence courts typically have specialized intake units, victim-witness advocates, specialized calendars, and intense judicial monitoring of offenders (A. Klein, 2004).

With STOP Program funding for a specialized domestic violence criminal court, this subgrantee was not only able to dispose of cases more quickly, but also to mobilize its system and community partners to improve the overall response to domestic violence:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed our judicial district to create a specialized domestic violence court that efficiently manages case delay for domestic violence cases. Prior to the creation of this court in 1996, domestic violence cases were mixed in with all criminal cases and were subject to case delays of several months for final disposition of a case. Now, cases are generally disposed of within 6 to 16 weeks, depending on whether a trial was requested. Also, in the creation of the specialized court, services were created through our prosecutor's office and the local shelter to meet with victims and assign an advocate to each case. Probation services also created a specialized bond supervision program that is still in place today, although no longer funded by STOP funds. In addition our CCR, known as COMVAC, continues to meet and is active in our community in the prevention and reduction of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The STOP funds have supported the domestic violence court, which, in turn, coordinates with the many community players who provide services to victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.

—10th Judicial District Domestic Violence Program, Kansas

To help courts more effectively manage their domestic violence docket and monitor the compliance of offenders with court-ordered conditions, STOP funds may be used for coordinators, case managers, or monitors as in the following examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the continued availability of the domestic violence court docket. This docket has been beneficial in providing a higher rate of offender accountability within Seminole County which, in turn, increases the rate of victim safety. Due to weekly monitoring of offenders by the domestic violence coordinator and coordination with the courts on a more regular basis, accountability has increased and recidivism rates have decreased for participating offenders.

—Family Resource Center, Oklahoma

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

[Before] receiving this funding, there was no [staff] position to ensure the compliance of those offenders that were court-ordered in Family Court to have a domestic violence assessment and follow through with treatment recommendations. This task was left to the victims, which placed them in danger and added to their victimization. In most cases, noncompliant offenders were never reported and, therefore, didn't face any consequences for not following the orders of the court. Having the court monitor track compliance has brought numerous offenders before the court that may never have been detected, making victims feel as though their orders are valid in the eyes of the court.

—Office of the Fayette County Sheriff, Kentucky

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to receiving this funding, the court did not monitor any compliance with any provisions of protection orders unless the victim filed a motion with the court alleging noncompliance. Now, we are able to monitor every respondent who was ordered for an evaluation by a Domestic Violence Coordinating Council-certified agency without relying on the victim.

—Family Court of the State of Delaware

STOP funds have been used for domestic violence court liaisons, court-based advocates, and resource coordinators³⁶ whose roles are multifaceted and can be critical to the success of the specialized court, the coordinated community response, and victim safety and offender accountability:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding allows for advocacy in both the civil and criminal courts. This is [particularly] important in assisting victims transitioning from the criminal court to the civil court process. Often, when a case is dissolved and the victim is still fearful, the victim can pursue a temporary restraining order in the civil court. This funding allows the process to be seamless for the victim. It is an immediate response to a critical need, ensuring safety on several levels. It has been noted in other courts that victims fail to follow through with the civil process because they are scared and intimidated by the process. In Hartford, the advocate is also in the position of having immediate access to the criminal case. This assists in facilitating the coordinated community response in the Hartford area.

—Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding for [the] Domestic Violence Court has helped to create a standard for the court system as an agent of change in the community. Policy is driven by victims' needs. There have been many successful collaborations. This has created an environment of cooperation, which allows for open discussion about policy. The domestic violence coordinator is a resource to the court system, local law enforcement, nonprofit agencies and attorneys. Many collaborative activities continue with the community such as training for the local bar association and law enforcement. Overall the Domestic Violence Court is well respected by the court community and continues to create successful collaborations on behalf of victims.

—Rutherford County Domestic Violence Court, Tennessee

³⁶ These staff may be employed directly by the court or by coalitions or victim services agencies, or may be working under a contract between the court and another agency.

Some states use STOP Program funding to provide training to the judiciary, as in the following example:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The 5 percent court allocation has been a tremendous benefit to the judiciary. It has allowed specialized training on violence against women issues, including sensitivity training on the critical issues of violence against women crimes.

—STOP administrator, West Virginia

Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking by 16 STOP subgrantees; 9 of these subgrantees used funds for judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.6 hearings per offender for 2,820 offenders during calendar year 2008. These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders, as shown in Table 8.

As illustrated in Table 8 below, for offenders who violated conditions of probation and whose violations were disposed of in STOP-funded courts, revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 41 percent of the total dispositions of those violations in 2008.

Table 8. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded courts in 2008

Type of Disposition	2008 (N = 1,948)	
	Number	Percent
Verbal/written warning	497	26
Partial/full revocation of probation	817	42
Conditions added	235	12
Fine	70	4
No action taken	329	17

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

Probation Supervision

Probation supervision offers the criminal justice system alternatives to incarcerating offenders. The primary role of the probation officer is to monitor offenders' compliance with court-ordered conditions. Probation and parole departments have devised policies and practices to respond to the heightened scrutiny and more nuanced sentencing by courts in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Following the example of police, prosecutors, and courts, probation departments funded under the STOP Program have adopted specialized caseloads for monitoring offenders. Many of these specialized probation officers engage in more intensive supervision of their probationers, including unscheduled home visits and curfew checks, as well as random drug and alcohol screening. Many require attendance at batterer intervention programs (BIPs) or sex offender treatment programs, while providing outreach and support to victims/survivors.

Research on the effectiveness of probation supervision in domestic violence cases suggests there are several essential ingredients for effective probation supervision of perpetrators. One is victim-focused supervision. A primary goal of the supervision must be victim/survivor protection, with victim/survivor restitution as a secondary goal. To achieve both, periodic probation officer contact and communication with victims/survivors is essential. This ongoing outreach to victims requires a shift away from traditional approaches to probation, which tend to focus on the offender, not the victim/survivor (A. Klein & Crowe, 2008; A. Klein, Wilson, Crowe, & DeMichele, 2005). Officers should also monitor compliance with state and federal firearms prohibitions (Crowe et al., 2009; A. Klein, 2006).

A study of Rhode Island's Department of Corrections/Probation and Parole found that a specialized probation supervision unit for individuals convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of reabuse and rearrest among low-risk offenders, and increased victim satisfaction, when compared with non-specialized supervision (A. Klein et al., 2005).

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

Some California subgrantees have incorporated elements of effective probation practice, including the following:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

OVW funding has allowed the department to assign one senior probation officer and one deputy probation officer to intensively supervise caseloads of no more than 30 probationers convicted of domestic violence offenses. These small caseloads allow the probation officer the opportunity to make frequent home and victim contacts, as well as, to immediately arrest a probationer who violates his conditions of probation. The funding further allows the caseloads to remain continuously covered and provides a continuity of staffing. Additionally, staff assigned have received extensive domestic violence training and have been able to develop an excellent working relationship with other law enforcement agencies, the district attorney, and the judge.

—Moreno Valley & Riverside Anti-Violence Against Women, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding has continued to allow the Merced County Probation Department to fund a probation officer position that provides intensive supervision services to domestic violence offenders. The probation officer continues to work closely with the victims and children by referring them to services within the community. The probation officer continues to oversee a case load of 40 adult felony offenders. The probation officer works an alternative work schedule which includes working evenings and weekends. The funding has allowed the officer to work nights and work overtime when deemed necessary in order to provide intensive supervision services to his clients.

—Merced County Probation Department, California

A subgrantee from Nebraska has overseen a dramatic increase in the scope of their probation supervision programming as a result of STOP Program funding:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

When we started we had fewer than 10 offenders on probation and no one in a batterer intervention program [BIP]. For the past several years we have had 150-plus offenders in batterer intervention programs and developed a Spanish-language BIP as well. Similarly, enhanced advocacy and advocacy in the adult probation department would not be possible.

—Lancaster County, Nebraska

The following subgrantees used STOP Program funds for intensive supervision of offenders while maintaining contact with victims to ensure accountability and victim safety:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program has allowed us to contact all victims of domestic violence at both the pre-sentence level and the supervision level, thus, increasing the accountability of the offenders and providing a safe environment for the victims to speak, to be heard, and to report any subsequent violence. Prior to this funding, all of the victims were contacted, but in some instances, the victim could not reveal the entire history of violence. As [a] result of this funding, there were renewed alliances with referral agencies and a spirit of greater cooperation among us to serve the victim. Data was kept on all victims contacted, where they were referred to, and the satisfaction of the victim in regard to the services provided. Without funding, this specific data would not be documented.

—City of Cleveland Municipal Court Probation Department, Ohio

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The creation of a victim services agent has allowed the Department of Correction, the largest law enforcement agency in the state, to provide direct services to victims. This project indirectly impacts offender accountability by keeping victims involved in offender supervision and has changed our "offender-focused" supervision philosophy. The victim services agent project serves victims whose offender is under probation and parole supervision for domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault. The project has highlighted the importance of keeping victims informed about probationer compliance, sentencing, bail, and release information.

—Department of Correction, Community Corrections, Delaware

As illustrated in Table 9 below, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 60 percent of the total dispositions of their violations in 2008.³⁷

Table 9. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2008

Type of Disposition	Total Violations 2008 (N = 1,891)	
	Number	Percent
Verbal/written warning	156	8
Partial/full revocation of probation	1,140	60
Conditions added	260	14
Fine	85	4
No action taken	250	13

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

During 2008, STOP Program-funded probation staff supervised a total of 4,907 offenders and made a total of 62,732 contacts with those offenders. The majority of these contacts—58 percent—were face-to-face, 28 percent were by telephone, and 14 percent were unscheduled surveillance. These agencies disposed of 1,891 probation violations, of which 1,140 (60 percent) resulted in partial or full revocation of probation. STOP Program-funded probation agencies also had a total of 5,524 contacts with 1,922 victims/survivors during 2008. Regular contact provides an opportunity to inform victims/survivors about services available in the community and lets them know that the criminal justice system is continuing to hold the offender accountable.

Sexual Assault

According to the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey, more than 300,000 women and 90,000 men are raped annually, and these rates have shown little variation over the past few decades. The survey reported that nearly 18 million women and 3 million men experienced a sexual assault during their lifetime.

³⁷ The overwhelming majority of dispositions of violations were reported under “Other conditions of probation or parole.” These high numbers could include technical violations (e.g., use of alcohol or controlled substances, failure to report) or they could also indicate the subgrantees’ inability to report dispositions in the specific categories on the reporting form. Those categories are for the following violations: protection order, new criminal behavior, failure to attend batterer intervention program, or failure to attend other mandated treatment. For more detail on dispositions for these specific categories for both courts and probation departments, see Tables 29 and 31 in Aggregate Accomplishments.

Epidemiological data suggest that at least 17 percent of women will be sexually assaulted in their lifetime. According to the survey, only one in five women reported their victimization to the police; of those reported assaults, only 37 percent were prosecuted (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

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

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and of the evidence collected, but also to provide victims/survivors of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is vital to ensure that victims/survivors obtain competent medical care and follow-up services in a manner that supports their immediate needs and long-term healing. Training on the collection of forensic evidence during the examination is critical to holding offenders accountable in the criminal justice process. Historically, victims/survivors of sexual assault were often retraumatized by their experiences in hospitals. Triage usually left them waiting hours for forensic exams. Physicians often were untrained in forensic evidence collection and not inclined to become involved in a procedure that could require them to appear in court. This lack of training compromised the ability of the criminal justice system to successfully prosecute perpetrators. In sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, trained nurse examiners provide prompt, sensitive, supportive, and compassionate care; the nurses also follow forensic protocols, ensuring the highest quality evidence is collected.

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

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the MCSATC [Madison County Sexual Assault Treatment Center] to maintain the integrity of the 24/7 on-call status of sexual assault nurse examiners (SANEs). These specially trained registered nurses respond and provide immediate comprehensive medical forensic examination to victims who have been acutely sexually assaulted. The SANEs are also responsible for activating a multidisciplinary team of professionals on behalf of the victim and her specific needs. Because of STOP funding, SANEs are able to address the needs of the victim in an immediate, comprehensive fashion thereby expediting the entire investigation process. STOP funding has also allowed the MCSATC to reach out to law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and healthcare providers in surrounding rural counties where limited victim services are available and offer 24-hour availability of forensic medical services to victims of these rural communities.

—Community Hospital Anderson, Indiana

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has also allowed for development of a Grant County SART and related multidisciplinary training and protocols. Rape cases now have the benefit of local expert witnesses [who are] able to explain to a jury why a sexual assault victim will not necessarily have [an] injury from the assault. This is certainly common knowledge among those who have dealt with sexual assault cases, but juries have a hard time understanding this fact. Having locally-trained SANEs has aided in investigations, as the investigations can proceed more expediently and we have medically-trained eyes helping guide the collection of evidence—during the rape examination, as well as at the crime scene, or elsewhere. Essentially, STOP funding has made the prosecution of domestic violence and sexual assault cases more effective, thus leading to safer victims and offenders who are held more accountable.

