



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**

2014 Report

Part A

Contents

Contents	i
List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgments.....	vii
Executive Summary.....	ix
Introduction	1
Background	3
Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program.....	3
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds	7
Eligibility Requirements	8
Reporting Requirements	9
Reporting Methods	10
STOP Program 2011 and 2012: 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	13
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed	15
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds.....	16
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects	17
Effectiveness of the STOP Program	19
The Criminal Justice Response	19
Law Enforcement.....	19
Prosecution.....	24
Courts.....	27
Probation	31
Victim Services	36
Underserved Populations.....	40
American Indians and Alaska Natives.....	42
Victims with Disabilities and Older Victims	46
Victims Who Are Immigrants or Refugees	51
Victims Who Live in Rural Areas.....	53
Sexual Assault.....	56
Stalking	61
Coordinated Community Response	64
Training.....	70
Remaining Areas of Need.....	74

Conclusion	79
STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments	81
Training.....	82
Coordinated Community Response	83
Policies.....	85
Products	87
Data Collection and Communication Systems	87
Specialized Units.....	88
System Improvement	89
Victim Services	90
Demographics of Victims Served.....	92
Types of Services Provided to Victims.....	95
Protection Orders.....	96
Criminal Justice.....	96
Law Enforcement.....	97
Prosecution.....	98
Courts.....	99
Probation	102
Batterer Intervention Program.....	104
References	105
Appendix A 2011	117
Appendix B 2011	125
Appendix A 2012	137
Appendix B 2012	145

List of Tables

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2011	12
Table 1b. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2012	12
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012	15
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012	16
Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2011 and 2012	17
Table 5. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2011 and 2012.....	31
Table 6. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2011 and 2012.....	35
Table 7. Victims receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2011 and 2012	38
Table 8. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2011 and 2012.....	70
Table 9. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012.....	74
Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2011 and 2012	81
Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012.....	82
Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2011.....	84
Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2012.....	85
Table 13a. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2011	86
Table 13b. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2012	86
Table 14. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2011 and 2012	88
Table 15. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2011 and 2012	88
Table 16a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2011	89

Table 16b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2012 89

Table 17a. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2011 89

Table 17b. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2012 89

Table 18a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2011 90

Table 18b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2012 90

Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011, by level of service and type of victimization..... 91

Table 19b. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2012, by level of service and type of victimization..... 91

Table 20. Victims receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012, by type of victimization..... 92

Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees..... 92

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012..... 93

Table 23a. Relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds in 2011 94

Table 23b. Relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds in 2012 94

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012 95

Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2011 and 2012 96

Table 26a. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2011 97

Table 26b. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2012 98

Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, stalking and related cases by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2011 and 2012 99

Table 28a. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2011 101

Table 28b. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2012 101

Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2011 and 2012, by type and number of contacts..... 102

Table 30a. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2011 103

Table 30b. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2012	104
Table 31. Outcomes for offenders in STOP-funded BIP programs in 2011 and 2012	104
Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2011	118
Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2011	120
Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2011	122
Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011	127
Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011	129
Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011	131
Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011	133
Table B5a. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2011.....	135
Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2012.....	139
Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2012.....	141
Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2012	143
Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2012	147
Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2012	149
Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012	151
Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012	153
Table B5b. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2012.....	155

Acknowledgments

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) gratefully acknowledges the work of the staff of the Violence Against Women Act 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 Program-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 of violence.

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

Executive Summary

Background

Congress first enacted the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994 to improve the national criminal justice response to violence against women, ensure services for victims, and create informed policy on the issue. Reauthorized in 2000, 2005, and 2013, VAWA articulates the Congress's commitment to effective strategies for preventing and responding to domestic and sexual violence, holding offenders accountable, and ensuring safety, autonomy, and justice for victims.¹

Programs and policies authorized by VAWA and subsequent legislation address sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.² They promote a coordinated community response to these crimes in which law enforcement, victim services organizations, prosecutors, courts, and others work together in a seamless, systemic way.

The STOP grant has allowed me to be in the courtroom to help women who are in very stressful situations, to make sure the victims' voices are heard in the judicial process, [and] to make sure victims of domestic assault in our community know where to get help if and when they need it.

—Court advocate, Family Resource Agency, Inc., TN

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers **19** discretionary and **3** formula grant programs that provide funding to criminal justice agencies, victim services organizations, and other entities that address domestic and sexual violence. This Executive Summary highlights the activities and accomplishments of the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Program (STOP Program) subgrantees in their efforts to help victims, families, and communities recover from the destructive and pervasive effects of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The full STOP Program 2014 Report to Congress (2014 STOP Report) includes detailed descriptions of subgrantees' aggregate accomplishments and data on their work spanning the 2-year report period. This summary and the full report include examples, many in the words of

¹ The term "victim" is used in this summary instead of "survivor" to emphasize that violence and abuse are criminal in nature and to account for victims who survive violence and those who do not.

² Sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking all predominately victimize women, and the STOP Program has a focus on women. However, VAWA programs and policies are designed to serve all victims of these crimes, including men.

state administrators and subgrantees, of the ways in which they are using VAWA funds to assist victims and improve the justice system response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

During Fiscal Years³ 2011 and 2012, OVW awarded a total of **\$269,532,798** to states and territories under the STOP Program; during calendar years 2011 and 2012, states and territories in turn subawarded a total of **\$255,203,456** to an annual average of **2,403⁴*** subgrantees. These subgrantees included **1,128*** victim services agencies and organizations (sexual assault, domestic violence, and dual programs, including tribal), **115*** state or tribal coalitions, **358*** law enforcement departments, **408*** prosecutors' offices, **54*** courts, and **341*** other organizations and agencies.⁵

OVW requires each state and territory applying for STOP Program funds to submit a plan describing how the state will recognize and address the needs of underserved populations and ensure equitable distribution of funds among those populations. This requirement, and the STOP statute, recognize the disproportionate rates at which these crimes may affect underserved and vulnerable populations, including underserved racial and ethnic populations, persons underserved because of age, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.

Scope and Impact of Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking

OVW relies on current national data and empirical research to inform its understanding of the scope and nature of domestic and sexual violence in the United States. National surveys administered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) measure the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and some of the adverse outcomes associated with those crimes. National data and research findings, taken with numerical and narrative information that OVW grantees report about the victims they serve and the services they provide, paint a picture of a persistent criminal justice and public health crisis for which solutions—however innovative and effective—are in limited supply.

³ References throughout this document to “fiscal year” are for the federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30).

⁴ Throughout this Executive Summary, figures with asterisks represent annual averages.

⁵ Other agencies and organizations include community-based organizations, units of government and government agencies (including tribal), corrections, universities and schools, and legal services providers.

OVW uses primarily two national measures of incidence and prevalence to estimate the extent of domestic and sexual violence. Because one is health-based and the other is criminal justice-based, these surveys generate different data on rates of violence. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) is an ongoing telephone survey that collects information from people 18 and older about their experiences of sexual violence, domestic and dating violence, and stalking. The NISVS makes national and state-level data



available simultaneously and contributes to an understanding of the impact of violence and abuse on distinct populations. Whereas the NISVS takes a public health approach to measuring incidence and prevalence, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) represents a criminal justice perspective. Through household telephone surveys, the NCVS collects information on nonfatal crimes, including those reported and not reported to law enforcement, against people 12 and older.

Other national data sets, such as the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), which the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) uses to publish statistics on crimes known to law enforcement, and the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), which monitors behaviors that contribute to violence among youth, are also used to further understand the extent to which sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking affect millions of people in the United States and the considerable impact of these crimes on communities.

Finally, OVW uses the findings of studies funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and other federal agencies to further inform its grant-making. These studies describe the dynamics and impact of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, including perpetrator behavior and characteristics, physical and mental health outcomes among victims and their children, criminal justice processes and outcomes, and the effectiveness of system- and community-based interventions to prevent and respond to these crimes and hold offenders accountable.

Effectiveness of STOP Formula Program Funding

STOP Program grants are critical to addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. They funded an average of **2,786 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff during each calendar year**, including governmental and non-governmental victim advocates, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, sexual assault nurse examiners (SANEs), and program coordinators and administrative staff. STOP Program funds are used primarily to provide victim services, training, and dedicated personnel in law enforcement and prosecution for responding effectively to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. States may use funding to enhance existing programs and services and to fill gaps in services.

Grants are awarded to all states and territories according to a statutorily determined, population-based formula. Every state and territory receives a base amount of \$600,000 and then an additional amount based on population. Each award received by states and territories must be allocated by them to the following categories: for victim services (30 percent, of which at least 10 percent must be awarded to culturally-specific, community based organizations), law enforcement (25 percent), prosecution (25 percent), and courts (5 percent), with the remainder to be allocated at the discretion of the state administering agency, within the program purpose areas.

STOP funds provide specialized violence against women training to advocates, law enforcement, prosecutors, emergency services personnel, court personnel, legal aid staff, medical professionals, mental health professionals, and social service agencies. STOP funds have also supported the development of both a domestic violence benchbook and a sexual assault/stalking benchbook for all magistrates and judges in the state. STOP funds have also provided sexual assault kits and stalking kits to law enforcement agencies.

—STOP administrator (WV)

Criminal Justice Response

Over the past 20 years, VAWA funding has transformed how criminal justice systems in many communities respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Some of the innovations funded by VAWA are law enforcement collaboration with victim services providers and healthcare professionals; use of evidence-based lethality assessments to curb domestic violence-related homicides; improved forensic medical examinations for sexual assault victims; enhanced training opportunities for law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges; investigation and prosecution policies and practices that focus on the offender and account for the effects of trauma on victims;

specialized law enforcement and prosecution units; specialized courts and dockets; and enhanced offender monitoring strategies.