—Grant County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed Foundation for Rape Information and Services (FRIS) to expand programs and services and to further increase our collaborative efforts with partners from a wide variety of disciplines. Prior to this funding, FRIS coordinated no mutlidisciplinary training on sexual assault or stalking and coordinated no statewide disciplinary collaboratives on these issues. During this funding period alone we have coordinated or assisted in coordinating 14 training [sessions]. All were either statewide or regional. The annual symposium reached 198 professionals. Following the changes to the West Virginia statute on stalking, we were able to disseminate information through a radio interview and press releases. Our collaborations with SANEs and the college campuses will have a far-reaching impact including the establishment of SART and SANE programs and an online training module for campus resident assistants. SART training has been conducted in four counties, and technical assistance and information has been provided to others seeking to develop a SART in their community. This funding has enabled us to provide training, technical assistance, and resources on stalking and sexual assault to hundreds of professionals in the state.

—West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information and Services

The following subgrantee has used STOP funds to ensure a seamless continuum of accessible, high-quality services for sexual assault victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the Collins Center to offer a comprehensive continuum of services for victims from one location—24-hour hotline, hospital and court accompaniment, crisis counseling, group support, [and] systems advocacy. This provides stability and consistency for victims and their families throughout the entire process following a sexual assault. Funding has also allowed us to increase community collaboration, training, and partnerships to better respond to victims through investigations and prosecution of sexual assault. The agency has been able [to] run more quality and consistent support groups for female victims with a high retention rate throughout the year and has also been able to provide crisis counseling and long-term mental health referrals for those victims who are underinsured or uninsured and would not be able to get services elsewhere.

—The Collins Center (formerly Citizens Against Sexual Assault—CASA), Virginia

This Massachusetts subgrantee is taking a comprehensive approach in its support of young women who have been victims of sexual exploitation:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funds helped to provide advocacy for young women, [who are] victims of sexual exploitation. Over a period of time, that has enabled some women not only to exit out of the sex trade but to enter college and go beyond just surviving. STOP funds have helped to provide support over [the] years — especially for young women who have no biological family or positive support systems while transitioning to adulthood, already burdened with challenges. More than half of the young women we worked with over the past year fit into this category. Without STOP funding, these young women would not have received the kind of services needed to be successful in life, as they were at a higher risk for incarceration and continued sexual and physical victimization. Assisting young women out of the sex trade, and having an opportunity to transition safely into adulthood to become healthy, stable, and productive young women produces substantial social benefits and reduces the potential substantial costs over time if these young women do not succeed. For example, incarceration and substance abuse produce many unforeseen costs; therefore, without options and a way out [of] it, young women most often then turn to substances and/or cycle through the court systems as they get older.

—*Kim's Project, Massachusetts*

This subgrantee in California is using STOP funds to help victims/survivors of sexual assault make their way through the criminal justice system and to provide them with counseling and advocacy:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The funding of the project has afforded our agency the opportunity to provide a continuum of care to victims of sexual violence. Without the funding, the victims would not have the same quality of supportive services necessary for them to navigate through the criminal justice system and move forward in their healing after the sexual assault. Advocates provide follow-up services to victims which include crisis intervention counseling for victims and significant others, support for victims and significant others through the maze of the criminal justice process, interviews with law enforcement, accompaniment and advocacy during the collection of forensic evidence, the judicial process, in-person counseling, emergency housing, and referrals to other supportive services.

—*Community Violence Solutions (Marin County), California*

A subgrantee in Georgia provided services to sexual assault victims/survivors in a rural area where there were no such services before STOP funding:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to receiving this crucial funding, there were no services of this kind offered in our rural mountain area. Since our beginning in the program the funding has provided vital services to our underserved rural areas for victims of sexual assault, rape and adult survivors [of child sexual abuse]. Services have an everlasting effect on the victims. FAITH [Fight Abuse in the Home] serves by enabling advocates to provide guidance through the legal system, court and hospital accompaniment, counseling, and crisis intervention services. The vital funding has also allowed advocates to work and collaborate with other service providers, law enforcement, and other agencies to provide a teamwork approach to the issues that surround rape and sexual assault. Services provided through our agency have also proven to be an essential tool in assisting adult survivors to overcome the abuse they have suffered either as a child or in other unfortunate ways. FAITH guides and empowers victims by assisting and supporting them in all aspects, which would not be available to them if necessary funding was not in place.

—*F.A.I.T.H. in Rabun County, Inc., Georgia*

In Wisconsin, a STOP subgrantee used funds to support counseling services, including culturally-specific services, for victims/survivors with few options because of their rural location and lack of financial resources:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

New Day Shelter (NDS) has been able to offer services of two masters-level therapists and a Native American counselor to victims of domestic violence and/or sexual assault/abuse because of OVW funding. The masters-level therapists provide expanded and extended individual therapy and supportive therapeutic services to victims of sexual assault and childhood sexual abuse who are uninsured or underinsured, and, therefore, unable to receive these services elsewhere. In the rural area we live in, there are very few therapists, [and] the ones that there are have long waiting lists, and many clients do not have the funds to pursue this treatment even if there were the availability of services. NDS also offers two support groups, facilitated by the masters-level therapists, to victims, focused on sexual assault issues that include women with severe and persistent mental health issues. To our knowledge, there is no other service in the area that offers a group experience to clients with these issues and with severe and persistent mental health problems. The continuity of the therapists' longevity at NDS has benefited the clients who need long-term individual therapy and involvement in a group to continue or at least maintain their healing.

—*New Day Shelter, Wisconsin*

Subgrantees also use STOP funds for prosecutors devoted exclusively to the prosecution of sexual assault cases. The work of prosecuting cases and ensuring that the victim/survivor is informed, empowered, and has access to services goes hand in hand, as illustrated in the following examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The project advocate meets with the victim before the case is reviewed for criminal charges in the district attorney's office. Following the successful model developed over the years, the advocate and the assigned assistant district attorney will stay with the case from start to finish so that the victim will have the same advocacy and legal team throughout the prosecution. The advocate provides crisis counseling and emotional support to the victims, educates victims about the steps in the criminal prosecution, prepares victims to testify in court and accompanies them to all court proceedings, stays in contact with victims to provide emotional support and keeps them apprised of the progress of the case, makes appropriate referrals for victims to outside agencies and resources, advocates for victims with the assigned assistant district attorney and ensures victims have the opportunity to confer with the prosecutor on their case, makes victims aware of crime victim compensation and assists them in completing required forms, assists victims in securing rights and remedies from other agencies, such as intervening with employers and insurance companies on behalf of victims; and helps victims complete forms which allows them to know the whereabouts of their perpetrators (sex offender registry) and when he/she is released from prison.

—Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office, Wisconsin

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

We continue to believe a major accomplishment in our County (due to OVW funding) is the streamlining [of] many of the cases, especially domestic violence and sexual assault cases. The victim only deals with one prosecutor, one victim advocate, and one detective throughout the entire criminal justice process (no matter how short that dealing is). We have found that through modifications to our SART team and its response to sexual assault, the victim is receiving more services in a "wraparound" approach. Because of the SART changes, victims are given the opportunity to meet with the prosecutor, and we have found that the vast majority of the sexual assault victims will talk with the prosecutor and discuss the ramifications of prosecution. No sexual assault victim is forced to cooperate with an investigation or meet with the prosecutor—the decision to pursue a criminal case is left in the victim's hands. There have been a number of sexual assault victims that have chosen to NOT pursue criminal cases, the [STOP-funded] prosecutor supports their decisions and wants to make sure they are working toward getting healthy. On the other hand, we have had a few cases where the victim did NOT want to participate in an investigation until weeks or months later; then they have wanted a prosecution to take place and once again, the prosecutor is supportive of that. Most importantly, STOP funding has allowed our [STOP-funded] prosecutor the ability to spend quality time with victims and find out their needs and emotional health. This has been extremely important to our sexual assault victims as they have been traumatized and are working through difficult trust issues. Further, the STOP funding has allowed our prosecutor to actively participate in multidisciplinary team efforts for sexual assault to not only review cases, discuss evidence, [and] train others, but to also work toward systemic changes in the area of sexual assault against women—this is especially important as we have a major university in our community.

—*Cache County Attorney's Office, Utah*

More than 220 sexual assault organizations—180 local programs, and 40 state sexual assault coalitions³⁸—received STOP Program funds. Sexual assault victims/survivors comprised 12 percent of all victims/survivors served with program funds in 2008. Although it is impossible to know the specific types of services provided to sexual assault survivors, subgrantees did report that victims/survivors were accompanied to the hospital. Those hospital visits often are for forensic exams for sexual assault victims/survivors. In addition to providing services to sexual assault victims, 684 subgrantees—66 percent of those using funds—provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault: sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination. STOP Program-funded

³⁸ In addition, subgrantees also reported that 444 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs, 9 tribal dual programs and 21 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2008.

prosecutors disposed of 4,854 sexual assault cases during 2008; an average of 75.5 percent of those cases resulted in convictions.³⁹

One of the statutory goals of the STOP Program is the training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners; 9 percent (199) of all subgrantees reported using STOP funds for SANE training. STOP Program funds also were used to support 42 FTE SANE staff positions. In addition, in terms of the program's broader impact, funds supported training for 5,034 SANES.

Stalking

Although the general public may be most familiar with stalking by strangers, the majority of stalking is actually perpetrated by partners or former partners of the stalking victims, or people known to the victim. More than half of all stalking cases emerge from romantic relationships, and more than 80 percent of stalkers are reportedly known to their victims (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). An analysis of 175 studies on stalking revealed that almost one-fourth of women have experienced stalking and the average length of time a person is stalked is 2 years (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). 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 also were physically assaulted by that partner, and 31 percent were sexually assaulted by that partner (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).⁴⁰ The NVAW Survey also found that half of all stalking victims report the stalking to the police, and that a quarter of those reported cases resulted in arrests.

The danger of stalking often has been underestimated. Stalking has been associated with a range of serious consequences for victims/survivors, including increased risk of violence, injury, and homicide (Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Swanberg, 2007; Roberts, 2005). A study using a nonrandom sample of more than 1,000 North American stalkers found that nearly a third had assaulted their victims. (Mohandie, Meloy, McGowan, & Williams, 2006). A 10-city study of female abuse victims and female victims of attempted or actual homicide committed by their intimate partners found a strong association between stalking and subsequent lethality or near-lethality. It found that stalking, when combined with a history of physical assault by a former or estranged partner, places women at greater danger of becoming victims of attempted or actual homicide by intimate partners. It also found that women who reported that they were being followed or spied on by a partner had more than a

³⁹ This rate includes deferred adjudications. For purposes of comparison, the average conviction rate (also including deferred adjudications) for domestic violence misdemeanors was 64 percent, and for domestic violence felonies the rate was 71 percent.

⁴⁰ The co-occurrence of physical assault, sexual assault, and stalking may explain in part the low percentage of stalking victims (2.2 percent) reported as being served with STOP Program funds. Subgrantees are instructed to report an *unduplicated* count of victims/survivors and to select only one primary victimization for each victim/survivor served during each calendar year. It is safe to assume that a significant number of domestic violence and sexual assault victims/survivors also were victims of stalking, even though they were not reported as stalking victims on the STOP Annual Progress Report form.

twofold increase in the risk of becoming a homicide victim (McFarlane, Abeita, & Watson, 2002).

It appears that women who are stalked after obtaining a protective order are at particularly high risk for violence, notwithstanding other variables including the presence of minor children, prior abuse, and the length of relationship. A study found, for example, that women who were stalked after the orders were issued were 4 to 5 times more likely to experience physical abuse, severe physical violence, and injury, as well as almost 10 times more likely to experience sexual assault than other women with orders (Logan, Shannon, Walker, & Faragher, 2006). Intimate stalkers are persistent and more likely to recidivate than non-intimate stalkers (Logan & Walker, 2009). Intimate stalkers also may be the least deterred by criminal justice intervention (Mohandie et al., 2006).

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

The New Mexico Department of Corrections used STOP funding to provide statewide training on stalking to criminal justice professionals:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to the STOP grant funding, the Corrections Department did not have the financial resources to provide statewide training to corrections staff about stalking, supervision of stalkers, and assisting the victims of stalking. The STOP funding has allowed the New Mexico Corrections Department to provide the first statewide stalking training to corrections staff, state probation and parole officers, federal probation, tribal probation, metropolitan court probation, D.A.'s [district attorney's] office victim advocates, New Mexico Attorney General Office victim advocates, state/tribal/local law enforcement, judges, and [staff members of] other state and non-profit agencies. The stalking training provided gave the participants the tools to learn about the dynamics of stalking, the importance of the supervision of stalking offenders, tribal codes and stalking, assisting stalking victims, and assisting the underserved populations. Additionally, the STOP Program funding has given the corrections department the opportunity to collaborate with other agencies. This collaboration has led to the development of ongoing collaboration with these agencies. The corrections department is very grateful to have received the STOP funding.

—New Mexico Corrections Department

A Virginia subgrantee educated victims/survivors on stalking, trained staff and volunteers, and developed a stalking brochure used in law enforcement training:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

This year STOP [funding] has helped make it possible to increase our assistance to stalking victims and to potential stalking victims. Many more victims who leave shelters know what to do if their abusers start stalking them. They know how to report the incidents, document, and safety plan. They know the importance of working with the police and insisting that the police take them seriously, do a report, and tell the stalker to stay away from them. The number of requests for presentations on stalking has increased this year. New in 2008, the Virginia Sexual & Domestic Violence Action Alliance has made it mandatory that all new volunteers and new staff members receive information on stalking before they start working with victims or start their jobs. Six volunteers and staff were trained in stalking the third quarter of 2008. [The] criminal justice coordinator developed and designed a new stalking brochure for victims. This brochure has been used at law enforcement trainings at the Regional Police Academy, Winchester Police Department, and in court.

—The Laurel Center, Virginia

A major issue in stalking is the use of technology. The Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the Tennessee Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence used STOP funding to provide training to address this problem:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funds allow PCADV [Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence] to provide training on stalking and technology at the statewide and local levels. Last year, PCADV helped to develop and present a joint Tech Safety and Stalking Conference for law enforcement and victim and DV [domestic violence] advocates. In addition, PCADV was able to provide some training on the local level to county STOP teams. Requests for training on tech safety and stalking continue as public awareness increases and more incidents are reported.

—Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the coalition to broaden our Training and Technical Assistance Project to include a component on technology. As the Internet continues to grow, social networking sites become more popular and a global positioning systems (GPS) become more commonplace. It is imperative that advocates learn how to assist victims/survivors who may have perpetrators stalking them through the use of these technologies. Coalition staff has been able to attend weeklong training hosted by the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) Safety Net Project to take part in a train-the-trainer module developed for advocates. This module trains our staff on important safety planning needs regarding technology and information access that we can then share with advocates across the state.

—Tennessee Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence

A California subgrantee used STOP funds to educate the public about stalking:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funds have allowed the Alameda County DA [district attorney] to enhance public awareness around issues of stalking and threat management, which has resulted in the increase in reporting of stalking cases, an increase in the successful prosecution of cases and better coordination of convicted stalkers.

—*County of Alameda, California*

STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, or strengthen programs that address stalking by 291, or 13 percent, of subgrantees in 2008. Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program disposed of 1,448 stalking cases in 2008; 71 percent of those cases resulted in conviction.⁴¹ Training on stalking issues was provided by 541 subgrantees (53 percent of those using funds for training). Training topics included an overview of stalking and information about the dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

Remaining Areas of Need

STOP administrators are asked to report on the most significant areas of unmet need of victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and offender accountability in their states. In their reports for 2008, the administrators regularly cited the following as remaining unmet needs:

- ▶ Training of criminal justice partners, especially the judiciary
- ▶ Economic challenges faced by victims/survivors
- ▶ Transportation and services for geographically isolated victims/survivors
- ▶ Services for underserved populations
- ▶ Legal representation for victims/survivors
- ▶ Organizational capacity development

Specific areas cited by STOP administrators included the need for increased training of criminal justice personnel, and judges in particular, on the issues of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. STOP administrators discussed the need for better understanding of protection orders by all criminal justice professionals, from law enforcement officers to judges. STOP administrators also cited a lack of consistency in court practices and outcomes for victims/survivors in their states, a problem that may retraumatize victims and discourage further participation in the justice system:

⁴¹ This rate includes deferred adjudications.

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Ultimately, it is judges who set the precedent for offender accountability, through issuing protective orders, utilizing consistent sentencing guidelines, providing follow-up on offenders ordered into batterer intervention programs, refusing to use anger management as a diversion, and by encouraging trials to occur, [even] absent victim cooperation and participation. Judges also set the stage for victim safety during court appearances by using or not using, appropriate methods for victims to give testimony without the offender's presence. Training is crucial, and to date, there are limited numbers of judges who voluntarily participate in continued domestic violence training, encourage law enforcement and prosecutors to advocate for trials, and fewer who support trials without the victim's active participation and testimony.

— *STOP administrator, Florida*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Ohio projects report frustration with what appears to be a lack of consistent protocols among law enforcement and the judicial system regarding the arrest and accountability standards for perpetrators. Similarly, while many judges are knowledgeable about the far-reaching implications of partner and family violence and comply with recommendations for best practices when working with victims and sentencing offenders, still others lack the training and insight needed in order to understand their role in the process. Their refusal to administer the best practice laws, as written by the legislature, subsequently has the potential to do greater harm than good, and many inadvertently re-victimize already traumatized victims.

— *STOP administrator, Ohio*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Training court officials in DV [domestic violence issues] is absolutely necessary for the effective use of batterer intervention programs. [With increased] understanding [by court officials] in the dynamics of manipulation, perpetrators of violence are held to the requirements of the program more consistently.

— *STOP administrator, North Carolina*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

A significant number of grantees identified training on the appropriate issuance and enforcement of protective orders as a continuing need across the commonwealth. From magistrates to law enforcement, and judges to prosecutors, it is clear that individuals within the justice system need even more training on when a protective order shall be issued, who can violate a protective order—a respondent—and who cannot—a petitioner, and [the potential for] increased situational lethality, as it relates to the violation of a protective order.

—STOP administrator, Virginia

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Too often, a victim’s negative experience with one system will influence her willingness to access those systems again. Victims may report abuse to the police only to have that used against her in future child protective services proceedings for failure to protect her children from witnessing abuse. The complexities of the many systems that victims encounter make policy development that much more difficult to ensure that the well-intentioned goal of one program does not negatively impact the safety of survivors.

—STOP administrator, Michigan

The subject of economic challenges faced by victims/survivors was a recurring area of remaining need cited by STOP administrators. Inadequate or the lack of temporary and transitional housing, transportation, job training, and employment opportunities represent significant obstacles to leaving abusive relationships. These challenges are magnified for victims/survivors in rural areas:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

For the abused women that OVW dollars serve, separation and divorce from their batterers most times results in a dramatic decrease in their standard of living. As victims flee abusive situations, the need for affordable housing becomes imminent. For these reasons, post-shelter transitional housing, affordable, private and/or public housing alternatives, and securing a living wage income are several critical issues that pose great need for Ohio. As well, the complexities presented by victims of domestic violence do not end when a survivor exits emergency shelter. The immediate crisis, or the precipitant for the initial intervention, may well be resolved when one leaves; however, this departure marks only the first step toward a survivor’s long journey to achieve a safe, healthy, and violence-free life. . . . In Ohio, while most counties have core shelter services in place to meet the needs of victims of domestic violence, few have the financial freedom to provide the supportive services, such as employment assistance, transportation, childcare, and transitional housing that make it possible for survivors to obtain employment and sustain long-term housing.

—STOP administrator, Ohio

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Though victims actively participate in processes necessary to secure housing, there are few affordable opportunities. As a result, victims are requesting shelter stay extensions. A tension exists for programs in trying to support these women's efforts to stay safe while, at the same time, providing immediate safety for victims just beginning their escape.

—STOP administrator, Alaska

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Many women remain or go back to abusive relationships in order to maintain healthcare coverage for their children. State level policy changes must be made to Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program to allow domestic violence victims access to insurance for their children.

—STOP administrator, Kansas

Programs serving victims/survivors in rural areas face a combination of economic and geographic difficulties. STOP administrators highlighted shelter and transitional housing needs, transportation, and access to SANEs as remaining areas of need for these victims/survivors:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Alabama has fewer shelter beds than most of its neighboring states and many rural counties are served by, at best, a circuit-riding advocate supported by TANF funds. There is a desperate need for additional domestic violence services, especially in the rural areas of southern Alabama and the extreme eastern border of the state. There is also a desperate need for the development of more non-shelter services, particularly targeting underserved populations.

—STOP administrator, Alabama

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Nevada still lacks some basic services in many areas of the state. Specifically, certified sexual assault nurse examiners are currently only conducting exams in Las Vegas and Reno. That leaves 90 percent (geographically) of the state without sexual assault forensic exam services. Victims must travel hundreds of miles to obtain these necessary exams. Shelter and transitional housing is limited or nonexistent, especially in rural Nevada. Many victims are forced to return to their abusers because no other options are available. This is especially true due to the fact that transportation services are unavailable to much of rural Nevada. We have recently learned that the commercial bus services have reduced the numbers of stops available across Nevada (both east/west and north/south). In many cases, the buses no longer stop in some communities. Alternatively, if the bus is full, any other scheduled stops along the route are cancelled. Because of this, bus tickets are often not an option even if a victim has family outside the area that is willing to take her in.

—STOP administrator, Nevada

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Accessing underserved communities, especially [in] rural and illiterate pockets in our state, remains an issue. The understaffed and overworked NGOs [nongovernmental organizations] cannot cover their target communities with basic services, much less expend the time and resources to perform outreach.

—STOP administrator, South Carolina

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Rural areas are still in need of resources to address barriers due to limited transportation, language, staffing resources, and cultural differences. There are fewer medical facilities, nearly no access to SANE services and response times are longer for law enforcement in rural areas.

—STOP administrator, Washington

STOP administrators consistently noted the need for culturally and linguistically appropriate responses across the spectrum of victims/survivors' needs and experiences. Commonly cited were the need for more multilingual advocates, police officers, and court personnel, particularly in areas with significant immigrant and refugee populations. Some STOP administrators also mentioned the need for mental health and substance abuse expertise:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Most programs in Virginia are at capacity in terms of funding levels for staff who serve survivors who can speak English. Now, these same programs are seeing a growing, increasingly desperate need for advocates and translators in court who speak Spanish and/or any number of Asian languages. What programs [staff members] have learned is that having a brochure translated is helpful, but having trained, bilingual, bicultural staff is essential to provide culturally appropriate services. Even with one additional STOP-funded project in this area in 2008, Virginia is beyond capacity. As Virginia's immigrant populations continue to grow and federal funding continues to shrink, the need for culturally-relevant and sensitive services will only become more urgent.

—*STOP administrator, Virginia*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

There seems to be a great need in our community for the increased availability of Spanish and Arabic language resources and interpreters. To be able to reach more of the victims and support professionals in the community, there is a need to conduct more outreach and have advocates more visible in the community to ensure that victims are aware of community services and how to access them.

—*STOP administrator, Michigan*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

[When] non-Spanish speaking officers attempt to take police reports from Hispanic victims and, due to the language barriers, information can often times be misinterpreted. [We] need law enforcement training on cultural diversity. Paperwork is not provided in the victims' primary language. . . . [There is a] lack of adequate resources for victims struggling with substance abuse and alcoholism. Domestic violence shelters cannot house them as we are not licensed to shelter individuals [who are] detoxing and [we] do not have medical staff to serve their needs. Substance abuse/detox facilities cannot provide a confidential location for victims in high-risk situations. . . . Lack of housing options for undocumented victims with severe mental health issues [is an unmet need].

—*STOP administrator, Utah*

STOP administrators frequently mentioned the need for increased services to sexual assault victims, training of stakeholders on sexual assault, better access to forensic medical exams, experienced legal representation and counseling services for victims/survivors of sexual assault, and sex-offender management:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Several local shelter programs report difficulty in maintaining nursing staff at their local hospitals that are trained to gather forensic evidence in cases involving adult sexual assault. Many hospitals find it difficult to allocate limited resources to a non-medical purpose.

—STOP administrator, Alaska

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Additional funding is necessary to increase needed services to sexual assault victims, and to increase community education about the reality of the issue of sexual assault. . . . California’s Sex Offender Management Board, chaired by the Executive Director of the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault, recently issued a report identifying gaps in California’s practices related to adult sexual offender management. These gaps include increased assistance for victims, the number and geographic distribution of sex offenders, sex offender recidivism, investigation and supervision of sex offenders; housing of sex offenders, offender treatment programs, and sex offender registration and notification. Legislation has been continuously introduced by the State Legislature to improve offender accountability and victim safety.

—STOP administrator, California

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Evidence-gathering and documentation in DV [domestic violence] cases, especially in light of changing constitutional and evidentiary standards, remain a persistent need. With regard to sexual assault, investigation and prosecution of drug- and alcohol-facilitated sexual assault remain a need.

—STOP administrator, Michigan

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The CNMI [Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands] has established a solid response to domestic violence as well as having an exceptional awareness program—with informational materials being printed and distributed on a regular basis. The same amount, if not more, of [the] concentration should be focused on a response to victims of sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. We lack some programs that can adequately respond to such victims, such as SANE programs or even counselors who specialize in these fields. Of course, this is in regard to victim/survivor safety; we want to make sure that victims are properly treated. Being that the victims have been traumatized, there is a possibility that the victim's mental stability will be compromised; we want to make sure that the victims are safe and taken care of. We are hoping within in the next couple of years, we will be able to establish a SART team, as well as be able to respond to victims of these needs.

—*STOP administrator, Northern Mariana Islands*

Increased access to legal services is a necessity for many victims/survivors. STOP administrators discussed the need for a range of legal services, including representation in divorce, child custody, protection order, and immigration proceedings. More information about available legal resources and access to free or reduced-fee advocacy in the court process is also needed:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

There is a need for increased funding for local domestic violence/sexual assault programs to fully staff their rural outreach and legal advocacy positions. Cuts in funding for Alaska Legal Services Corporation at the state and federal level have severely limited domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking victims' access to legal representation. This leaves the OVW-funded Legal Advocacy Project as the only resource for finding attorneys for victims.