Snapshots of the impact of STOP Program funds on criminal justice systems

- ✦ Domestic violence case managers with the Jackson, Tennessee Police Department conduct lethality assessments with victims who work with them, to evaluate the existing and ongoing risk to the victim. This often makes the victim more determined to follow through with prosecution and offers the opportunity for more safety planning.
- ✦ The STOP Program-funded Special Prosecutor's position in the Madison County (Iowa) Attorney's Office has led to the elimination of deferred prosecutions in simple misdemeanor domestic abuse assault charges. Securing these convictions means that repeat offenders are held more accountable because their subsequent offenses are enhanced to a more serious/severe level.
- ✦ Santa Rosa (Florida) County's STOP-funded specialized domestic violence injunction court has a system for the review, violation, and pick up of those ordered to batterers' intervention (BIP) or other court-ordered treatment when they are not complying. This has resulted in a much better BIP completion rate by respondents, compared to counties without a similar system.
- ✦ In Clark County, Nevada, STOP funding is used for a court access project that is available to assist victims 24 hours a day, 7 days a week in an extremely rural area. Victims are informed about their rights, how to exercise those rights, the types of relief that are available through the civil and criminal court systems, and the availability of safe housing and other safety measures.

Grantee and subgrantee reports demonstrate that VAWA-funded criminal justice solutions are evolving alongside the changing dynamics of violence and victimization and are used to address sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking as they intersect with the use of technology by perpetrators and advances in forensic science.

In the 2 years covered by this report, STOP Program subgrantees reported the following accomplishments in criminal cases:

- ✦ Law enforcement made **61,486** arrests for sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking and **6,569** arrests for protection order violations.

- ✘ Prosecutors disposed of **187,084** cases, of which **70 percent**⁶ resulted in convictions.
- ✘ Courts monitored an average of **6,577*** offenders for compliance with court-ordered conditions at **31,532** individual review hearings.
- ✘ Probation agencies supervised an average of **7,392*** offenders and conducted **138,090** monitoring activities.
- ✘ Supervised offenders who violated protection orders had their probation partially or fully revoked **81 percent** of the time.

Services for Victims and Families

VAWA grant funds are used to provide services to victims and their families as they cope with the immediate and long-term impact of violence in their lives. These services help victims stay safe and establish independence after leaving an abusive relationship, and they connect victims with resources to support their recovery and, if they choose, their pursuit of justice. Direct services funded under the STOP Program include:

- ✘ **Crisis intervention and victim advocacy** to help victims deal with their immediate needs after being victimized, find resources, and plan for safety in the aftermath of violence;
- ✘ **Legal advocacy and representation** in civil and criminal matters, which help victims navigate the legal system and obtain favorable outcomes in their cases;
- ✘ Assistance with **obtaining orders of protection**, which are one of the most frequently sought legal remedies for domestic violence victims and have been shown to reduce further violence and improve quality of life for victims; and
- ✘ **Shelter and transitional housing** for victims fleeing abuse, with accompanying services to help them find employment and permanent housing for themselves and their children.

STOP Program subgrantees provided more than over **1.75 million (1,756,963)** services to victims in the 2 years covered by this report. On average, they provided services to **526,819*** individuals each year, including **431,244 *** primary victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The services that subgrantees provided to victims and family members most often were:

⁶ This percentage includes cases of deferred adjudication, which represented 18 percent of all conviction outcomes.

- × Housing bed nights—
1,898,003
- × Hotline calls—
1,215,428
- × Victim advocacy—
451,946
- × Crisis intervention—
393,412
- × Criminal justice
advocacy—**302,534**
- × Civil legal advocacy—
226,630

The satellite area is a proud community and reluctant to seek help from outside their area. They pride themselves on their ability to care for members of their community. The lack of transportation within the area makes it more difficult for persons to access services if we were unable to maintain an office within their community. The grant allows us to provide counseling and advocacy services to sexual assault victims in our Satellite Area.

—A Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Service, Illinois

Coordinated Community Response

One of the original statutory purposes of the STOP Program was to “support statewide, formal and informal multidisciplinary efforts, to coordinate the response of 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, dating violence, and stalking” (42 U.S.C. § 3796gg(b)). Like other VAWA-funded grantees, STOP subgrantees work in meaningful ways with community partners to ensure an effective, coordinated response to these crimes.

Multidisciplinary teams shape local approaches for preventing and responding to violence and abuse, provide cross-disciplinary training so each member understands the others’ roles, facilitate referrals, and assess gaps

Multidisciplinary meetings with prosecutors, detectives, SANEs, and crisis counselors are scheduled regularly for case reviews so that information about the progress of each case can be shared with counselors who may be providing services to the victim. . . . Since the SANE Program began, the number of sexual assault cases entering the criminal justice system has exceeded the number for any given year in the history of this county.

**—Lexington-Fayette Urban County
Government Division of Police, Kentucky**

and weaknesses in the community’s response. An example of a coordinated community response often funded by the STOP Program is the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART). SARTs are designed to meet victims’ needs, improve investigation and prosecution, and foster accountability for each system involved. Another example is domestic violence fatality review teams, which determine what led

to a domestic violence homicide and identify system deficiencies in the

process. STOP administrators and subgrantees report that collaboration with community partners improves the quality of services and the effectiveness of the justice system response.

The following agencies and organizations met regularly with STOP Program subgrantees to address systems-level issues related to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and/or stalking:⁷

- × Domestic violence organizations
- × Law enforcement agencies
- × Prosecution offices
- × Sexual assault organizations
- × Courts
- × Social service organizations
- × Health/mental health organizations
- × Corrections

Services for and Response to Underserved and Other Vulnerable Populations

Victims' experiences and a growing body of research confirm that certain populations are victimized by violence and abuse—and report it—at different rates. These populations may also have less favorable experiences with the criminal justice system when they report. The ways that victims experience, resist, and survive violence can be shaped by a host of cultural, social, and economic factors.

Thus, funds authorized by Congress through VAWA are used to address unique challenges that people from underserved and marginalized populations face when they are victimized. STOP state administrators are required to direct at least 10 percent of the funds awarded for victim services to culturally-specific, community-based organizations. Altogether, states and territories allocated **23.9** percent and **20** percent

STOP funding has increased our ability to reach out to the local Hispanic/Latina community, by allowing the YWCA to hire a bilingual domestic violence advocate, create bilingual forms for internal use and translate Spanish materials for community outreach. . . . As a result more Hispanic women and children have received comprehensive shelter and other services from the YWCA than would ever have been possible before STOP funding.

—YWCA North Central Indiana

⁷ The most frequently reported types of partner agencies/organizations are presented.

to these organizations, respectively, in 2011 and 2012.

Each year, STOP subgrantees served the following numbers of primary victims who are

- ✦ American Indian or Alaska Native—**7,636***
- ✦ Black or African American—**86,892***
- ✦ Hispanic or Latino—**72,862***
- ✦ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander—**1,522***
- ✦ Immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers—**21,993***
- ✦ Residents of rural areas—**112,973***
- ✦ People with disabilities—**26,131***
- ✦ People with limited English proficiency—**36,209***
- ✦ Youth and young adults (ages 13 to 24)—**18,417***
- ✦ Elderly adults 60 or older—**16,828***

Training of Professionals

Victims have contact with a range of professionals, including law enforcement, prosecutors, court personnel, health and mental health professionals, and others. Victims' experiences with these people can have a profound effect on their recovery and their willingness to assist the criminal justice system. Whether it is a police officer responding to a call, a forensic nurse conducting a sexual assault medical forensic exam, or a judge hearing a case that involves a history of domestic violence, it is critical that each person respond appropriately, make informed decisions, and prevent further harm. Ongoing training plays a crucial role in equipping people to respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. One of the primary and original purposes of the STOP Program is to provide training to law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence. That training since expanded to include a broad range of professionals who work directly with victims, or who encounter victims in their work.

The trainings provided to social service agencies can also lead to more referrals to our program as many members of the E. St. Louis community are connected with at least one social service agency. This funding allows us to continue services in a very impoverished community that would not otherwise have services for victims of sexual assault.

—Call for Help, Inc. (MO)

During the 2-year period covered by the report, STOP subgrantees used funds to train a total of **439,207** service providers, criminal justice personnel, and other professionals to improve their response to victims. People trained included the following:

- ✗ Law enforcement officers—**124,634**
- ✗ Victim advocates⁸—**53,783**
- ✗ Health/mental health professionals, including forensic nurse examiners—**49,228**
- ✗ Court personnel⁹—**18,194**
- ✗ Educators—**17,020**
- ✗ Social service organization staff—**15,621**
- ✗ Prosecutors—**14,497**
- ✗ Attorneys and law students—**9,448**

Remaining Areas of Need

STOP state administrators and subgrantees are asked in their reports to identify what needs remain unmet. Their responses help OVW understand the emerging and under-resourced issues faced by victims and the systems designed to serve them, and barriers to holding offenders accountable. Administrators identified the following critical areas of unmet need in their state:

- ✗ Sustaining and enhancing organizational capacity, including retaining and hiring staff
- ✗ Maintaining core services for victims
- ✗ Providing legal representation for victims in cases involving divorce, custody, and visitation, especially for those who are immigrants or living in rural areas
- ✗ Addressing victims' basic needs for food, shelter and long-term housing, employment, transportation, etc.
- ✗ Providing culturally- and linguistically-competent services
- ✗ Ensuring sufficient opportunities for training of first responders

⁸ This number includes governmental and non-governmental victim advocates.

⁹ This number includes judges, clerks, court administrators and coordinators, docket managers, etc.

- ✘ Ensuring sufficient opportunities for training on sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking, particularly to criminal justice professionals
- ✘ Making services available to address substance abuse and mental health issues that co-occur with, or result from, victimization

It is not unusual for victims of domestic violence to seek assistance from victim service agencies, law enforcement, and prosecutors, only to return to their abusers. One of the biggest reasons for this is their inability to get a divorce and fight for custody of their children.

—STOP administrator (OK)

Victims of crime enter the Utah criminal justice system confused, afraid and often still exhibiting financial and emotional trauma from the crime committed against them. Few victims have the resources or knowledge to fully exercise their rights; and, when their rights are violated they are often untrained to seek remedies on their own.