—*STOP administrator, Alaska*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The most significant area of remaining need is providing legal representation and advocacy for victims of violence against women. The Court Watch Project, conducted by the New Jersey Coalition for Battered Women, confirmed that an unrepresented victim is less likely to receive a final restraining (protection) order when the offender is represented by legal counsel. This has been identified as a priority since New Jersey first received STOP funds and remains a critical need. Efforts continue to expand pro bono projects and legal advocacy programs with six grants awarded to law schools and nonprofit organizations this reporting period. In New Jersey, most domestic violence matters are handled in municipal court where the victims are likely to seek relief. Unfortunately, there are few services or advocacy [programs] for victims in these courts. To address this need, a pilot project was initiated to support municipal court programs in two counties. These programs provided advocacy for victims through court accompaniment, assistance, and referrals. The programs have been successful, but there are no other available funds to continue these two programs or to expand services and programs to other counties.

—STOP administrator, New Jersey

Finally, STOP administrators expressed a need for increasing the capacity of organizations that receive STOP funding. Programs serving victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking need to stabilize and grow if they are to meet the changing and challenging needs of victims/survivors and their communities. Uncertain financial and political support threatens the effectiveness of these organizations. STOP administrators discussed the organizations' needs to attract and retain experienced staff, provide ongoing training, address staff turnover, and to create and support specialized units in the criminal justice system:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Programs find it difficult to retain experienced staff for the wages they are able to pay. Individuals will go to work at a program, get training, and then move into higher-paying jobs at other service agencies. This is particularly true for programs in communities where the employee pool is small and the number of service agencies is high. Local programs also report difficulty in paying for increased fixed costs. Increased costs for utilities, heating oil, health insurance premiums, and workers' compensation continue to encroach on funds that could be used for programming. Funders for basic operational costs are few and far between.

—STOP administrator, Alaska

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The creation of police, prosecution, and court specialized divisions is a high priority for ACADV [Alabama Coalitions Against Domestic Violence], the STOP administrator, the chief justice of Alabama, and the Council on Violence Against Women. All agree that police, prosecutors, and courts that focus on domestic violence are essential. The limiting factor is funding for officers, prosecutors, and court staff. The creation of targeted criminal justice intervention [programs] is a huge area of unmet need.

—STOP administrator, Alabama

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Unfortunately, because of budget restrictions we are not able to hire as many advocates as we would like to so that the advocate's caseload could be lighter, thus allowing them to have more frequent and meaningful time with victims. This is especially true with regard to the Law Enforcement Advocate program. If we could have more of those special advocates working with police and victim service agencies, victims would be better served and police would be better educated.

—STOP administrator, Rhode Island

STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

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

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

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for staff: **2,143** (95 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2008

Staff	Number	Percent
All staff	2,757	100
Victim advocate (nongovernmental)	822	29.8
Program coordinator	325	11.8
Prosecutor	267	9.7
Law enforcement officer	246	8.9
Counselor	183	6.6
Victim assistant (governmental)	159	5.8
Legal advocate	151	5.5
Support staff	140	5.1
Administrator	106	3.8
Attorney	96	3.5
Investigator (prosecution-based)	55	2.0
Trainer	50	1.8
Sexual assault nurse examiner/sexual assault forensic examiner (SANE/SAFE)	42	1.5
Paralegal	34	1.2
Probation officer/offender monitor	32	1.1
Court personnel	21	.8
Information technology staff	6	.2
Translator/interpreter	2	.1
Other	20	.7

Training

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

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for training: **1,031** (46 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Total number of people trained: **263,644**
- ▶ Total number of training events: **12,571**

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2008

People trained	Number	Percent
All people trained	263,644	100
Law enforcement officers	77,529	29.4
Multidisciplinary	35,473	13.5
Victim advocates	23,439	8.9
Health professionals	17,922	6.8
Volunteers	14,190	5.4
Social service organization staff	13,154	5.0
Court personnel	9,626	3.7
Educators	8,107	3.1
Faith-based organization staff	7,341	2.8
Advocacy organization staff	6,582	2.5
Mental health professionals	6,250	2.4
Corrections personnel	5,890	2.2
Attorneys/law students	5,673	2.2
Sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners	5,034	1.9
Government agency staff	5,025	1.9
Prosecutors	4,928	1.9
Victim assistants	3,419	1.3
Elder organization staff	2,728	1.0
Immigrant organization staff	1,810	.7
Legal services staff	1,410	.5

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2008

People trained	Number	Percent
Disability organization staff	1,350	.5
Tribal government/Tribal government agency staff	1,174	.4
Military command staff	1,117	.4
Substance abuse organization staff	1,073	.4
Batterer intervention program staff	949	.4
Translators/interpreters	397	.2
Sex offender treatment providers	349	.1
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	159	.1
Other	1,546	.6

The most common topics of training events were overviews of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking; advocate response, safety planning for victims/survivors, law enforcement response, confidentiality, domestic violence statutes/codes, and protection orders.

Coordinated Community Response

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

Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2008

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Advocacy organization	59	137	282	16	244	202
Batterer intervention program	136	285	388	86	389	269

Table 12. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to community agencies in 2008

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Corrections	167	376	480	71	523	355
Court	737	602	270	207	508	371
Domestic violence organization	877	529	322	324	790	437
Educational institution/organization	58	218	400	37	275	241
Faith-based organization	68	266	511	22	296	322
Government agency	283	444	376	52	390	305
Health/mental health organization	293	664	528	69	668	379
Law enforcement	915	619	268	301	768	431
Legal organization	334	506	416	66	424	320
Prosecutor's office	572	580	372	283	625	383
Sex offender management/sex offender treatment	11	36	138	14	103	97
Sexual assault organization	355	422	440	170	579	385
Social service organization	472	629	361	109	691	354
Tribal government/tribal government agency	14	53	153	8	82	90
Other	31	56	36	17	92	38

Policies

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

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: **471** (21 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 13. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2008

Policy/protocol	Subgrantees using funds (N = 471)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations	196	41.6
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services	175	37.2
Confidentiality	167	35.5
Informing victims about crime victims' compensation and victim impact statements	159	33.8
Mandatory training	139	29.5
Sexual assault response and protocols	120	25.5
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities	115	24.4

NOTE: Only topics of policies reported by the highest number of subgrantees are presented. Total number of subgrantees addressing specific policy topics is higher than subgrantees using funds for policies, since subgrantees report on all topics that apply.

Products

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

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for products: **484** (21 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 14. Use of STOP Program funds to develop or revise products for distribution in 2008

Product	Number developed or revised	Number used or distributed
All products	1,705	2,287,152
Brochures	544	1,213,423
Manuals	173	53,112
Training curriculums	273	22,125
Training materials	350	70,760
Other	365	927,732

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, distributed, and/or translated products in the following 22 languages:

Arabic	Creole	Marathi
ASL (American Sign Language)	French	Polish
Bengali	Gujarati	Portuguese
Bosnian	Hindi	Russian
Braille	Japanese	Spanish
Burmese	Khmer	Urdu
Chamorro	Korean	Vietnamese
Chinese		

Data Collection and Communication Systems

STOP Program subgrantees develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking against women. These systems link police, prosecution, and the courts for the purposes of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions.

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: **273** (12 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2008

Activity	Subgrantees using funds (<i>N</i> = 273)	
	Number	Percent
Manage data collection and communication	153	56.0
Share information with other community	115	42.1

Table 15. Use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2008

Activity	Subgrantees using funds (N = 273)	
	Number	Percent
partners		
Expand existing data collection/communication systems	104	38.1
Purchase computers/other equipment	76	27.8
Develop new data collection/communication systems	56	20.5

NOTE: Total number of subgrantees reporting data collection activities is higher than subgrantees using funds for data collection, since subgrantees report on all activities that apply.

Table 16. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2008

Purpose	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	147
Arrests/charges	129
Protection orders	120
Evaluation/outcome measures	112
Incident reports	111
Violations of protection orders	106

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, dating violence, and stalking cases.

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for specialized units: **529** (23 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 17. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2008

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	8	8	1	1
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	266	276	22	30
Train a specialized unit	41	31	4	6
Other	5	2	1	1

Table 18. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2008

	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Sexual assault	170	187	20	15
Domestic violence/dating violence	265	267	28	35
Stalking	158	183	17	18

System Improvement

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

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for system improvement: **248** (11 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 19. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2008

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation / parole
Evaluation	86	38	29	21	14
Interpreters	75	20	15	20	2
Language lines	18	4	3	1	0
Meetings between tribal and non-tribal entities	19	7	6	4	5

Table 19. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2008

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation / parole
Safety audits	26	9	9	9	8
Security personnel or equipment	12	12	5	4	2
Translation of forms and documents	86	17	13	11	4
Other	24	12	11	9	7

Victim Services

During the 12-month reporting period, a total of 1,570 subgrantees (69 percent of all subgrantees) used funds for victim services. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 461,734 victims/survivors (98 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence; only 2 percent of victims/survivors seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See Tables 20, 21 and 22 for information on the level of service provided, the types of victims/survivors served, and the reasons victims/survivors were partially served or not served by subgrantees in 2008.)

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for victim services: **1,570** (69 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 20. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008, by level of service and type of victimization

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence / dating violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	470,538	100	401,129	100	57,585	100	11,824	100
Not served	8,804	1.9	7,125	1.8	1,479	2.6	200	1.7
Served	442,324	94.0	376,758	93.9	54,226	94.2	11,340	95.9
Partially Served	19,410	4.1	17,246	4.3	1,880	3.3	284	2.4

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

Table 21. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2008, by type of victimization

Type of victimization	Victims/survivors served	
	Number	Percent
All victimizations	461,734	100
Domestic violence/dating violence	394,004	85.3
Sexual assault	56,106	12.2
Stalking	11,624	2.5

Table 22. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees⁴²

Reason	Subgrantees reporting
Program reached capacity	170
Did not meet eligibility or statutory requirements	166
Services not appropriate for victim/survivor	160
Conflict of interest	123
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with mental health issues	122
Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor	116
Transportation	107
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with substance abuse issues	100
Program unable to provide service due to limited resources/priority setting	92

Demographics of Victims/survivors Served

Of the more than 461,734 victims/survivors served during the 12-month reporting period and for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (56 percent), female (91 percent), and age 25–59 (66 percent).

⁴² Although STOP subgrantees do not report a reason for not serving or for partially serving individual victim/survivors, they do report reasons for not serving or partially serving victims/survivors in general by checking all reasons that apply.

Table 23. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008

Characteristic	Victims/survivors receiving services	
	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity		
American Indian/Alaska Native	9,575	2.3
Asian	7,945	1.9
Black/African American	88,253	21.3
Hispanic/Latino	74,415	18.0
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	4,032	1.0
White	232,001	56.0
Unknown	47,344	NA
Gender		
Female	403,722	91.3
Male	38,404	8.7
Unknown	19,608	NA
Age		
13–17	23,220	5.6
18–24	101,826	24.7
25–59	273,327	66.3
60+	13,838	3.4
Unknown	49,523	NA
Other demographics		
People with disabilities	24,392	5.3
People with limited English proficiency	37,462	8.1
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	23,171	5.0
People who live in rural areas	119,685	25.9

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom the information was known. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 461,734 victims. Because victims/survivors may have identified with more than one race/ethnicity, the total number reported in race/ethnicity may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors served.

Table 24. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2008

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence / dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	272,393	75.5	11,247	22.8	7,443	56.5
Other family or household member	34,111	9.5	11,209	22.7	705	5.4
Dating relationship	49,135	13.6	5,536	11.2	2,331	17.7
Acquaintance	4,210	1.2	15,309	31.0	2,249	17.1
Stranger	755	.2	6,093	12.3	445	3.4
Unknown	39,855	NA	11,354	NA	1,982	NA
Total	360,604	100	49,394	100	13,173	100

NA = not applicable

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

Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and resources, health care, education, finances, transportation, childcare, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (assistance navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. In addition to the services listed in Table 25, STOP Program subgrantees routinely provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

Table 25. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008

Type of service	Victims/survivors served (N = 461,734)	
	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	214,359	46.4
Crisis intervention	203,701	44.1
Criminal justice advocacy	149,115	32.3

Table 25. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2008

Type of service	Victims/survivors served (N = 461,734)	
	Number	Percent
Civil legal advocacy	115,540	25.0
Counseling/support group	108,827	23.6
Civil legal assistance	24,875	5.4
Transportation	22,358	4.8
Hospital response	14,979	3.2
Language services	11,422	2.5
Forensic exam	7,471	1.6
Other	2,639	.6

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

Number of victims/survivors receiving shelter services:

- ▶ **19,878** victims/survivors and **17,807** family members received a total of **719,389** emergency shelter bed nights
- ▶ **1,194** victims/survivors and **1,468** family members received a total of **174,742** transitional housing bed nights

Total number of hotline calls:

- ▶ From victims/survivors: **278,377**
- ▶ From all callers, including, victims/survivors: **496,805**

Number of victim-witness notification/outreach activities: **209,511**

Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims/survivors seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement of protection order violations, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders. STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims/survivors in the protection order process. In 2008, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims/survivors in obtaining more than 182,659 temporary and final protection orders.

Table 26. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2008

Provider	Total	Temporary	Final
All providers	182,659	108,801	73,858
Victim services staff	131,010	76,305	54,705
Law enforcement	25,238	16,946	8,292
Prosecution	26,411	15,550	10,861

Close to half (490) of all subgrantees using funds for training addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and 162 developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders. These policies addressed the issues of protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection orders, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and mutual restraining orders. STOP Program subgrantees also used funds for data collection and communication systems for tracking and sharing information about protection orders; 120 subgrantees reported this, making it the third most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

Criminal Justice

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

Law Enforcement

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

Table 27 summarizes STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2008. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: **298** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 27. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2008

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Cases/incidents investigated	6,491	79,780	1,945	88,216
Incident reports	5,628	78,288	1,693	85,609
Calls for assistance	6,932	72,422	3,354	82,708
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	2,244	33,461	721	36,426
Arrests	1,495	26,802	586	28,883
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	829	13,626	394	14,849
Enforcement of warrants	350	7,320	184	7,854
Arrests for violation of protection order	85	3,396	123	3,604
Forensic medical evidence	1,454	NA	NA	1,454
Arrests for violation of bail bond	131	1,017	36	1,184
Dual arrests	NA	997	NA	997
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	1	42	1	44

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not engage in the other activities referred to in this table. For example, a subgrantee may receive STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity is to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on arrests or incidents reports unless those activities were also supported by STOP Program funds.

Prosecution

Prosecution of offenders varies by state, although city or county officials in municipal or district courts usually handle misdemeanor offenses, and county prosecutors in superior courts generally handle felony offenses. After police arrest a suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to charge the offender and prosecute the case.

Table 28 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases during 2008.

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: **292** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 28. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and related cases by STOP Program funded prosecutors in 2008

Case	Cases disposed of	Dispositions resulting in convictions	
		Number	Percent
All cases	113,683	76,040	66.9
Misdemeanor domestic violence	69,978	44,486	63.6
Felony domestic violence	16,612	11,579	69.7
Violation of protection order	9,361	6,900	73.7
Domestic violence ordinance	5,989	3,693	61.7
Violation of probation/parole	3,513	3,323	94.6
Felony sexual assault	3,108	2,235	71.9

NOTE: Four tribal grantees referred 77 cases to a federal or state entity for prosecution. Detail does not add to total number of cases because not all categories of cases are shown.

Courts

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

Of the 16 courts (or court-based programs) that received STOP funding to conduct court activities,⁴³ 9 used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders' compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- ▶ **2,820** offenders were monitored
- ▶ **4,616** individual judicial review hearings were held

⁴³ Although 38 courts received STOP funding in 2008, only 16 of those courts used funds specifically for court activities. Other activities court subgrantees engaged in with STOP funding included training, CCR, policies, products, data/communication systems, security, and interpreters/translators/language lines.

The data in Table 29 reflect the consequences imposed by STOP Program-funded courts for violations of probation and other court orders in 2008. Overall, 41 percent of these violations resulted in partial or full revocation of probation.

- ▶ Number of subgrantees using funds for court: **16** (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 29. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2008⁴⁴

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 = 881)	441	50.1	138	15.7	5	.6	0	0	297	34
New criminal behavior (N = 101)	0	0	28	27.7	73	72.3	0	0	0	0
Failure to attend BIP (N = 188)	0	0	101	53.7	87	46.3	0	0	0	0
Other (N = 746)	52	7.0	522	70.0	70	9.4	70	9.4	32	4

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

Probation

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

The total number of continuing and new offenders supervised by STOP-funded probation staff during 2008 was 4,907; of those, 4,723 were being supervised for domestic violence or dating violence offenses, 175 for sexual assault offenses, and 9 for stalking offenses. These offenders received a total of 62,732 contacts, as shown

⁴⁴ The category "Failure to attend mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)" was not included in Table 29 because of a low *N* (32); 87.5 percent of the dispositions for this violation category were partial or full revocation.

in Table 30. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims/survivors as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. A total of 1,922 victims/survivors received 5,524 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2008.

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

Table 30. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008, by type and number of contacts

Type of contact	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	3,816	36,176
Telephone	2,503	17,464
Unscheduled surveillance	2,254	9,092

- ▶ Offenders completing probation without violations: **508** (53 percent of those completing probation)
- ▶ Offenders completing probation with violations: **459** (47 percent)

The data in Table 31 reflect the dispositions of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008. Offenders received partial or full revocation of their probation for violations of protection orders (67.6 percent), failure to attend batterer intervention programs (67.4 percent), failure to attend mandated offender treatment, not including BIPs (57.8 percent), or new criminal behavior (60.8 percent).

Table 31. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008

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 = 102)	2	2.0	69	67.6	16	15.7	0	0	15	14.7
New criminal behavior (N = 403)	9	2.2	245	60.8	27	6.7	22	5.5	100	24.8
Failure to attend BIP (N = 405)	18	4.4	273	67.4	93	23.0	21	5.2	0	0
Failure to attend offender treatment (N = 265)	28	10.5	153	57.8	37	14.0	19	7.2	0	0

Table 31. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2008

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
Other (N = 716)	99	13.8	400	55.9	87	12.2	23	3.2	107	14.9

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

Batterer Intervention Programs

- ▶ Number of individual subgrantees using STOP Program funds for batterer intervention programs (BIPs): **17** (1 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Total number of offenders in BIPs: **2,066**
 - ▶ Number of continuing offenders from last reporting period: **742**
 - ▶ Number of offenders entering during current reporting period: **1,324**

Table 32. Outcomes of participants in batterer intervention programs

Type of contact	Number of offenders
Completed program	665
Terminated from program	556
Returned to program after termination	107

References

- Allen, N. E., Bybee, D. I., & Sullivan, C. M. (2004). Battered women's multitude of needs: Evidence supporting the need for comprehensive advocacy. *Violence Against Women, 10*(9), 1015–1035. doi:10.1177/1077801204267658
- Anderson, M. (1993). A license to abuse: The impact of conditional status on female immigrants. *Yale Law Journal, 102*, 1401–1430.
- Beaulaurier, R. L., Seff, L. R., Newman, F. L., & Dunlop, B. (2007). External barriers to help seeking for older women who experience intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(8), 747–755. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9122-y
- Belknap, J., Graham, D., Hartman, J., Lippen, V., Allen, G., & Sutherland, J. (2000). *Factors related to domestic violence court dispositions in a large urban area: The role of victim/witness reluctance and other variables* (No. NCJ 184232). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bhuyan, R., Mell, M., Senturia, K., Sullivan, M., & Shiu-Thornton, S. (2005). "Women must endure according to their karma": Cambodian immigrant women talk about domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(8), 902–921. doi:10.1177/0886260505277675
- Bonomi, A., Anderson, M., Reid, R., Carrell, D., Fishman, P., Rivara, F., & Thompson, R. (2007). Intimate partner violence in older women. *The Gerontologist, 47*(1), 34–41.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2006). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 2005 statistical tables: National Crime Victimization Survey* (No. NCJ 215244). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Buzawa, E. S., Hotaling, G. T., Klein, A., & Byrne, J. (1999). *Response to domestic violence in a pro-active court setting* (No. NCJ 181427). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Camacho, C. M., & Alarid, L. F. (2008). The significance of the victim advocate for domestic violence victims in municipal court. *Violence and Victims, 23*(3), 288–300. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.3.288
- Campbell, D. W., Sharps, P. W., Gary, F., Campbell, J., & Lopez, L. M. (2002). Intimate partner violence in African American women. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 7*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nursingworld.org/>
- Campbell, R., Bybee, D., Ford, J., & Patterson, D. (2008). *Systems change analysis of SANE programs: Identifying the mediating mechanisms of criminal justice system impact* (No. NCJ 226497). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/226497.pdf>

- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichy, L. F. (2005). The effectiveness of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs: A review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*(4), 313–329. doi:10.1177/1524838005280328
- Casey, R., Berkman, M., Stover, C. S., Gill, K., Durso, S., & Marans, S. (2007). Preliminary results of a police-advocate home-visit intervention project for victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Psychological Trauma, 6*(1), 39–49. doi:10.1300/J513v06n01_04
- Committee on Law and Justice. (2001). *Crime victims with developmental disabilities: Report of a workshop*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Crandall, C. S., & Helitzer, D. (2003). *Impact evaluation of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program* (No. NCJ 203276). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Crowe, A., Sydney, L., DeMichele, M., Keilitz, S., Neal, C., Frohman, S., ... Thomas, M. (2009). *Community corrections response to domestic violence: Guidelines for practice*. Lexington, KY: American Probation & Parole Association.
- Davis, R., & Maxwell, C. (2002). *Preventing repeat incidents of family violence: A reanalysis of data from three field tests* (No. NCJ 200608). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Davis, R., & Taylor, B. (1997). A proactive response to family violence: The results of a randomized experiment. *Criminology, 35*(2), 307–333. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb00878.x
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2003). Do domestic violence services save lives? *National Institute of Justice Journal, 250*, 20–25.
- Eastman, B. J., Bunch, S. G., Williams, A. H., & Carawan, L. W. (2007). Exploring the perceptions of domestic violence service providers in rural localities. *Violence Against Women, 13*(7), 700–716. doi:10.1177/1077801207302047
- Elliott, L., Nerney, M., Jones, T., & Friedmann, P. (2002). Barriers to screening for domestic violence. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 17*(2), 112–116. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2002.10233.x
- Elman, R. A. (2005). Confronting the sexual abuse of women with disabilities. VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_SVDisability.pdf
- Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2004). Ethnic differences in intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population: The role of alcohol use and socioeconomic status. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*(4), 303–317. doi:10.1177/1524838004269488

- Fleury, R. E., Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D. I. (2000). When ending the relationship does not end the violence: Women's experiences of violence by former partners. *Violence Against Women, 6*(12), 1363–1383. doi:10.1177/10778010022183695
- Friday, P. C., Lord, V. B., Exum, M. L., & Hartman, J. L. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence police unit* (No. NCJ 215916). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and other unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 397–405. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9094-y
- Frye, V., Hoselin, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S., & Wilt, S. (2005). Femicide in New York City 1990 to 1999. *Homicide Studies, 9*(3), 204–228. doi:10.1177/1088767904274226
- Gallup-Black, A. (2005). Twenty years of rural and urban trends in family and intimate partner homicide: Does place matter? *Homicide Studies, 9*(2), 149–173. doi:10.1177/1088767904274158
- Ganeshpanchan, Z. (2005). Domestic and gender based violence among refugees and internally displaced women. Retrieved from <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/GaneshpanchanDomesticViolenceIDPS.pdf>
- Gondolf, E. W. (2000). Mandatory court review and batterer program compliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(4), 428–437. doi:10.1177/088626000015004006
- Gondolf, E. W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(6), 605–631.
- Gondolf, E. W., Fisher, E., & McFerron, J. (1990). The help-seeking behavior of battered women: An analysis of 6,000 shelter interviews. In E. Viano (Ed.), *The Victimology Handbook: Research Findings, Treatment and Public Policy* (pp. 113–127). New York, NY: Garland Publishing Company.
- Gordon, J. A., & Moriarty, L. J. (2003). The effects of domestic violence batterer treatment on domestic violence recidivism: The Chesterfield County experience. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 118–134. doi:10.1177/0093854802239166
- Grama, J. L. (2000). Women forgotten: Difficulties faced by rural victims of domestic violence. *American Journal of Family Law, 14*(3), 173–189.
- Greenfield, L. A., & Smith, S. K. (1999). *American Indians and crime* (No. NCJ 173386). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nara-wayback-001.us.archive.org/peth04/20041031201856/http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/aic.pdf>

- Hamberger, L. K., Guse, C., Boerger, J., Minsky, D., Pape, D., & Folsom, C. (2004). Evaluation of a health care provider training program to identify and help partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(1), 1–11. doi:10.1023/B:JOFV.0000011578.37769.c4
- Harrell, A., Castro, J., Newmark, L., & Visher, C. (2007). *Final report on the evaluation of the judicial oversight demonstration: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Harrell, A., Schaffer, M., DeStefano, C., & Castro, J. (2006). *The evaluation of Milwaukee's Judicial Oversight Demonstration, final research report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Hartley, C. C., & Frohmann, L. (2003). *Cook County Target Abuser Call (TAC): An evaluation of a specialized domestic violence court, revised executive summary* (No. NCJ 202944). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Hunnicut, G. (2007). Female status and infant and child homicide victimization in rural and urban counties in the U.S. *Gender Issues, 24*(3), 35–50. doi:10.1007/s12147-007-9046-0
- Jolin, A., Feyerherm, W., Fountain, R., & Friedman, S. (1998). *Beyond arrest: The Portland, Oregon Domestic Violence Experiment, final report* (No. NCJ 179968). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Keilitz, S. (2004). *Specialization of domestic violence case management in the courts: A national survey* (No. NCJ 199724). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Klein, A. (2004). *The criminal justice response to domestic violence*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Klein, A. (2006). *Enforcing domestic violence firearm prohibitions, a report on promising practices*. Washington, DC: Office on Violence Against Women & National Center on Full Faith and Credit.
- Klein, A., & Crowe, A. (2008). Findings from an outcome examination of Rhode Island's specialized domestic violence probation supervision program: Do specialized supervision programs of batterers reduce reabuse? *Violence Against Women, 14*(2), 226–246. doi:10.1177/1077801207312633
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). *An evaluation of Rhode Island's specialized supervision of domestic violence probationers*. Waltham, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corporation & American Probation and Parole Association.
- Klein, Andrew. (2005). *Rhode Island domestic violence shelter and advocacy services: An assessment*. Sudbury, MA: Advocates for Human Potential, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.rijustice.ri.gov/sac/Reports/Final%20ShelterEval%209-20-05.pdf>