—STOP administrator (UT)

Victims repeatedly stated they were not sure where to seek assistance except for calling the police. If they chose not to call the police, they turned to family and friends; and if they did not have that support, they remained in the abusive relationship. Housing, counseling, job placement, legal/court advocacy, and access to interpreters were mentioned time after time by victims as services and resources lacking in their communities.

—STOP administrator (OH)

We need more follow up care beyond crisis intervention for victims. There is a huge need for jobs, housing, transportation, career and life skills training, legal services, substance abuse treatment, more effective batterer intervention, and more sexual assault services from certified providers of sexual assault forensic exams to more advocacy and training.

—STOP administrator (NV)

The 2014 STOP Program Report to Congress reflects 2 years of collective efforts to respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking in every state and territory. The Report includes information about the types of awards and subgrantees, detailed demographic information on victims served by state, aggregated information on arrests made, case prosecutions and outcomes, offenders supervised and monitored, victims served, services provided, and professionals trained. Administrators and subgrantees speak in their own voices about significant accomplishments that would not have been possible in the absence of STOP Program funding and about the work that remains to be done.

Introduction

The *STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2014 Report Part A*¹⁰ is submitted in response to the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide a biennial report to Congress on the STOP Program, including how funds were used and an evaluation of the effectiveness of funded programs. This Report is based on data submitted by STOP administrators and STOP subgrantees reflecting STOP awards made and STOP Program-funded activities engaged in during calendar years 2011 and 2012.¹¹

The section entitled “Background” (page 3) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program—the Program’s goals, the allocation and distribution of STOP Program funds, and states’ eligibility, reporting requirements, and reporting methods.¹² “STOP Program 2011 and 2012: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar years 2011 and 2012—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities in which they engaged. “Effectiveness of the STOP Programs” (page 19) describes key activities carried out with STOP Program funds, discusses why they are important, and provides examples of specific STOP Program-funded programs and initiatives engaging in those activities. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 81) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail. Finally, Appendix A and Appendix B present data on the number and amounts of awards in the mandated allocation categories (i.e., victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and courts), culturally-specific awards, allocations by victimization, and the number and characteristics of victims served on a state-by-state basis.

¹⁰ This report is based on 2011 and 2012 calendar year data and is submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2014. Previous STOP Program reports can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/ovwrptcongress.htm>.

¹¹ During this time period, data have also been collected from grantees that received additional funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA); data from Recovery Act STOP Program grantees and subgrantees funded under ARRA are presented in Part B of this report.

¹² Throughout this report, references to “states” or “states and territories” are intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP awards—i.e., the 50 states, the 5 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia.

More extensive discussion of the prevalence of violence against women and what research and practice have shown to be effective strategies for responding to the violence can be found in the *2014 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act (2014 Biennial Report)*.¹³

¹³ The 2014 Biennial Report, as well as previous biennial reports, can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/ovwrptcongress.htm>.

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), VAWA 2005 (Public Law No. 109–162), and VAWA 2013 (Public Law No. 113-4).¹⁴ The STOP Program, which funds states and territories, promotes a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system’s response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking and increasing the availability of victim services. The program encourages the development and strengthening of effective law enforcement, prosecution, and judicial strategies and victim services.

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

- ▶ 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

¹⁴ VAWA 2013 added seven new purposes areas to the STOP Program. (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(b)(14)-(20)). Because these and other requirements became effective as of Fiscal Year 2014 and this report is based on data from calendar years 2011 and 2012, the new purpose areas are not included here.

- ▶ 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 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 domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking that are sensitive to the needs and safety of victims¹⁵ and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States carry out these strategies by forging lasting partnerships between the criminal justice system and victim service providers 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 2011, states were encouraged to develop and support projects to:

- ▶ Support core services for victims of sexual and domestic violence, particularly support for rape crisis centers and shelters
- ▶ Provide comprehensive culturally specific services beyond bilingual advocacy, particularly to individuals like the children of immigrants, who may not need bilingual services
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training to tribal law enforcement and tribal courts regarding services for victims in tribal communities
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training to target violence against women, including violence across the lifespan and elders who cope with historical sexual abuse (e.g., sexual assault of Native American women, enslaved African women, and African/American women)
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training and services that address domestic violence or sexual assault and prisoner re-entry, including advocacy services to: battered women convicted of crimes; victims of prison rape; victims whose experiences of sexual assault or domestic violence played a role in their crimes; women whose batterers are returning from prison; and communities where a sex offender is being paroled to that community
- ▶ Provide comprehensive training to court personnel on sexual assault issues
- ▶ Support Full Faith and Credit training for tribes, states and territories
- ▶ Develop and implement risk/danger assessments to address issues of victims who are considered to be in high risk of lethality in relationships

For Fiscal Year 2012, states were encouraged to develop and support projects that:

¹⁵ The term “victim” is used in this report instead of “survivor” to emphasize that violence and abuse are criminal in nature and to account for victims who survive violence and those who do not.

- ▶ Support core services for victims of sexual and domestic violence, particularly support for rape crisis centers and domestic violence shelters
- ▶ Provide culturally-specific services and training to underserved communities based on factors such as race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, or gender identity
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training to tribal law enforcement and tribal courts regarding services for victims in tribal communities
- ▶ Provide comprehensive training to victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and court personnel on sexual assault, to encourage increased reporting, arrest and successful prosecution of perpetrators
- ▶ Support Full Faith and Credit training for tribes, states and territories
- ▶ Implement evidence-based risk/danger assessments to identify and prioritize victims who are considered to be in relationships with a high risk of lethality

Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

The United States Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, plus 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 territory. Funds remaining after the allocated base amount will be distributed among states and territories according to population (not including populations of Indian tribes (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(b)(5) and (6)).¹⁶

Funds granted to the states and territories 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.¹⁷ STOP Program awards may support up to 75 percent of the costs of all projects receiving subgrants, including the

¹⁶ The provision regarding populations of Indian tribes was changed in VAWA 2013, but was not in effect during the time period covered by this report.

¹⁷ The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the “STOP administrator(s).”

cost of administering those subgrants; the remaining 25 percent of costs must be covered by nonfederal match sources.¹⁸

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

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive STOP Program funds, states must meet all application requirements and certify that they are in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA. First, the states' laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence to incur costs related to prosecution, or victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to obtaining protection orders; and second, states must certify that a government entity incurs the 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 (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)).

¹⁸ VAWA 2005, as amended, contains a 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 both by STOP Program funding and by required nonfederal match sources.

Within 120 days of receiving a STOP Program grant, states are required to submit implementation plans describing their identified goals and how funds will be used to accomplish these goals.¹⁹ 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 showing of need, based on the current availability of existing domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the population, and geographic area to be served in relation to the availability of such programs in other such populations and geographic areas
- ▶ 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 sizes
- ▶ 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

¹⁹ VAWA 2013 requires that states submit their implementation plans at the same time they submit their applications, effective Fiscal Year 2014. It also requires consultation and coordination with, and documentation from enumerated entities within the state involved in the implementation planning process. (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(2)-(3)).

require 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 VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School), to develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness and new progress report forms for all OVW grant programs, including the STOP Program.

Reporting Methods

STOP administrators submit annual administrators reports online through the Office of Justice Program’s Grants Management System; STOP Program subgrantees submit electronic versions of the annual progress report to their state STOP administrators. The Muskie School provides ongoing, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms.²⁰ States are required to submit both the state STOP Administrator report and the state STOP subgrantee reports annually.

²⁰ 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 state’s subgrantees in how to complete the subgrantee progress reporting form. A self-paced online tutorial on how to complete the STOP subgrantee progress reporting form is available for use by subgrantees and can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulatrain.htm#online>

STOP Program 2011 and 2012: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on subgrantee data submitted by **2,398** subgrantees in 2011 and **2,408** subgrantees in 2012 from 55 states and territories,²¹ as well as STOP administrator data submitted by **56** STOP administrators in 2011 and **55** administrators²² in 2012, about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar years 2011 and 2012. 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.²³

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)).²⁴ Tables 1a and 1b show the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories in 2011 and 2012.

²¹ American Samoa did not submit subgrantee data on STOP Program-funded activities in 2011 or 2012.

²² Guam did not submit a STOP administrators report for 2012.

²³ The two forms can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulaform.htm>.

²⁴ STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim assistants/victim-witness specialists in those agencies.

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2011²⁵

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	265	7,609,842	6
Law enforcement	857	32,374,908	24
Prosecution	773	32,759,803	24
Victim services	1,197	44,591,120	33
Administration	NA	10,283,575	8
Discretionary	246	7,396,125	5
Total	3,338	135,015,373	100

NA = not applicable

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

Table 1b. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2012

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	232	7,296,441	5
Law enforcement	842	35,086,680	25
Prosecution	693	32,850,927	23
Victim services	1,230	47,049,064	33
Administration	NA	10,368,160	7
Discretionary	250	8,188,546	6
Total	3,247	140,839,818	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A. More specific information regarding types of activities engaged in with STOP Program funds, based on data from subgrantee Annual Progress Reports, is available on a state-by-state basis in Appendix B. Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

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

²⁵ Because STOP administrators make subawards on a fiscal year basis and report this information on a calendar year basis, the percentages shown in Tables 1a and 1b may not accurately reflect the percentages allocated to the requisite categories from each fiscal year award.

recognize and meaningfully respond 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)(B)).

In 2011, 52 states and territories made **231** awards totaling \$10,753,076 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 23.9 percent of funds awarded for victim services. In 2012, 54 states and territories made **203** awards totaling \$9,355,255 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 20 percent of funds awarded for victim services.²⁶

How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

In 2011 and 2012, 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.

The overwhelming 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. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims represent 52 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.²⁷ 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.²⁸ An annual average²⁹ of 67 percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims, 41 percent

²⁶ Detailed information regarding amounts of awards/percentages to culturally-specific, community-based organizations on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A 2011 Table A3a and Appendix A 2012 Table A3b.