- Klevens, J., Baker, C. K., Shelley, G. A., & Ingram, E. M. (2008). Exploring the links between components of coordinated community responses and their impact on contact with intimate partner violence services. *Violence Against Women, 14*(3), 346–358. doi:10.1177/1077801207313968
- Lee, M. R., & Stevenson, G. D. (2006). Gender-specific homicide offending in rural areas. *Homicide Studies, 10*(1), 55–73. doi:10.1177/1088767905283640
- Lee, R. K., Sanders Thompson, V. L., & Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Intimate partner violence and women of color: A call for innovations. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(4), 530–534.
- Lewis, S. H. (2003). *Unspoken crimes: Sexual assault in rural America*. Enola, PA: National Sexual Violence Resource Center. Retrieved from http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications_NSVRC_Booklets_Unspoken-Crimes-Sexual-Assault-in-Rural-America%20.pdf
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Cole, J., & Swanberg, J. (2007). Partner stalking and implications for women's employment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(3), 268–291. doi:10.1177/0886260506295380
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., & Walker, R. (2005). Protective orders in rural and urban areas: A multiple perspective study. *Violence Against Women, 11*(7), 876–911. doi:10.1177/1077801205276985
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Walker, R., & Faragher, T. (2006). Protective orders: Questions and conundrums. *Trauma, 7*, 174–205. doi:10.1177/1524838006288930
- Logan, T., & Walker, R. (2009). Civil protective order outcomes: Violations and perceptions of effectiveness. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(4), 675–692. doi:10.1177/0886260508317186
- Logan, T., Walker, R., Cole, J., Ratliff, S., & Leukefeld, C. (2003). Qualitative differences among rural and urban intimate violence victimization experiences and consequences: A pilot study. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(2), 83–92.
- Luna-Firebaugh, E. M., Lobo, S., Hailer, J., Barragan, D., Mortensen, M., & Pearson, D. (2002). *Impact evaluation of STOP grant program for reducing violence against women among Indian tribes, final report* (No. NCJRS 195174) (p. 320). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/195174.pdf>
- Martin, S. L., Ray, N., Sotres-Alvares, D., Kupper, L., Moracco, K., Dickens, P., ... Gizlice, Z. (2006). Physical and sexual assault of women with disabilities. *Violence Against Women, 12*(9), 823–837. doi:10.1177/1077801206292672
- McFarlane, J., Abeita, J., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 20*(1-2), 51–68. doi:10.1002/bsl.477

- McFarlane, J., & Malecha, A. (2005). *Sexual assault among intimates: Frequency, consequences and treatments* (No. NCJRS 211678). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Miller, N., & Nugent, H. (2002). *Stalking laws and implementation practices: A national review for policymakers and practitioners*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse.
- Mohandie, K., Meloy, J. R., McGowan, M. G., & Williams, J. (2006). The RECON typology of stalking: Reliability and validity based upon a large sample of North American stalkers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *51*(1), 147–155. doi:10.1111/j.1556-4029.2005.00030.x
- National Center on Elder Abuse. (2005). *Fact sheet: Elder abuse prevalence and incidence*. Washington, DC.
- Nosek, M. A., Foley, C. C., Hughes, R. B., & Howland, C. A. (2001). Vulnerabilities for abuse among women with disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability*, *19*(3), 177–189.
- Nosek, N., & Hughes, R. (2006). *Violence against women with disabilities, Fact sheet #1: Findings from Studies 1992-2002*. Houston, TX: Baylor College of Medicine, Center for Research on Women with Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www.bcm.edu/crowd/index.cfm?pmid=1409#pers>
- O'Dell, A. (2008). Why do police arrest victims of domestic violence? The need for comprehensive training and investigative protocols. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *15*(3), 53–73. doi:10.1080/10926770802097210
- Otto, J., & Quinn, K. (2007). *Barriers to and promising practices for collaboration between adult protective services and domestic violence programs*. Washington, DC: National Center on Elder Abuse. Retrieved from http://www.ncea.aoa.gov/ncearoot/main_site/pdf/BarrierstoPromisingPractices.pdf
- Paranjape, A., Tucker, A., McKenzie-Mack, L., Thompson, N., & Kaslow, N. (2007). Family violence and associated help-seeking behavior among older African American women. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *68*(2), 167–172. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2007.05.019
- Puffett, N. K., & Gavin, C. (2004). *Predictors of program outcome and recidivism at the Bronx misdemeanor domestic violence court*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.
- Raj, A., & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence against immigrant women: The roles of culture, context, and legal immigrant status on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, *8*(3), 367–398. doi:10.1177/10778010222183107
- Ramsey-Klawnsnik, H. (1991). Elder sexual abuse: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, *3*(3), 73–90. doi:10.1300/J084v03n03_04
- Rennison, C. (2001). *Violent victimization and race, 1993-98* (No. NCJ 176354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Roberts, K. A. (2005). Women's experience of violence during stalking by former romantic partners: Factors predictive of stalking violence. *Violence Against Women, 11*(1), 89–114. doi:10.1177/1077801204271096
- Ruback, R. B., & Ménard, K. S. (2001). Rural-Urban differences in sexual victimization and reporting: Analyses using UCR and crisis center data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*(2), 131–155. doi:10.1177/0093854801028002001
- Runner, M., Yoshihama, M., & Novick, S. (2009). *Intimate partner violence in immigrant and refugee communities: Challenges, promising practices and recommendations*. Family Violence Prevention Fund. Retrieved from http://www.endabuse.org/userfiles/file/ImmigrantWomen/IPV_Report_March_2009.pdf
- Salazar, L. F., Emshoff, J. G., Baker, C. K., & Crowley, T. (2007). Examining the behavior of a system: An outcome evaluation of a coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(7), 631–641. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9116-9
- Shepard, M. (1999). *Evaluating coordinated community responses to domestic violence*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_ccr.pdf
- Shepard, M., Falk, D., & Elliott, B. (2002). Enhancing coordinated community responses to reduce recidivism in cases of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(5), 551–569. doi:10.1177/0886260502017005005
- Shepard, M., & Pence, E. (1999). An introduction: Developing a coordinated community response. In E. Pence & M. Shepard (Eds.), *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond* (pp. 3–23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, B., Davis, R., Nickles, L., & Davies, H. (2001). *An evaluation of efforts to implement no-drop policies: Two central values in conflict, final report* (No. NCJ 187772). Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Smith, D. L. (2008). Disability, gender and intimate partner violence: Relationships from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Sexuality and Disability, 26*(1), 15–28. doi:10.1007/s11195-007-9064-6
- Spitzberg, B., & Cupach, W. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(1), 64–86. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2006.05.001
- Teaster, P. B., Roberto, K. A., Duke, J. O., & Kim, M. (2001). Sexual abuse of older adults: Preliminary findings of cases in Virginia. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect, 12*(3&4), 1–16. doi:10.1300/J084v12n03_01
- Thompson, R., Meyer, B. A., Smith-DiJulio, K., Caplow, M. P., Maiuro, R. D., Thompson, D. C., ... Rivara, F. P. (1998). A training program to improve domestic violence identification and management in primary care: Preliminary results. *Violence and Victims, 13*(4), 395–410.

- Thompson, R., Rivara, F., Thompson, D., Barlow, W., Sugg, N., Maiuro, R., & Rubanowice, D. (2000). Identification and management of domestic violence: A randomized trial. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 19(4), 253–263. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00231-2
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (No. NCJ 183781). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>
- Townsend, M., Hunt, D., Kuck, S., & Baxter, C. (2005). *Law enforcement response to domestic violence calls for service* (No. NCJ 215915). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/215915.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2011). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2012 (131st Edition)*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>

Appendix A 2008

Table A1: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2008⁴⁵

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						Total	ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC			
Alabama	66	38	12	14	2	0	873,045	632,435	698,530	179,327	863,939	3,247,276	403,297	
Alaska	15	9	2	2	2	0	189,143	89,491	190,508	34,200	0	503,342	41,379	
American Samoa	14	8	2	2	2	0	476,151	303,841	303,841	23,082	0	1,106,915	0	
Arizona	25	16	4	3	2	0	951,678	315,667	303,462	190,321	0	1,761,128	220,240	
Arkansas	44	5	13	18	-	8	295,769	229,983	403,353	0	218,858	1,147,963	0	
California	107	32	51	18	3	3	3,523,570	2,847,335	2,352,271	1,049,859	980,144	10,753,179	1,238,552	
Colorado	117	66	18	21	4	8	1,325,545	866,139	866,403	174,914	231,551	3,464,552	0	
Connecticut	9	4	2	1	2	0	534,497	195,098	352,735	109,944	0	1,192,274	0	
Delaware	15	7	5	1	2	0	348,600	193,667	193,667	80,407	0	816,341	40,772	
District of Columbia	8	3	1	1	1	2	204,165	83,225	168,054	33,611	126,446	615,501	26,924	
Florida	127	36	38	50	3	0	2,105,688	1,382,778	1,297,156	226,303	0	5,011,925	278,157	
Georgia	54	27	13	12	2	0	1,236,365	632,015	626,081	127,719	0	2,622,180	148,309	
Guam	15	8	2	2	2	1	173,702	144,752	144,752	28,950	86,852	579,008	51,551	
Hawaii	18	2	7	6	1	2	94,197	227,872	333,083	44,342	86,530	786,024	48,938	
Idaho	16	5	3	4	1	3	268,361	223,635	223,636	44,727	134,180	894,539	0	
Illinois	34	18	7	5	4	0	2,773,679	990,369	908,655	199,144	0	4,871,847	156,516	
Indiana	76	41	10	23	2	0	965,128	390,326	696,860	89,140	0	2,141,454	120,087	
Iowa	78	27	34	12	2	3	506,806	346,613	330,887	67,441	88,784	1,340,531	0	
Kansas	33	12	6	9	4	2	442,968	272,258	303,155	100,487	84,651	1,203,519	59,503	
Kentucky	42	13	9	12	4	4	631,224	444,152	414,454	140,639	254,105	1,884,574	97,006	
Louisiana	69	24	27	13	5	0	326,463	397,166	300,814	171,696	0	1,196,139	341,657	
Maine	26	11	8	7	-	0	323,333	231,103	167,357	0	0	721,793	72,832	
Maryland	101	43	19	15	5	19	543,065	385,223	438,011	110,109	274,194	1,750,602	155,678	
Massachusetts	72	31	29	8	1	3	683,236	586,193	545,480	106,418	319,256	2,240,583	0	
Michigan	372	92	94	94	92	0	1,337,441	795,574	850,028	174,351	0	3,157,394	171,653	
Minnesota	56	7	19	17	9	4	496,631	899,017	503,550	241,213	216,000	2,356,411	99,490	
Mississippi	47	21	16	10	-	0	552,499	435,312	454,378	0	0	1,442,189	0	
Missouri	59	32	12	8	6	1	856,082	500,566	530,566	185,869	46,268	2,119,351	103,582	

⁴⁵ Data in Table A1 are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2008.

Table A1. Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2008													
	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
Montana	22	10	3	5	1	3	276,697	175,518	188,203	40,000	33,315	713,733	92,674
Nebraska	51	11	12	13	4	11	275,241	257,714	255,592	59,825	147,355	995,727	80,000
Nevada	48	20	7	13	4	4	443,374	193,623	312,573	56,460	87,000	1,093,030	80,064
New Hampshire	25	11	5	8	1	0	353,627	261,803	257,948	50,000	0	923,378	54,845
New Jersey	58	25	14	17	1	1	1,060,589	790,866	772,919	126,191	60,000	2,810,565	0
New Mexico	45	21	16	2	3	3	330,125	254,625	14,921	53,220	108,777	761,668	0
New York	131	58	35	33	1	4	2,156,990	1,319,995	1,347,512	257,125	235,174	5,316,796	80,064
N. Mariana Islands	14	2	6	4	2	0	335,724	279,769	335,725	55,954	0	1,007,172	124,341
North Carolina	29	8	8	4	3	6	573,483	701,758	564,954	121,746	702,401	2,664,342	415,886
North Dakota	173	43	43	37	12	38	614,823	383,965	391,290	68,955	48,453	1,507,486	47,260
Ohio	118	36	28	26	8	20	1,101,010	910,643	602,473	175,161	310,753	3,100,040	-
Oklahoma	37	13	7	7	4	6	390,246	231,380	354,534	68,360	201,085	1,245,605	221,623
Oregon	59	38	9	9	3	0	641,867	460,626	418,329	131,914	0	1,652,736	0
Pennsylvania	288	98	94	94	2	0	1,725,929	866,394	866,394	185,548	0	3,644,265	0
Puerto Rico	24	15	2	2	2	3	559,563	498,655	336,734	51,637	101,151	1,547,740	175,083
Rhode Island	25	6	13	1	1	4	448,478	134,152	195,509	39,101	235,420	1,052,660	71,175
South Carolina	44	20	11	7	3	3	617,274	503,082	476,295	112,497	131,823	1,840,971	176,994
South Dakota	34	25	2	5	1	1	241,664	249,257	198,470	57,026	79,439	825,856	30,508
Tennessee	54	20	9	10	2	13	626,991	412,959	526,440	98,678	339,016	2,004,084	218,085
Texas	91	46	18	23	1	3	2,907,527	1,288,936	1,739,707	250,000	487,550	6,673,720	-
Utah	68	29	15	11	4	9	428,541	355,758	314,265	82,940	174,825	1,356,329	28,821
Vermont	32	11	9	11	1	0	321,079	207,450	249,846	38,245	0	816,620	0
Virgin Islands	16	7	4	2	1	2	295,972	367,935	294,650	29,748	40,000	1,028,305	136,729
Virginia	86	35	18	15	5	13	718,507	527,607	509,263	112,147	292,783	2,160,307	186,897
Washington	169	62	55	50	1	1	922,769	671,068	674,193	102,453	50,000	2,420,483	-
West Virginia	56	17	18	16	1	4	351,826	263,709	294,884	49,290	94,818	1,054,527	74,200
Wisconsin	56	26	15	11	4	0	929,890	540,372	556,803	114,001	0	2,141,066	0
Wyoming	111	51	21	13	2	24	482,905	420,829	321,768	8,000	211,664	1,445,166	73,593
TOTAL	3,679	1,402	960	837	241	239	43,171,742	28,572,253	28,273,921	6,530,435	8,184,560	114,732,911	6,164,901

Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2008

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Alabama	30	70	0	100
Alaska	22	73	5	100
American Samoa	50	50	0	100
Arizona	10	88	2	100
Arkansas	13	86	1	100
California	10	85	5	100
Colorado	42	56	2	100
Connecticut	37	63	0	100
Delaware	25	70	5	100
District of Columbia	42	58	0	100
Florida	21	77	2	100
Georgia	29	67	4	100
Guam	37	37	26	100
Hawaii	35	60	5	100
Idaho	35	55	10	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	45	50	5	100
Iowa	29	68	3	100
Kansas	16	79	5	100
Kentucky	20	77	3	100
Louisiana	31	50	19	100
Maine	42	58	0	100
Maryland	21	77	2	100
Massachusetts	20	78	2	100
Michigan	20	73	7	100
Minnesota	45	50	5	100
Mississippi	45	45	10	100
Missouri	18	80	2	100
Montana	13	78	9	100
Nebraska	13	84	3	100
Nevada	19	76	5	100
New Hampshire	25	65	10	100
New Jersey	40	60	0	100
New Mexico	38	52	10	100
New York	29	69	2	100
No.Mariana Islands	5	95	0	100
North Carolina	28	61	11	100
North Dakota	37	62	1	100
Ohio	1	99	0	100
Oklahoma	19	75	6	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100

Table A2. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2008

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Pennsylvania	35	60	5	100
Puerto Rico	10	88	2	100
Rhode Island	30	66	4	100
South Carolina	45	45	10	100
South Dakota	9	88	3	100
Tennessee	9	88	3	100
Texas	21	76	3	100
Utah	18	77	5	100
Vermont	20	75	5	100
Virgin Islands	16	81	3	100
Virginia	19	79	2	100
Washington	25	70	5	100
West Virginia	15	75	10	100
Wisconsin	55	43	2	100
Wyoming	14	74	12	100

Table A3. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific, community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2008⁴⁶

State	2008		
	Amounts awarded to victim services	Amount of victim services awards to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Alabama	873,045	280,000	32.1
Alaska	189,143	76,480	40.4
American Samoa	476,151	476,151	100
Arizona	951,678	34,988	3.7
Arkansas	295,769	54,154	18.3
California	3,523,570	1,144,419	32.5
Colorado	1,325,545	180,588	13.6
Connecticut	534,497	0	0
Delaware	348,600	46,073	13.2
District of Columbia	204,165	118,000	57.8
Florida	2,105,688	57,656	2.7
Georgia	1,236,365	364,665	29.5
Guam	173,702	173,702	100
Hawaii	163,880	156,130	95.3
Idaho	268,361	42,822	16.0
Illinois	2,773,679	2,121,040	76.5
Indiana	965,128	127,444	13.2
Iowa	506,806	43,135	8.5
Kansas	442,968	39,257	8.9
Kentucky	631,224	167,319	26.5
Louisiana	326,463	45,356	13.9
Maine	323,333	32,000	9.9
Maryland	543,065	278,788	51.3
Massachusetts	683,236	130,000	19.0
Michigan	1,337,441	95,000	7.1
Minnesota	496,631	140,000	28.2
Mississippi	552,499	39,050	7.1
Missouri	856,082	56,118	6.6
Montana	276,697	28,000	10.1
Nebraska	275,241	0	0
Nevada	443,374	35,300	8.0
New Hampshire	353,627	30,000	8.5
New Jersey	1,060,589	133,480	12.6

⁴⁶The STOP administrators in Connecticut, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Nebraska did not report awards to culturally-specific, community-based organizations.

Table A3. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific, community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2008⁴⁶

State	2008		
	Amounts awarded to victim services	Amount of victim services awards to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
New Mexico	330,125	110,458	33.5
New York	2,156,990	256,909	11.9
N. Mariana Islands	335,724	0	0
North Carolina	573,483	79,952	13.9
North Dakota	614,823	41,374	6.7
Ohio	1,101,010	13,440	1.2
Oklahoma	390,246	24,257	6.2
Oregon	641,867	63,967	10.0
Pennsylvania	1,725,929	122,321	7.1
Puerto Rico	559,563	200,740	35.9
Rhode Island	448,478	23,443	5.2
South Carolina	617,274	76,807	12.4
South Dakota	241,664	33,693	13.9
Tennessee	626,991	89,317	14.2
Texas	2,907,527	2,310,738	79.5
Utah	428,541	60,519	14.1
Vermont	321,079	22,727	7.1
Virgin Islands	295,972	295,972	100
Virginia	718,507	71,340	9.9
Washington	922,769	73,176	7.9
West Virginia	351,826	29,574	8.4
Wisconsin	929,890	375,322	40.4
Wyoming	482,905	19,652	4.1
TOTAL	43,171,742	11,142,813	25.8

Appendix B 2008

Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2008

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Alabama	20	6	4	4	4	7	4	14	6	6	0	0	0
Alaska	23	16	7	4	5	1	5	17	1	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	5	6	2	0	6	1	6	5	1	1	0	0	0
Arizona	23	12	6	3	1	4	2	18	2	3	1	2	0
Arkansas	21	3	2	2	0	14	1	11	8	3	0	0	0
California	167	69	17	19	5	41	7	130	18	15	0	7	0
Colorado	59	34	15	12	5	7	4	52	0	5	0	0	0
Connecticut	8	2	2	1	1	3	0	5	2	1	0	0	1
Delaware	15	7	3	4	7	6	1	12	0	1	1	1	0
District of Columbia	10	7	5	3	1	1	1	6	0	1	1	0	0
Florida	42	8	6	9	2	19	4	25	11	13	1	0	0
Georgia	51	27	17	17	6	14	14	33	7	6	0	0	0
Guam	9	6	0	4	1	2	2	5	1	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	12	10	2	3	2	9	4	5	2	1	0	0	0
Idaho	14	9	6	3	1	2	1	13	0	0	0	0	1
Illinois	13	9	1	3	1	4	1	22	5	5	0	4	0
Indiana	64	32	17	19	8	20	8	42	6	19	0	0	0
Iowa	63	30	13	6	10	31	6	25	25	10	0	0	0
Kansas	22	13	6	6	3	6	5	13	1	5	1	0	0
Kentucky	30	9	4	4	0	8	1	21	7	3	1	0	0
Louisiana	72	17	7	5	10	25	1	46	18	11	2	0	0
Maine	21	11	7	6	8	6	5	13	5	2	0	0	0
Maryland	59	23	19	5	7	14	9	42	4	3	0	0	0
Massachusetts	64	33	8	17	6	8	6	57	3	3	0	0	0
Michigan	48	29	12	8	10	8	7	46	2	4	0	0	0
Minnesota	29	20	16	8	5	2	9	10	1	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	37	2	1	1	0	0	0	21	10	6	0	0	0
Missouri	59	15	9	9	2	17	1	40	12	7	1	0	1

Table B1. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2008

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Montana	21	13	0	3	1	2	1	13	3	1	0	0	0
Nebraska	13	9	9	3	1	4	3	10	3	3	0	1	5
Nevada	29	12	9	7	3	5	3	27	0	1	0	0	0
New Hampshire	21	15	5	8	3	7	3	12	3	6	0	0	0
New Jersey	51	37	20	27	9	3	11	42	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	30	11	7	7	5	4	4	16	0	2	0	0	0
New York	111	67	40	42	21	27	14	90	11	18	1	3	2
North Carolina	6	4	3	2	2	3	1	4	2	0	1	0	0
North Dakota	35	11	9	1	8	3	4	31	1	0	0	0	2
Northern Mariana Islands	3	4	2	1	1	3	0	4	3	1	1	0	0
Ohio	89	34	17	12	13	31	10	66	17	12	0	0	0
Oklahoma	28	14	6	7	5	11	3	13	5	5	0	3	0
Oregon	56	18	5	9	2	2	8	50	0	2	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	50	42	26	19	7	29	7	45	27	35	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	11	4	1	2	1	2	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
Rhode Island	9	6	2	3	3	0	2	7	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	26	15	3	11	4	5	1	16	3	4	1	0	1
South Dakota	32	9	5	5	3	3	4	29	0	5	0	0	1
Tennessee	45	24	10	12	5	8	3	30	4	6	1	0	0
Texas	99	49	20	15	12	32	11	71	14	16	2	0	0
Utah	39	22	11	14	2	5	6	33	2	2	0	0	0
Vermont	8	8	4	1	0	7	1	8	4	5	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	7	4	0	3	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	2
Virginia	86	60	17	63	17	23	9	59	12	9	0	1	0
Washington	86	33	2	5	19	13	9	66	10	8	0	0	0
West Virginia	20	9	6	5	2	3	0	12	12	9	0	0	1
Wisconsin	31	20	12	9	4	8	9	13	3	4	0	0	0
Wyoming	41	12	6	3	3	3	6	41	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	2,143	1,031	471	484	273	529	248	1,570	298	292	16	22	17

Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2008

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	20	14	5,851	5,778	73	-	5,851	5,471	296	84
Alaska	25	17	1,971	1,797	30	144	1,827	1,493	278	56
American Samoa	7	5	1,216	1,216	-	-	1,216	1,003	213	-
Arizona	23	18	5,621	5,082	445	94	5,527	5,251	236	40
Arkansas	21	11	4,711	4,505	205	1	4,710	3,485	905	320
California	175	130	24,060	21,009	2,336	715	23,345	18,478	4,610	257
Colorado	60	52	16,088	15,192	332	564	15,524	13,083	2,247	194
Connecticut	8	5	5,201	5,201	-	-	5,201	4,763	438	-
Delaware	22	12	3,742	3,653	89	-	3,742	3,372	349	21
District of Columbia	10	6	1,559	826	64	669	890	725	160	5
Florida	42	25	18,878	17,615	1,081	182	18,696	16,905	1,501	290
Georgia	52	33	12,281	11,683	400	198	12,083	6,568	5,098	417
Guam	9	5	877	815	47	15	862	595	227	40
Hawaii	20	5	2,540	2,535	5	-	2,540	2,538	1	1
Idaho	15	13	2,835	2,463	26	346	2,489	2,204	210	75
Illinois	27	22	15,542	15,191	149	202	15,340	13,676	1,658	6
Indiana	66	42	11,621	10,877	541	203	11,418	10,329	901	188
Iowa	66	25	5,505	5,243	202	60	5,445	4,738	662	45
Kansas	22	13	6,196	6,189	7	-	6,196	5,737	288	171
Kentucky	30	21	8,081	7,980	60	41	8,040	7,622	379	39
Louisiana	81	46	22,161	21,725	317	119	22,042	18,998	2,849	195
Maine	28	13	2,634	1,888	596	150	2,484	2,180	295	9
Maryland	64	42	9,785	8,677	939	169	9,616	8,715	750	151
Massachusetts	64	57	12,024	10,639	1,281	104	11,920	10,805	1,047	68
Michigan	48	46	16,453	16,074	177	202	16,251	13,422	1,456	1,373
Minnesota	30	10	1,837	1,574	259	4	1,833	1,047	718	68
Mississippi	37	21	6,131	5,632	278	221	5,910	5,121	716	73
Missouri	59	40	11,906	10,831	838	237	11,669	9,519	1,239	911
Montana	22	13	2,844	2,844	-	-	2,844	2,169	386	289
Nebraska	13	10	4,305	4,182	115	8	4,297	3,667	421	209
Nevada	32	27	6,908	6,521	267	120	6,788	5,501	569	718