²⁷ These staff categories include victim advocates, victim assistants/victim-witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, and attorneys.

²⁸ 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.

²⁹ Throughout this report, averages represent averages per reporting period (i.e., the calendar year) and are based on 2011 and 2012 data. Because subgrantees, grant-funded staff, and victims carry over from one reporting period to another, it is not accurate to provide a total for these types of data.

used funds to provide training, 18 percent to develop or implement policies, 18 percent to develop and/or distribute products, 13 percent for law enforcement activities, 13 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

Services. An average of approximately **431,000** victims received services supported by STOP Program funds each year (of **437,000** victims who sought services). Although the majority were white (56 percent), female (90 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (67 percent), subgrantees reported that 22 percent of the victims they served were black or African-American, and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.³⁰ Twenty-six percent of the victims served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims used victim advocacy (**226,000**), crisis intervention (**196,700**), and criminal justice advocacy (**151,300**) in greater numbers than any other services.³¹ In addition, a total³² of more than **687,800** hotline calls were received from primary victims during 2011 and 2012.

Training. From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Twenty-eight percent of all people trained with STOP Program funds (a total of more than **124,600** individuals) during this 2-year period were law enforcement officers; this reflects the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Victim advocates comprised the next largest category, with a total of nearly **53,800** trained. A total of more than **439,200** professionals and volunteers acting in the role of a professional were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2-year period.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to more than **133,600** calls for assistance, to investigate more than **178,200** incidents of violence, and to serve nearly **38,000** protection orders during the 2-year period. STOP Program-funded officers arrested more than **61,400** offenders.

³⁰ For more information on the races/ethnicities and other demographic characteristics of victims served, see Table 22. To see this information displayed by state, see Appendix Tables A3a and B3a. These percentages are based on the number of victims for whom race/ethnicity was known and victims may identify with more than one race/ethnicity. These percentages may represent an undercounting of the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for more than 8 percent of victims were reported as unknown for these reporting periods. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this race/ethnicity information, as it could prevent victims from seeking further help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim's safety, service providers are advised not to collect it.

³¹ Victims were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year; these numbers are rounded to the nearest hundred.

³² Throughout this report, unless otherwise indicated, "total" represents 2011 and 2012 data added together.

Prosecutors. STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of a total of more than **187,000** cases during calendar years 2011 and 2012, with an overall conviction rate of **70** percent.³³ Approximately **111,300** of the cases disposed of were domestic violence misdemeanor cases, of which **68** percent 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 years 2011 and 2012. 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 2011 and 2012

Purpose area	Average Subgrantees (N = 2,403)	
	Average	Percent
Victim services projects	1,645	68
Training law enforcement officers, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	807	34
Specialized units (law enforcement, judges, court personnel, prosecutors)	588	24
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	579	24
Support of statewide coordinated community responses	416	17
Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives	402	17
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	335	14
Stalking initiatives	317	13
Development of data collection and communication systems	219	9
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	212	9
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	148	6
Addressing the needs and circumstances of American Indian tribes	71	3

³³ This percentage includes cases of deferred adjudication, which represented 18 percent of all conviction outcomes.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012

Purpose area	Average Subgrantees (N = 2,403)	
	Average	Percent
Supporting the placement of special victim assistants	63	3
Training, victim services, and protocols addressing domestic violence committed by law enforcement	20	1

NOTE: Each subgrantee was able to select all relevant purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar years 2011 and 2012. Thus, the total number of purpose areas reported is greater than the total number of subgrantees.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Dual programs (programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault) were the most frequent recipients of STOP Program funding, followed by domestic violence programs 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 2011 and 2012

Type of agency	2011 Subgrantees (N = 2,398)		2012 Subgrantees (N = 2,408)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Dual (domestic violence/sexual assault) program	523	21.8	516	21.4
Domestic violence program	429	17.9	415	17.2
Prosecution	412	17.2	404	16.8
Law enforcement	352	14.7	364	15.1
Sexual assault program	174	7.3	175	7.3
Community-based organization	95	4.0	100	4.2
Court	59	2.5	49	2.0
Unit of local government	51	2.1	57	2.4
Government agency	50	2.1	57	2.4
Sexual assault state coalition	41	1.7	47	2.0
Domestic violence state coalition	39	1.6	46	1.9
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	29	1.2	31	1.3
Dual state coalition	23	1.0	32	1.3
University/school	18	0.8	16	0.7

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012

Type of agency	2011 Subgrantees (N = 2,398)		2012 Subgrantees (N = 2,408)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program	13	0.5	9	0.4
Tribal government	4	0.2	4	0.2
Tribal coalition	1	0.04	1	0.04
Other	85	3.5	85	3.5

NOTE: Of the organizations listed above, an average of 58 reported that they were faith-based and 117 reported that they were culturally-specific, community-based organizations.

Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

The percentage of STOP Program-funded projects focused solely on domestic violence and dating violence was 29 percent in 2010, 31 percent in 2011 and decreased to 30 percent in 2012. The percentage addressing domestic violence, dating violence, and either sexual assault or stalking was 20 percent in 2010, 19 percent in 2011, and 19 percent in 2012 (Table 4). The average combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking for the 2-year period remained approximately the same, at 13 percent.

Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2011 and 2012

Type of victimization	2011 Subgrantees (N = 2,398)		2012 Subgrantees (N = 2,408)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Domestic violence/dating violence only	753	31	713	30
Sexual assault only	290	12	308	13
Stalking only	5	0	3	0
Domestic violence/dating violence and sexual assault	360	15	378	16
Domestic violence/dating violence and stalking	85	4	97	4
Sexual assault and stalking	9	0	5	0
Domestic violence/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking	896	37	904	38

Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes the key activities undertaken 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—improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Program-wide accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, as are specific STOP Program-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 81.)

The Criminal Justice Response

The authorizing statute for the STOP Program says STOP funds may be used to develop, train, or expand units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges and other court personnel who focus their efforts on violent crimes against women, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These are usually referred to as specialized units in law enforcement and prosecution, and specialized domestic violence courts or dockets in the judicial system. An average of **588** STOP subgrantees (24 percent of all subgrantees) reported using funds to support specialized units in law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation or parole. The statute also authorizes funds to be used to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecution policies specifically addressing violent crimes against women. An average of **579** STOP subgrantees (24 percent) reported using funds for that 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 an average of **219** subgrantees (9 percent).

Law Enforcement

Law enforcement is the gatekeeper to the criminal legal system. Without immediate and informed law enforcement response to crimes of sexual

assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, victims remain in jeopardy and offenders escape accountability, almost invariably committing more crimes of violence. In the absence of thorough investigation, probable cause assessment, arrest and charging, offenders are immune from prosecution and potential sanctions. Over the past 20 years, many law enforcement agencies have adopted significant changes in policy, procedure and practice. These changes have enhanced the criminal legal process and thus have contributed to reduced recidivism and increased victim safety and satisfaction.

A study of law enforcement response to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking in Alaska demonstrated the pivotal role of law enforcement in the criminal legal system. Swift response to reported abuse and meticulous investigation increased rates of referral to prosecution, acceptance of cases, and conviction. Sixty percent of the sexual assault arrests and 84 percent of the domestic violence arrests referred for prosecution were accepted, and 80 percent of both resulted in convictions. Factors that predicted referral for prosecution were collection of physical or DNA evidence, identification of multiple offenses, documentation, tape recording of victim and/or suspect, admissions of guilt by the accused, other corroborative evidence, victim cooperation, and prompt arrest or referral of the case to prosecutor (i.e., within 14 to 19 days of the reported crime). Researchers noted that time, training, and resources are essential for full investigation resulting in higher rates of referral (Rosay, Wood, Rivera, Postle, & TePas, 2011).

A national study of domestic violence witnessed by children found that arrests of perpetrators were most likely to occur when law enforcement used at least six of the following best practices: In-person investigating, following up with victims after initial contact, conducting safety planning with victims, assessing the needs of children exposed to the violence, providing victims with 911 telephones, describing protection orders and court procedures, connecting victims with available shelter and services, explaining the effects of domestic violence on children, and helping victims feel safe (Hamby, Finkelhor, & Turner, 2014).

Predictive policing is an approach to cost-effective, enhanced crime prevention and intervention increasingly used by law enforcement agencies. It takes data from various sources, analyzes them, and uses the results to anticipate, prevent, and respond to potential crime (Perry, McInnis, Price, Smith, & Hollywood, 2013). One method of *predictive policing* is assessing the risks of future domestic violence. The Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) employs an 11-item evidence-based assessment tool for use by law enforcement with victims of domestic violence during 911-call response (Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence, 2012). Should the

assessment tool identify high-risk for repeat, severe, or near-lethal domestic abuse and with the permission of victims, responding officers place a call to the local domestic violence service program to connect victims with hotline advocates who then discuss safety planning and inform victims of domestic violence services. This officer-initiated intervention is also designed to educate victims about the risk factors in their intimate partner relationships, to improve victim decision-making about self-care and to encourage victims to pursue shelter and advocacy services. In some jurisdictions, officer-advocate teams make home visits to those victims assessed to be at high risk for severe or escalated violence. The team informs “high-risk victims” of legal advocacy, counseling, emergency housing, health care, and services offered by domestic violence programs and other community resources (Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence, 2012; Messing et al., 2014).

Research reveals that when first responders use LAP, the frequency and severity of violence against victims decreases and they adopt protective strategies and seek help more often. Victims in the Oklahoma LAP study were more likely to take immediate action—such as removing or hiding their assailants’ firearms, seeking civil protection orders, engaging in the criminal legal process against violent partners, and obtaining domestic violence services—and to continue doing so throughout the duration of the study (approximately seven months) (Messing et al., 2014).

Strong multi-agency relationships ensure effective response to domestic violence. Coordinated response by police and advocate teams increases victims’ feelings of safety and comfort with police, which in turn results in more reporting of repeat violence to police (Stover, 2012).

Significant changes in police leadership, policy, and perspectives on sexual assault appear to be critical for an appropriate response to sexual assault. Notwithstanding available evidence, arrests of alleged perpetrators of sexual assault may be infrequent, particularly in intimate partner and non-stranger cases. A 4-year study of officer responses to victim reports of sexual assault to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) revealed that only 1 in 9 of the suspects were arrested. Arrest rates were low despite corroborative evidence—e.g., witnesses, physical evidence, or SART exams—in almost half of the reported cases. In about two-thirds of the cases, victims were physically, as well as sexually, assaulted and nearly half were injured. A quarter of the incidents involved the use of a gun, knife, or other weapon. Interviews of LAPD detectives revealed two contrasting approaches to arrest based on beliefs about the credibility of victims of intimate partner and non-stranger sexual assault. Many officers stated that intimate partner/non-stranger rape is “not real rape,” is the “fault” of the victim, and does not implicate “public safety” as does stranger rape. Other detectives, expressing

beliefs that were not victim-blaming and that affirmed victim credibility, attributed the low arrest rate in sexual assault cases to the lack of departmental leadership (Spohn & Tellis, 2012). Research on police response to sexual assault in other jurisdictions reveals that extra-legal factors, particularly the “lack of credibility” of victims, were cited as reasons not to arrest (Tasca, Rodriguez, Spohn, & Koss, 2013).

STOP administrators were encouraged to fund projects to develop and implement evidence-based risk/danger assessments to identify and prioritize victims who are considered to be in relationships with a high risk of lethality.

Following are two examples of subgrantees who used lethality assessment not only to assess the level of risk but also to ensure that victims received appropriate services:

Victims who work with our DV case managers go through a lethality assessment. This helps us evaluate the existing and ongoing risk to the victim. Often it makes the victim more determined to follow through with prosecution and gives us an opportunity to do some safety planning. Although [the lethality assessment is] not evidence, it is often discussed with allied services and prosecutors as a factor in services and prosecution outcomes.

—City of Jackson—Jackson Police Department, Tennessee

The person funded under this grant oversees the Department's entire Domestic Violence/Lethality Assessment program. . . . He reviews all domestic violence reports and makes sure all the departmental reporting protocols as well as lethality assessment protocols have been followed and where necessary all arrests have been made. If arrest protocols have not been made the DV Coordinator will make sure the investigating officer makes the arrest or he will apply for charges himself. He also makes sure that each victim has been referred to all the appropriate support agencies.

—Hagerstown Police Department, Maryland

STOP funds have been used to provide overtime for officers to investigate sexual assault cases more thoroughly and to support a dedicated domestic violence investigator:

STOP Grant funds supported overtime for officers investigating sexual assault cases. This led to more thorough investigation and reporting which in turn led to more prosecutable cases.

The Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART) has provided substantial assistance in the successful prosecution of domestic violence crimes in Black Hawk County. The philosophy of the Waterloo Police Department is to investigate DV incidents as if the victim will not be able to testify later in court, or evidence-based prosecution. The DART Investigator is vital in gathering all the needed evidence, from getting statements from victims or witnesses, subpoenas for phone records, or warrants for offenders. The Investigator trains and guides officers in what additional information is needed and assists when the officer is unable to complete the case (due to days off, restrictions in hours he/she works, etc.)

—*Waterloo Police Department Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART), Iowa*

During calendar years 2011 and 2012, an average of **322** subgrantees (13 percent of all subgrantees reporting) used STOP Program funds for activities carried out by law enforcement personnel, with an average of **263 FTEs**³⁴ per reporting period. Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2011 and 2012 responded to and prepared incident reports for a total of **171,689** cases, investigated **178,255** cases, made **61,486** arrests, and referred **81,527** cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than **37,740** protection/restraining orders, made **8,387** arrests for violations of bail and protection orders, and enforced **18,517** warrants over the 2-year period covered by this report.³⁵

In addition to traditional law enforcement activities, subgrantees also took part in the following activities designed to improve response and arrests of offenders: An average (per reporting period) of **280** used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; **601** provided training on law enforcement response; **295** addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; **89** developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor; and **66** developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

³⁴ For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see Tables 26a and 26b on pages 97-98.

³⁵ 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 also were supported by the STOP Program.

Prosecution

Since the enactment of VAWA, significant innovations in prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking have been implemented. Among these advances are the development of policies and procedures for comprehensive investigation; establishment or expansion of specialized units; upgrades in databases and technology; increased staffing by dedicated prosecutors, investigators, and victim advocates; training and technical assistance on complex cases. Results include better outreach to victims, enhanced charges for repeat abusers, higher prosecution and conviction rates, upgraded sanctions of convicted abusers, and protections and restitution for victims.

Early intervention and outreach to victims immediately after defendants are arraigned may lead to an increase in victim participation in prosecution and in conviction rates. The Early Victim Engagement (EVE) Project in the Kings County, N.Y., District Attorney's Office contacts domestic violence victims by telephone immediately after a defendant is arraigned to advise of the charges, bail conditions, release status, court dates, criminal protection orders, and available emergency shelter, counseling, and other services. EVE staff conduct follow-up with victims for safety planning, and clarification of the legal process. An investigation of the rates of victim participation in the prosecution process and convictions of domestic violence assailants compared EVE-involved cases with domestic violence cases where there were no EVE services. EVE Project outreach and services to victims whose assailants were in the community before their trials produced increased victim participation in intake appointments with district attorney staff, enhanced development of supplemental evidence, and higher rates of conviction (Peterson, 2013). Similarly, an impact evaluation of the Domestic Violence Coordinated Triage Intervention Project in Denver, Colorado, found that victim-focused contact improves the participation of domestic violence victims in the prosecution of criminal cases; in fact, women who were contacted by system-based advocates were six times more likely to participate in prosecution (DePrince, Belknap, Labus, Buckingham, & Gover, 2012).

Findings of a study looking at domestic violence cases in two metropolitan jurisdictions—one employing evidence-based prosecution and the other a victim-centered strategy—suggest that victims whose cases are prosecuted using a victim-centered approach are less likely to report both psychological and physical violence after case disposition (Finn, 2013).

Videotaping statements of domestic violence perpetrators by prosecutor staff may increase the rate of convictions, particularly when victim testimony is not available at trial, when defendants acknowledge the existence of a protection order or admit to violating the order (Peterson, 2012).

Within the past 10 years, many states have enacted strangulation laws. Recent mortality data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicate that strangulation/hanging/suffocation accounts for upwards of 12 percent of the homicides of females annually in the states that participated in the National Violent Death Review Reporting System (Parks, Johnson, McDaniel, & Gladden, 2014). An 11-city study revealed that the risk of previous non-fatal strangulation for future attempted homicide and homicide of women is more than seven times greater than the risk of other acts of violence inflicted on battered women. The same study showed that non-fatal strangulation occurred in 45 percent of the attempted homicides, in 47 percent of the subsequent homicides, and in 10 percent of other acts of domestic violence (Glass et al., 2008). The relatively recent recognition that strangulation poses an acute lethal risk has led to a sharp rise in the number of prosecutions for strangulation of both sexual and domestic violence victims in Travis County, Texas. A prosecutor, who specializes in strangulation, reports that 400 strangulation cases were filed in 2013; 4 years before, in 2010, that number was 200 (McKay, 2014). VAWA funding offers prosecutors training on strangulation and related forensic evidence. New diagnostic guides and instructional materials provide blueprints for prosecuting strangulation cases (California District Attorneys Association & Training Institute on Strangulation Prevention, 2013).

Although many prosecution practices have greatly improved since the enactment of VAWA, not all types of violence against women are equally likely to be prosecuted. Non-evidentiary factors consistently emerge as significant determinants of whether a rape case is prosecuted or a defendant is found guilty, and of the severity of the sentence imposed. Charging decisions in non-stranger sexual assault cases are affected by several legally irrelevant victim characteristics: Whether the victim had a prior criminal record, whether the victim was drinking alcohol prior to the assault, and whether the victim invited the suspect to her residence (Beichner & Spohn, 2012). However, sexual assault cases may be more likely to be investigated and prosecuted, and reach the final stages of prosecution (i.e., conviction at trial and/or guilty plea bargains), after the implementation of a sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) program (R. Campbell, Patterson, & Bybee, 2012).

While much is now known about stalking and cyber-stalking (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009; Black et al., 2011; Logan, 2010; Reys, Henson, & Fisher, 2012), there is little current research on the prosecution of either.

Preliminary research on prosecution of domestic violence stalkers found that even when police identified criminal conduct as stalking, prosecutors were more likely to charge lower level crimes (A. Klein, Salomon, Huntington, Dubois, & Lang, 2009).

A specialized prosecutor funded under STOP is integrating a new technology in the prosecution of crimes involving strangulation:

[Our STOP Program-funded special prosecutor] has worked full time in the Family Violence Division of the Baltimore County State's Attorney's Office [and] has served as the lead prosecutor in integrating the use of the Alternative Light Source into DV Prosecutions in Baltimore County. This technology is currently being used at Northwest Hospital in Randallstown, Maryland. It is particularly beneficial in strangulation cases where injuries are not visible until a few days after the attack. The Light Source allows a person to see the pooling of blood underneath the skin, and thus helps to corroborate a victim's assertion that he or she had been strangled by their partner.

—Baltimore County State's Attorney's Office, Maryland

In the two examples that follow, STOP Program funds were used for specialized domestic violence and specialized sexual assault prosecutors. This has resulted in expedited resolution, higher conviction rates, and more consistent handling of domestic violence and sexual assault cases.

The creation of the [STOP Program-funded Special Prosecutor] position has allowed the County Attorney's Office to eliminate "Deferred Prosecutions" in Simple Misdemeanor (Ordinance) Domestic Abuse Assault charges. . . . Prior to the receipt of STOP funds, a Deferred Prosecution agreement was extended to the Defendant and, per the agreement, the Defendant's case would be dismissed upon successful completion of Batterer's Education Programming. Dismissals of domestic abuse assault charges posed problems for prosecuting repeat offenders because domestic abuse assaults are enhanceable offenses. By securing a conviction, repeat offenders are held more accountable because their second/subsequent offenses are enhanced to a more serious/severe level.