Table B2. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2008

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Hampshire	23	12	2,151	1,982	72	97	2,054	1,502	404	148
New Jersey	53	42	13,402	12,982	199	221	13,181	12,102	1,077	2
New Mexico	32	16	1,617	1,586	8	23	1,594	1,460	132	2
New York	111	90	28,147	24,216	2,714	1,217	26,930	23,412	3,414	104
North Carolina	7	4	2,340	2,337	3	-	2,340	2,225	15	100
North Dakota	40	31	1,586	1,556	25	5	1,581	1,322	244	15
Northern Mariana Islands	7	4	285	285	-	-	285	249	36	-
Ohio	90	66	27,428	26,717	570	141	27,287	24,753	1,761	773
Oklahoma	29	13	2,565	2,474	89	2	2,563	1,866	602	95
Oregon	56	50	7,706	7,404	214	88	7,618	6,144	1,300	174
Pennsylvania	50	45	21,175	20,192	611	372	20,803	16,425	4,021	357
Puerto Rico	12	9	4,849	4,848	1	-	4,849	4,773	22	54
Rhode Island	10	7	7,289	7,224	65	-	7,289	6,956	318	15
South Carolina	28	16	5,648	5,347	193	108	5,540	5,055	393	92
South Dakota	32	29	7,197	7,131	54	12	7,185	5,338	605	1,242
Tennessee	45	30	4,793	4,714	47	32	4,761	4,254	408	99
Texas	104	71	31,207	29,587	1,250	370	30,837	27,350	3,003	484
Utah	41	33	11,266	9,452	803	1,011	10,255	8,863	945	447
Vermont	9	8	2,592	2,587	5	-	2,592	1,984	575	33
Virgin Islands	8	4	493	491	-	2	491	461	16	14
Virginia	86	59	15,316	14,039	998	279	15,037	13,094	1,738	205
Washington	91	66	5,056	5,047	6	3	5,053	4,590	427	36
West Virginia	22	12	4,543	4,393	148	2	4,541	4,144	271	126
Wisconsin	35	13	5,750	5,545	165	40	5,710	2,738	2,845	127
Wyoming	42	41	4,773	4,751	11	11	4,762	3,764	431	567
TOTAL	2,261	1,570	470,538	442,324	19,410	8,804	461,734	394,004	56,106	11,624

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Alabama	2,042	19	21	8	194	3,397	246	4,865	354	632	146	985	3,285	145	1,290
Alaska	42	1,090	86	44	149	400	30	1,671	150	6	181	352	1,143	50	101
American Samoa	0	-	0	1,216	0	-	0	1,020	93	103	172	395	396	150	103
Arizona	278	296	46	16	2,560	1,922	409	4,912	605	10	205	945	3,510	304	563
Arkansas	1,683	7	29	1	101	2,770	119	3,836	759	115	527	1,125	2,804	125	129
California	2,768	663	556	236	6,136	4,687	8,327	14,781	2,049	6,515	1,239	4,194	9,629	382	7,901
Colorado	724	358	130	29	3,963	7,810	2,545	13,466	1,650	408	1,208	2,733	7,566	446	3,571
Connecticut	1,672	2	23	2	1,998	1,374	130	4,199	981	21	268	1,155	3,535	166	77
Delaware	903	11	28	1	422	2,252	125	3,391	303	48	127	636	2,583	100	296
District of Columbia	386	-	9	-	365	61	69	845	44	1	25	238	507	21	99
Florida	4,120	28	148	40	3,061	9,441	1,865	15,544	2,435	717	457	4,165	12,141	561	1,372
Georgia	3,534	8	295	3	1,195	4,408	2,685	8,671	1,199	2,213	1,372	2,393	4,772	392	3,154
Guam	8	1	124	659	4	41	25	710	138	14	246	188	378	21	29
Hawaii	2	1	54	99	7	42	2,335	2,540	-	0	1	75	115	6	2,343
Idaho	26	59	21	-	540	1,760	109	2,270	184	35	227	651	1,453	140	18
Illinois	5,330	64	210	487	2,719	6,144	715	14,344	952	44	898	3,915	9,780	326	421
Indiana	2,436	35	103	9	1,250	6,749	867	10,759	629	30	678	2,903	6,717	358	762
Iowa	545	90	34	28	1,219	3,406	176	5,065	346	34	266	1,320	3,327	65	467
Kansas	940	57	68	11	990	3,473	657	5,157	852	187	141	1,567	3,117	446	925
Kentucky	1,166	43	40	4	391	6,151	245	7,292	722	26	401	1,884	5,153	212	390
Louisiana	7,431	56	97	97	312	9,563	4,570	16,041	1,751	4,250	1,159	4,463	10,982	444	4,994
Maine	88	17	16	5	49	2,212	97	2,347	137	0	248	561	1,567	60	48
Maryland	3,514	13	94	12	1,459	3,911	743	8,671	934	11	164	2,541	6,171	297	443

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008

State	Race/ethnicity								Gender			Age				
	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown	
Massachusetts	1,309	22	367	69	3,152	6,329	836	10,944	848	128	623	2,489	8,151	448	209	
Michigan	4,950	132	58	95	727	9,378	1,001	14,885	1,025	341	733	3,259	10,900	388	971	
Minnesota	156	652	13	198	228	448	138	1,675	98	60	188	531	922	55	137	
Mississippi	2,275	68	136	132	106	2,256	937	5,021	224	665	475	1,311	2,753	409	962	
Missouri	2,983	47	66	20	351	7,540	712	11,061	605	3	304	2,583	7,586	292	904	
Montana	40	518	58	10	48	2,041	129	2,582	262	-	223	1,220	1,366	29	6	
Nebraska	255	121	34	12	568	2,920	387	3,888	364	45	453	1,227	2,300	57	260	
Nevada	561	212	132	76	1,965	3,502	340	5,818	801	169	331	1,500	4,164	260	533	
New Hampshire	102	5	31	-	125	1,648	149	1,339	663	52	196	504	1,184	62	108	
New Jersey	3,014	21	533	19	2,620	6,263	716	11,855	1,111	215	362	2,508	8,702	697	912	
New Mexico	15	95	7	-	1,215	233	29	1,470	114	10	64	270	1,190	37	33	
New York	6,229	229	1,025	55	4,020	13,956	1,614	24,242	2,557	131	1,871	5,301	15,423	1,114	3,221	
North Carolina	743	1	42	11	155	696	692	2,046	276	18	26	387	1,105	116	706	
North Dakota	41	372	10	3	60	994	106	1,457	114	10	84	463	959	32	43	
N. Mariana Islands	-	-	85	197	-	3	-	250	35	-	10	59	206	7	3	
Ohio	6,945	27	157	143	969	15,191	3,899	25,627	1,407	253	893	6,436	16,969	452	2,537	
Oklahoma	255	274	21	25	250	1,730	64	2,395	138	30	182	526	1,735	75	45	
Oregon	140	206	73	31	1,162	5,158	852	6,780	668	170	312	1,457	5,157	229	463	
Pennsylvania	2,913	30	318	66	1,914	13,677	1,885	19,782	966	55	775	4,637	12,921	931	1,539	
Puerto Rico	1	-	-	-	4,796	52	-	4,715	134	-	86	1,087	3,349	148	179	
Rhode Island	746	46	78	-	987	4,911	521	6,257	847	185	431	3,039	3,482	297	40	
South Carolina	1,537	18	26	1	229	3,193	537	5,112	426	2	79	1,006	3,979	84	392	
South Dakota	157	2,560	79	7	109	4,151	148	6,070	1,062	53	389	1,421	5,021	149	205	
Tennessee	902	23	26	21	362	3,372	81	4,527	224	10	97	965	3,517	93	89	

Table B3. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Texas	6,447	139	329	15	12,728	9,907	1,490	27,351	2,589	897	1,168	7,681	20,096	667	1,225
Utah	244	248	141	78	2,293	6,609	654	9,592	648	15	574	2,527	6,604	218	332
Vermont	25	17	8	4	23	1,513	1,007	2,371	202	19	170	497	1,037	44	844
Virgin Islands	312	1	2	10	136	30	-	383	108	-	166	115	206	4	-
Virginia	4,100	45	339	33	1,254	8,610	695	13,251	1,449	337	555	3,185	9,943	443	911
Washington	261	188	178	91	1,053	3,282	-	5,053	-	-	54	1,425	3,359	214	1
West Virginia	249	7	9	5	23	4,056	192	4,125	371	45	271	724	2,420	110	1,016
Wisconsin	626	133	1,304	6	1,167	2,148	331	5,096	426	188	443	944	2,881	250	1,192
Wyoming	82	200	28	30	536	3,795	110	4,305	375	82	276	1,158	3,109	210	9
TOTAL	88,253	9,575	7,945	4,470	74,415	231,566	47,341	403,722	38,404	19,608	23,220	101,826	273,327	13,838	49,523

Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	152	86	22	1,627
Alaska	225	235	122	1,438
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Arizona	255	1,165	451	1,999
Arkansas	80	35	9	818
California	862	1,736	418	1,708
Colorado	1,072	1,555	803	5,961
Connecticut	233	572	36	116
Delaware	118	245	182	1,288
District of Columbia	54	421	392	0
Florida	267	2,275	1,958	2,052
Georgia	263	898	1,028	3,367
Guam	0	3	0	77
Hawaii	12	31	21	146
Idaho	218	331	266	1,646
Illinois	1,383	1,863	65	1,930
Indiana	521	997	681	2,422
Iowa	229	976	968	3,925
Kansas	178	839	256	2,358
Kentucky	559	426	386	3,729
Louisiana	1,874	211	79	8,353
Maine	247	88	63	1,708
Maryland	343	1,215	792	2,633
Massachusetts	921	1,909	906	915
Michigan	873	261	40	3,536
Minnesota	113	119	122	990
Mississippi	145	45	20	1,240
Missouri	948	283	189	5,225
Montana	462	0	6	0
Nebraska	223	301	413	1,711
Nevada	299	1,298	772	1,993
New Hampshire	103	76	61	193
New Jersey	408	1,377	710	262
New Mexico	115	654	674	882
New York	1,443	2,401	2,503	5,590
North Carolina	174	114	75	15
North Dakota	159	15	9	669
Northern Mariana Islands	5	27	42	73

Table B4. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2008

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Ohio	1,213	610	306	5,542
Oklahoma	107	153	112	1,478
Oregon	464	860	509	3,916
Pennsylvania	1,862	984	579	6,886
Puerto Rico	159	3	210	663
Rhode Island	10	356	30	0
South Carolina	182	186	69	3,043
South Dakota	310	57	17	2,859
Tennessee	467	279	297	2,023
Texas	1,213	4,091	2,194	5,978
Utah	389	1,627	1,149	2,770
Vermont	233	13	11	1,809
Virgin Islands	3	83	61	52
Virginia	779	870	630	4,062
Washington	389	323	120	1,758
West Virginia	409	46	9	1,719
Wisconsin	307	1,675	1,266	570
Wyoming	360	163	62	1,962
TOTAL	24,392	37,462	23,171	119,685

Table B5. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2008

State	<i>Current/ former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
Alabama	2,941	552	521	182	111	1,573
Alaska	1,285	322	81	135	22	54
American Samoa	244	284	206	263	219	-
Arizona	4,000	822	397	147	71	267
Arkansas	2,509	1,178	560	82	34	396
California	15,985	889	1,976	1,588	725	2,301
Colorado	9,719	1,230	1,636	631	186	2,341
Connecticut	3,169	1,027	620	171	46	168
Delaware	3,018	220	21	147	47	328
District of Columbia	707	18	37	66	8	58
Florida	11,533	1,641	1,048	333	92	4,261
Georgia	5,334	1,298	1,177	1,453	471	2,713
Guam	380	136	57	207	40	42
Hawaii	228	1	15	-	-	2,296
Idaho	2,191	568	625	257	116	47
Illinois	7,551	1,643	4,873	533	252	685
Indiana	8,203	763	1,823	465	131	460
Iowa	4,127	404	461	302	69	202
Kansas	4,767	395	343	151	49	548
Kentucky	4,929	1,094	1,397	92	34	558
Louisiana	9,377	2,367	2,730	844	277	7,429
Maine	1,992	131	229	95	16	92
Maryland	7,193	291	1,088	254	76	759
Massachusetts	6,705	1,477	3,396	210	88	479
Michigan	11,643	803	3,024	1,005	159	885
Minnesota	826	360	82	237	214	117
Mississippi	3,796	664	774	334	63	314
Missouri	7,517	1,181	1,514	896	258	873
Montana	2,109	366	27	212	80	110
Nebraska	1,958	584	900	145	50	660
Nevada	4,277	828	1,088	320	139	367
New Hampshire	1,115	300	322	233	33	80
New Jersey	8,420	1,007	2,426	278	169	1,014
New Mexico	1,254	75	98	94	30	44
New York	16,500	3,379	3,907	1,457	588	1,537
North Carolina	292	77	404	33	71	1,470

Table B5. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2008

State	<i>Current/ former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
North Dakota	1,144	138	90	149	26	40
N. Mariana Islands	196	46	11	2	30	-
Ohio	18,648	2,169	1,993	957	246	3,848
Oklahoma	1,881	509	509	310	293	301
Oregon	4,971	701	571	362	95	1,047
Pennsylvania	14,024	2,676	2,155	1,435	441	810
Puerto Rico	4,916	4	52	45	10	51
Rhode Island	1,498	328	202	210	42	5,056
South Carolina	4,604	196	578	145	28	83
South Dakota	4,021	459	663	212	31	2,168
Tennessee	3,505	544	584	138	65	94
Texas	21,649	4,172	4,044	1,168	233	1,652
Utah	7,409	1,069	911	544	126	370
Vermont	1,803	211	267	158	47	285
Virgin Islands	353	112	14	8	3	1
Virginia	10,974	1,637	1,312	638	195	701
Washington	3,658	618	588	145	39	6
West Virginia	2,769	614	982	166	18	118
Wisconsin	2,572	970	868	697	201	647
Wyoming	2,694	477	725	427	90	385
TOTAL	291,083	46,025	57,002	21,768	7,293	53,191