—Madison County Attorney's Office, Iowa

A Specialized Sexual Assault Prosecutor is a positive STOP-funded activity as it allows the use of a prosecutor who is specially trained to handle these very difficult cases. Sexual assault cases are subject to many substantive statutes and evidence rules that do not apply to other types of crimes and require special prosecution training and experience. Use of a specialized prosecutor also provides consistent handling of sexual assault cases in our large, rural judicial district with many law enforcement agencies that have a wide range of resources and experience with sexual assault cases. Utilization of the specialized prosecutor is also important as it provides a centralized information system for all victims of sexual assault crimes.

—*Office of the District Attorney, 7th Judicial District, Colorado*

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received a total of **277,738** cases of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, and stalking and accepted **210,984** (76 percent) of those cases for prosecution during the two reporting periods. STOP Program-funded prosecution offices showed an overall conviction rate of **70 percent**³⁶ for cases reaching disposition during the 2 years covered by this report.³⁷

During calendar years 2011 and 2012, an average of **306** subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with an average of **287** FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by an average of **314** subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve the prosecution response: An average of **347** provided training on prosecution response; **86** developed and/or implemented policies on victim-witness notification; and **66** addressed policy development and/or implementation regarding protection order violations. The lower dismissal rate in STOP Program-funded prosecution agencies may reflect the impact of specialized prosecutors engaging in training and the development and implementation of strategic policies that result in increased offender accountability.

Courts

Over the past 20 years, reforms in court systems produced significant changes in policy, structure, technology, rules, practice guidelines, and court-related programs. From pre-trial to post-conviction, enhanced court

³⁶ This percentage includes cases of deferred adjudication, which represented 18 percent of all conviction outcomes.

³⁷ 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 27 on page 99.

processes related to sexual assault, domestic and dating violence, and stalking increase access to justice for victims and both heighten accountability and deter perpetrators (Lippman, 2012). Judges are leaders in the configuring of new court structures and processes, such as criminal domestic violence courts, integrated domestic violence courts, and dockets for mental health-involved domestic violence offenders (Leventhal, Angiolillo, & D’Emic, 2014).

Risk assessment appraisals inform bail-setting and conditions of pre-trial release, offer guidance on sentencing, identify “red flags” for probation conditions, and augment judicial monitoring of perpetrators. Judicial officers in California are using a risk assessment tool designed for application in civil, criminal, and family law cases. The tool, adapted from the evidence-based *Danger Assessment*³⁸ tool on domestic violence, identifies red flags for severe and potentially fatal domestic assault (J. Campbell & Chatman, 2013).

Judicial monitoring is a system of mandated court appearances before judicial officers to determine offender compliance with sentencing provisions and to impose swift sanctions for non-compliance. Judicial officers report that judicial monitoring sessions are opportunities to reiterate and clarify information about requirements, restrictions, and consequences for violations. Likewise, offenders assigned to judicial monitoring may be more likely to understand their obligations and to recognize that noncompliance will result in severe adverse consequences (Labriola, Cissner, Davis, & Rempel, 2012).

Youth domestic violence criminal courts are crafting relief that recognizes the rehabilitative needs of juvenile offenders, and at the same time imposes restraints on offender behavior and limits contact with victims (Center for Court Innovation, 2014). Teen protection order courts pay special attention to the unique safety requirements of teen victims, particularly in light of the overlap of offender and victim social networks and enrollment in the same schools and community programs. Court procedures, rules, and resources to enhance victim safety and well-being in teen protection order courts are in varying stages of development (A. Klein et al., 2013).

The goals, policies, and structures of specialty domestic violence (DV) courts (i.e., domestic violence dockets, specialized domestic violence courts, unified family courts, and/or integrated domestic violence courts) may vary. (Labriola, Bradley, O’Sullivan, Rempel, & Moore, 2010; Moore, 2009). However, the following components of criminal domestic violence courts are

³⁸ A more detailed description of the instrument can be found at <http://www.dangerassessment.org/about.aspx>

considered essential and exist across the country: Case management/coordination, expedited hearings, victim advocacy, close supervision and evaluation of offenders, batterer intervention and other treatment programs, courthouse safety, and collaboration of key stakeholders (Hovda, 2012).

Research findings on case processing and outcomes in specialty domestic violence courts, including those comparing integrated domestic violence (IDV) courts³⁹ with domestic violence and traditional criminal courts, are mixed (Cissner, Labriola, & Rempel, 2013; Peterson, 2014; Schlueter, Wicklund, Adler, Owen, & Halvorsen, 2011). Preliminary research in Idaho suggests that domestic violence criminal courts produce greater case efficiency, judicial contact, victim support services and satisfaction, and stakeholder collaboration, and more convictions than traditional criminal courts (Hovda, 2012). A New York statewide investigation of domestic violence courts found that these courts reduced rearrests for any criminal charges, inclusive of domestic violence charges, among convicted offenders who were subject to policies such as judicial supervision and sanctions for noncompliance (Cissner et al., 2013).

Beyond the effects of court structure and process, recidivism may further be deterred by the court's imposition of more severe sanctions. A study examining the impact of differential sentencing of domestic violence offenders found that the rate of new domestic violence crimes was lower for those batterers who were sentenced more severely for DV and non-DV crimes during the first years of their experience with criminal courts. More severe sanctions deterred recidivism over an 8-year period (A. Klein, Centerbar, Keller, & J. Klein, 2014).

Employment of "domestic violence" managers in administrative offices of state courts who manage information dissemination, help develop court rules and forms and consult on ways to improve court systems (National Center for State Courts, 2012). There has been enactment of laws in more than half of the states that require training judicial officers on domestic violence; some state laws also address training for judicial officers on sexual assault and stalking ("Mandatory domestic violence training for judges," 2013).

³⁹ Integrated domestic violence courts follow a "one judge, one family" approach, scheduling criminal, civil, protection order, and other related cases and matters involving the same family to be heard by the same judge and, whenever possible, on the same date.

The following STOP Program-funded protection order court has a system for review and sanctioning of respondents who have violated court-imposed batterers' intervention (BIP) and other treatment conditions that has become a model for their state:

STOP grant funding has allowed us to have a specialized domestic violence injunction court that ensures better security for victims, immediate service of orders for protection at court, information and referral handouts, monitoring of court ordered treatment, coordination of cases with criminal cases, and regular assessment and review of practices and procedures. This program would not exist without the staff funded by the grant.

Our system for review, violation, and pick up of those ordered to [batterers' intervention (BIP) or other court-ordered] treatment allows us to have a much better completion rate by respondents, than counties without a similar system in the state. The Office of Court Improvement within the Office of the State Court Administrator has used our system of monitoring and enforcement as a model for piloting in other counties in Florida.

—Santa Rosa County Board of County Commissioners, Florida

Other courts have used STOP Program funds for training and for services to victims:

This project has created a specialized office in the court system that is available to assist victims 24 hours a day, 7 days a week [in an extremely rural area]. The person employed by this office with the STOP funds is always available to meet with the victims/survivors who are in need of assistance. The victims are informed that they have rights, how to exercise those rights, the types of relief that are available through the civil and criminal court systems, the availability of safe housing and other safety measures, and other resources that are available for assistance for their individual situation, and are provided with a connection with advocacy services for long term support.

—Clark County Government—The Court Access and Collaboration Project, Nevada

Court supported training [on the Firearms Surrender Protocol Implementation] in the judicial districts is supported by STOP funds awarded to the Courts for Judicial education. This generally is part of a full implementation effort. Judges and clerks are training together to implement the protocol in a county-by-county pattern. Statewide multi-system training sessions are being presented to groups of 100 as an introduction to the protocol and an opportunity for communities to network with each other and share implementation experience.

—STOP administrator, Wisconsin

Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, and stalking by an average of **46** STOP subgrantees in 2011 and 2012; **9** of these subgrantees used funds for judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of **2.4** hearings per offender for an average of **6,577** offenders in 2011 and 2012. These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders.

As illustrated in Table 5, 41 percent of all violations disposed of by STOP Program-funded courts in 2011 resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2012, 49 percent had this result.

Table 5. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2011 and 2012

Type of disposition	Total violations			
	2011 (N = 2,136)		2012 (N = 1,074)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Partial/full revocation of probation	764	41.0	531	49.4
Conditions added	461	24.7	221	20.6
Verbal/written warning	392	21.0	230	21.4
No action taken	214	11.5	91	8.5
Fine	33	1.8	1	0.1

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

Probation Supervision

Since the enactment of VAWA, probation and parole departments have devised policies and practices to respond to the heightened scrutiny and more nuanced sentencing by courts in cases of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Increasingly, probation departments have adopted specialized practices for intensive supervision of offenders and many specialized units provide outreach and support to victims.

A review of studies looking at programs that are applying swift, certain, and proportional responses to offender violations suggests that the field of community corrections is relying on this evidence to support and inform the implementation of such practices in other programs and jurisdictions (American Probation and Parole Association, National Center for State Courts, & Pew Charitable Trust, 2013).

An analysis of data on more than 150,000 offenders in Washington State revealed that domestic violence offenders had more extensive criminal histories, were charged with more assaults and violent offenses, and were identified as “higher risk to re-offend” than non-domestic violence offenders. Domestic violence offenders also had higher rates of recidivism for both domestic violence and non-domestic violence crimes (Harmon & Miller, 2013). Other research confirms that batterers often engage in other criminal conduct in addition to domestic violence (Richards, Jennings, Tomsich, & Gover, 2013).

A statewide study in Rhode Island tracked the patterns of domestic violence and non-domestic violence offenses committed by domestic violence perpetrators over ten years, beginning with their earliest criminal justice system involvement. Where probation officers violated batterers for noncompliance and corresponding sanctions for violations were severe, recidivism was significantly lower. This reduction, however, occurred most often when batterers were sanctioned more severely for domestic violence offenses than for non-domestic violence offenses. Where the punishment for non-domestic violence crimes was greater, batterers were more likely to continue abusing their partners (A. Klein et al., 2014).

Research on high-risk sex offenders suggests that electronic monitoring programs using GPS technology produce significantly better outcomes. Compliance with conditions of parole was three times greater when offenders were tracked with GPS monitors rather than subjected to traditional parole supervision. Recidivism—including rearrest, reconviction, and return to incarceration—was more than twice as high among parolees who received traditional supervision. Similarly, re-incarceration for parole violations was almost 40 percent higher among those subjected to traditional parole supervision (Gies et al., 2012).

The use of GPS technology by a STOP Program-funded probation agency to monitor higher risk offenders resulted in impressive outcomes:

The Domestic Violence (DV) Enhanced Electronic Supervision (EES) program has been so effective that a 'fact sheet' encompassing January through September 2011 was devised for distribution to partner agencies to showcase the success of the program . . . Of the participants discharged from the program, there has been an 85 percent success rate. In order to qualify for successful discharge from the program, offenders are required to meet certain milestones, such as regularly attending the batterers intervention program, obtaining employment or attending school, abiding by protective orders, and abstaining from substance use, among others. On average, EES participants have spent 119 days on GPS monitoring, during which time the grant funded DV EES officer has maintained regular contact with victims and treatment providers, in addition to offenders. It should also be noted that 40 percent of participants have prior domestic violence convictions and 35 percent have multiple victims; given those significant percentages, it is believed that the EES program is capturing offenders who are well suited for participation and consequently providing a higher level of supervision to the population.

—*Santa Barbara County Probation Department, California*

In the following example, STOP Program funding allowed for intensive supervision of a smaller caseload of offenders, and thus a better understanding of the needs of offenders and victims:

With a caseload size of 40 or less, we are able to be more proactive in the supervision of clients [offenders]. Additional time is spent interacting with clients and victims, learning more about the dynamics of each family and their individual needs. Further, we are afforded added time to attend review hearings in Court and make more of a direct impact on clients' lives. . . . The Probation Officer assigned to this position regularly monitors the mandated counseling and provides information regarding services available to the clients. During the initial interview with a client, the Probation Officer discusses all firearms restrictions as ordered by the Court, and requires the client to sign an understanding of his/her firearms prohibition.

—*County of San Joaquin, California*

The STOP Program-funded surveillance, court services, and probation officers in the following examples played critical roles in the success of domestic violence courts in holding offenders accountable and in the larger system that provides safety and support for victims and their families:

STOP Grant funding has enabled Pima County to maintain and refine a specialized Domestic Violence Court through the support of an extra courtroom clerk and two Probation surveillance officers who assist four probation officers by providing extra field monitoring of probationers sentenced in DV Court. The DV Court Judge and Probation staff do not operate in a void. Critical to holding offenders accountable and keeping victims safe is the ongoing coordination with victim advocates in and out of the courtroom through both the County Attorney's Office and Emerge Center, BIP counselors, law enforcement and prosecutors. Together and with STOP Grant support, these entities have held batterers to a level of accountability that was not possible several years ago. And as a result, victims and their children have experienced increased safety and options.

—Pima County Consolidated Justice Court DV Court, Arizona

We have the benefit of a [STOP-funded] dedicated Court Services Officer [CSO] who supervises all domestic violence offenders placed on supervised probation by the Domestic Violence Court. . . . The CSO appears at all sentencing, compliance and revocation dockets, provides testimony as to offender status, acts as a liaison between the Court, the District Attorney and service agencies and provides outcome data regarding the success of the program. . . . The CSO can, at any time, provide complete and accurate information regarding any of the offenders placed on supervised probation within the program which assures accountability and, combined with all other programs and services, reduces recidivism.

—Cleveland County, Oklahoma

Prior to receiving this funding, we were not able to form the Domestic Violence Court because of the need for a probation officer. . . . The probation officer is essential to the Domestic Violence Court because the probation officer ensures that the offenders are complying with court orders by attending court ordered services. If the offender does not comply, then the probation officer sends a report to the assigned assistant district attorney, resulting in a hearing before the Court. This is an integral part of the Domestic Violence Court due to the immediate sanctions and offender accountability. These efforts have increased the safety of victims of domestic abuse because of the ability to monitor the offenders.

—District Attorney #2, Oklahoma

An average of **28** subgrantees funded probation activities during each of the reporting periods covered by this report; these subgrantees hired an average of **31** probation officers. STOP subgrantees reported training **8,428** professionals in the category of corrections officers, which includes probation and parole officers.

As illustrated in Table 6, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 38 percent of the total dispositions of their violations in 2011 and 61 percent in 2012.⁴⁰

Table 6. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2011 and 2012

Type of disposition	Total violations			
	2011 (N = 2,703)		2012 (N = 3,138)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Partial/full revocation of probation	1,018	37.7	1,907	60.8
Verbal/written warning	758	28.0	480	15.3
No action taken	335	12.4	350	11.2
Conditions added	304	11.2	238	7.6
Fine	288	10.7	163	5.2

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

During 2011 and 2012, STOP Program-funded probation officers supervised an annual average of **7,392** offenders and made a total of **138,090** contacts with those offenders. The highest percentage of contacts (41 percent) were face to face, 33 percent were by telephone, and 26 percent were unscheduled surveillance. STOP Program-funded agencies also had a total of **12,000** contacts with an average of **2,365** victims during 2011 and 2012.

⁴⁰ 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 provided 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, see Tables 30a and 30b on pages 103-104.

Victim Services

Services for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking were the most frequently funded activities under the STOP Program. The authorizing statute allows for the following victim services activities to be conducted with STOP Program funds:

- ▶ developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking programs
- ▶ developing or improving victim services for underserved populations
- ▶ developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs that address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault
- ▶ providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters
- ▶ maintaining core victim services while supporting emergency services for victims and their families
- ▶ funding supportive services and advocacy for victims of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel

The provision of services to victims and families is critical in creating safety and security. Victims and families struggle with the physical, emotional, and financial implications of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. An estimated 1,900 domestic violence programs and 1,300 rape crisis centers operate in the U.S. alone (T. Poore, National Alliance Against Sexual Violence, personal communication, August 22, 2014; National Network to End Domestic Violence, 2014a).

To address the complex needs of victims and families, advocates and community members work diligently to create responsive programs and services. These services include crisis intervention, emergency assistance (e.g., clothing, food, medical care, and housing), victim advocacy, criminal justice advocacy, civil legal advocacy, counseling and support, victim-witness notification, medical response, language lines, hotline services, transportation, and referrals to community resources and agencies.

The need for crisis intervention is clear and undeniable: According to the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, more than a third of female victims of intimate partner violence needed services and nearly a quarter reported needing medical care (Breiding, Chen, & Black, 2014). A study of 1,401 respondents who used nonresidential services found that more than half (56.4 percent) had used a domestic violence program

more than 4 times in the past year and nearly 30 percent used services more than 20 times; most victims initially engaged with support groups, support services, counseling, legal advocacy, and shelters. More than 90 percent of the respondents in this study reported that, as a result of the services they received, they were “more hopeful about the future” (95 percent) and they knew “more ways to plan for safety” (95 percent) and “more about rights and options” (93 percent) (Lyon, Bradshaw, & Menard, 2012).

Housing insecurity can result in a victim staying with or returning to the abuser. Women and men who have experienced housing insecurity are at higher risk for rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that in a 12-month period, 10 percent of women and 8 percent of men who faced housing insecurity were victims of intimate partner violence, as compared to 2.3 percent of women and 3.1 percent of men who did not face housing insecurity (Breiding et al., 2014). Shelters are a safe place for victims who are leaving abusive relationships: In addition to housing, they may provide counseling and advocacy, legal assistance, and referrals to other sources of help. One study of 70 domestic violence centers in Illinois found that women who were in shelter received a wide range of services for a more extended period of time than women who had never entered a shelter (Grossman & Lundy, 2011).

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of **431,244** victims during each reporting period. Of those, 86 percent were victims of domestic violence, 12 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2 percent were victims of stalking.⁴¹ These victims received a wide range of services, including victim advocacy (assistance with obtaining services or resources, including material goods and services, such as health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. Subgrantees providing these services also routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and information to victims as needed.

⁴¹ The overall number of victims served represents an unduplicated count; this means that each victim is counted only once by each subgrantee, regardless of the number of times that victim received services during each calendar year. Because victims can only be counted once, they must be reported under only one primary victimization. It is not uncommon for victims 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 served.

Table 7. Victims receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2011 and 2012

Type of service	Victims served	
	2011	2012
Victim advocacy ⁴²	230,617	221,329
Crisis intervention	201,634	191,778
Criminal justice advocacy	149,574	152,960
Civil legal advocacy	118,324	108,306
Counseling/support group	112,052	103,360
Transportation	24,340	22,338

NOTE: Each victim is reported only once in each category of service, regardless of the number of times that service was provided to the victim during the reporting period. Only the most frequently reported categories are presented; for a complete listing of categories of services provided to victims, see Table 24.

In the following examples, STOP Program funds were used for therapeutic services for trauma survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault:

The STOP VAWA funded counselor is a skilled, trauma-focused therapist with experience in working with adolescent and adult survivors of trauma. The counselor provides therapeutic interventions through cognitive behavioral therapy, empowerment, as well as emotional and physical safety planning for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Many of the survivors are challenged with mental health and physical concerns and bring with them poor childhood experiences including low school performance, malnourishment and physical or emotional trauma. The skilled and compassionate therapeutic interventions allow these individuals to feel more hopeful about the future and feel more comfortable asking for help. This counselor is critical within the DVIS/Call Rape counseling team. Dedicating a counselor to these clients allows her to focus on client care—both as a counselor and an advocate.

—Domestic Violence Intervention Services, Inc. (DVIS/Call Rape), Oklahoma

⁴² This number represents advocacy provided to victims by both governmental and nongovernmental advocates. For the purposes of reporting victim services activities provided by STOP subgrantees, advocacy provided by victim assistants or advocates located in governmental agencies are considered victim services; however, these victim services activities may also be considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for law enforcement, prosecution, and state and local courts as reported by STOP administrators, and are not considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for victim services, which refers to nonprofit victim services only.

Forty percent of the victims that we serve are able to receive services because of the STOP funding that we receive. The STOP funding also has enabled us to offer and provide therapy services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault that could not afford the service in any other way. Many victims desire therapy as a part of their recovery and have no medicaid, insurance or income. The victims in our community benefit greatly from the STOP funding and we appreciate the expanded services that we can offer. The STOP funding has resulted in an increased number of victims receiving services and therapy.

—*Wabash Valley Alliance- Domestic Violence Program, Indiana*

Bilingual advocates funded by STOP made services accessible to Hispanic/Latina victims in Central Indiana:

STOP funding has increased our ability to reach out to the local Hispanic/Latina community, by allowing the YWCA to hire a bilingual domestic violence advocate, create bilingual forms for internal use and translate Spanish materials for community outreach. Spanish-speaking persons who call or come to the YWCA now have someone they can talk to in their own language, removing one of the biggest barriers to accessing services. As a result more Hispanic women and children have received comprehensive shelter and other services from the YWCA than would ever have been possible before STOP funding.

—*YWCA North Central Indiana*

The following agency used STOP Program funds to provide much-needed sexual assault services in a rural community:

The STOP Program funding has enabled ADV&SAS [A Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Service] to maintain an office in Livingston County with an advocate based within the community. This is extremely important because the satellite area is a proud community and reluctant to seek help from outside their area. They pride themselves on their ability to care for members of their community. The lack of transportation within the area makes it more difficult for persons to access services if we were unable to maintain an office within their community. The grant allows us to provide counseling and advocacy services to sexual assault victims in our Satellite Area. We have been able to provide information throughout the community regarding agency services. We are engaged in institutional advocacy efforts with law enforcement, social service providers and the medical community.

—*A Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Service, Illinois*

Underserved Populations

Sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking affect all populations in the United States. However, for underserved populations, the types of violence used or control exerted, the community supports available, strategies for seeking help, gender roles, access to resources, and the dictates of social norms may be distinct from those in the dominant culture. A victim may perceive, manage, and resist violence based on religious beliefs, ethnicity, language, race, immigration status, cultural and social norms, geographic isolation, and economic opportunity (Adams & J. Campbell, 2012; Cho, 2012; Rennison, DeKeseredy, & Dragiewicz, 2012).

American Indians and Alaska Natives; immigrants and refugees; people of color; women with disabilities; women who are older; children and youth; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT); and women living in rural areas are all groups who often face unique challenges and barriers to accessing criminal justice response, receiving assistance, and obtaining social and economic supports.

VAWA and OVW require states to specify in their implementation planning process how they will use STOP funds to address the needs of underserved victims. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program include specific references to the delivery of services to underserved populations,⁴³ addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims, and assisting victims in immigration matters. In addition, VAWA 2005 included a new mandate that at least 10 percent of the funds awarded by states to fulfill the 30 percent requirement for victim services be awarded to culturally-specific, community-based organizations.⁴⁴

The following are examples of how STOP administrators have attempted to meet the needs of diverse populations in their states:

⁴³ 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.” VAWA 2013 at Section 13925 (a)(39) expands the definition of “underserved populations” to include populations underserved because of sexual orientation, gender identity, or religion.

⁴⁴ 42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)(B)

Tribal Domestic Violence Legal Advocacy—Funding supported a non-competitive application process. The project provided legal advocacy and other services to Tribal domestic violence victims including courtroom/hearing support and legal education. Marginalized (underserved/culturally specific)—Funds supported services to four community-based culturally specific organizations serving diverse communities. Those communities included: Deaf/Deaf Blind, Korean, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Refugee/Immigrants. The funds have allowed these organizations to expand their legal advocacy and support services.

—*STOP administrator, Washington*

According to 2011 Census estimates, the two largest minority populations in Tennessee are African Americans (16.9 percent) and Hispanics/Latina origin (4.7 percent). The 2012 STOP Annual Report points out that African Americans and Hispanics are also the largest minority populations receiving services from STOP victim service providers: 19.8 percent of the total victims receiving STOP victim services in 2012 were African American and 6.5 percent of victims receiving STOP victim services in 2012 were Hispanic. Other populations making Tennessee their home include but are not limited to immigrants and refugees from Sudan, Ethiopia, Congo, Rwanda, Uganda, Cameroon, Iraq, Burma, Bhutan, and Burundi (www.sccnashville.org). STOP subrecipients are actively working to accommodate the needs of culturally specific populations. . . . Agencies are offering weekly support groups for Spanish speakers, establishing relationships with agencies, such as Head Start and the Health Department, and churches that serve culturally specific populations to improve service delivery, hiring bilingual staff, printing brochures in multiple languages, collaborating with the League of Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and using the Language Line to communicate with non-English speakers.

—*STOP administrator, Tennessee*

Of all subgrantees providing services in calendar years 2011 and 2012, 99 percent provided services to victims in at least one of the underserved categories.⁴⁵ Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to an annual average of **7,636** victims who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; **86,892** victims who were black or African-American; **72,862** victims who were Hispanic or Latino; **5,757** victims who were Asian; **16,828** victims who were 60 years of age or older; **26,131** victims with disabilities; **36,209** victims with limited English proficiency; **21,993**

⁴⁵ It is not possible to report the overall percentage of victims receiving services who were from one or more of the underserved populations because victim data were reported in the aggregate and individual victims may be reported in a number of the underserved categories. “Underserved” categories referred to here include the following: People of races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the Office 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. See footnote 42 for VAWA 2005 definition of “underserved.”

victims who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and **112,973** victims living in rural areas.⁴⁶

In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (such as brochures, manuals, training curricula, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims. Training was provided to a total of **6,729** 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 to assist them with referrals to appropriate services and agencies.

Training on issues specific to underserved populations was provided by an average of **688** subgrantees—69 percent of subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, an average of **225** subgrantees—53 percent of subgrantees using STOP funds for policy development—established and/or implemented policies regarding appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims in underserved populations and to improve responses to the needs of these victims.

American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indians (AI) and Alaska Natives (AN) are a diverse people, represented by 566 federally recognized tribes, with an estimated combined population of 2.9 million. Approximately 67 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native people live outside tribal lands (Norris, Vines, & Hoeffel, 2012).

Studies reveal that AI/AN women report higher rates of intimate partner violence than women of any other ethnic or racial background. Data collected by the U.S. Department of Justice suggest that the average annual rate of rape and sexual assault for AI/AN people is four times higher than the national average (Williams, 2012). Data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics' annual National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) indicate that AI/AN people are victims of serious violent crimes i.e., rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated and simple assault at rates four times greater than white people, more than twice the rate of African American, and almost three times

⁴⁶ For more detailed demographic information on victims served by all states, see Table 22 on page 93; for demographic information on victims served by individual states see Appendix B 2011 Tables B3a and B4a and Appendix B 2012 Tables B3b and B4b.

greater than Latino populations. These differences have been relatively stable since 2003 (Truman, Langton, & BJS Statisticians, 2014). The findings of the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey confirm that 46 percent of AI/AN women have been victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner during their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014). The 2010 Census found that 29.1 percent of AI/AN people live in poverty, making this population particularly vulnerable to domestic violence (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

The public safety challenges in Indian country vary widely from district to district – and from tribe to tribe – depending on jurisdictional issues, geography, tribal cultures, and myriad other factors. The ratio of law enforcement officers to population served remains lower on Indian reservations than in other jurisdictions across the country. And, law enforcement agencies in Indian country have the daunting challenge of patrolling large areas of sparsely populated land. In many places, the local Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) field office, the United States Attorney's Office, and the Federal courthouse are located many miles away from where tribal members reside, which only compounds the difficulties facing investigators and prosecutors, as well as victims, witnesses, and defendants involved in a Federal prosecution (U.S. Department of Justice, 2012). As discussed in a law review article, efforts to protect these victims are further complicated because many live in isolated rural communities with limited or no access to cellular/landline phone services, transportation, or emergency care; and limited criminal justice, legal assistance, and safe housing resources. Getting to or receiving services can often be tremendously challenging. Too often, incidents of domestic violence are under-reported or undocumented because victims are not able to obtain assistance from police or medical professionals and “as a result numerous perpetrators are never held accountable.” The Offices of the U.S. Attorneys (OUSA) declined to prosecute 50 percent of the 9,000 cases filed by tribes between 2005 and 2009 (Petillo, 2013).

Congress passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA) (25 USC 2802) in 2010 to improve prosecution of Indian Country crimes; the act required more accountability on the part of federal prosecutors, increased coordination with tribal governments, and strengthened tribal criminal justice programs. Section 212 of TLOA requires the Attorney General to submit an annual report to Congress detailing investigative efforts by the FBI and dispositions of matters received by United States Attorneys' Offices (USAOs) with Indian country responsibility. The Department's most recent Investigations and Prosecutions report, covering calendar year (CY) 2013, found that a substantial majority of Indian country criminal investigations opened by the FBI were referred for prosecution and a substantial majority of Indian

country criminal cases opened by the United States Attorneys' Offices were prosecuted. USAO data for CY 2013 show that 34 percent (853) of all Indian country submissions for prosecution (2,542) were declined for prosecution. In CY 2012, USAOs declined approximately 31 percent (965) of all (3,145) Indian country submissions for prosecution; for CY 2011, just under 37 percent (1,041) of the cases submitted for prosecution (2,840) were declined. The most common reason for declination by USAOs was insufficient evidence (56 percent in CY 2013, 52 percent in CY 2012, and 61 percent in CY 2011)⁴⁷ (U.S. Department of Justice, 2013).

Until the passage of VAWA 2013, tribal courts could not exercise jurisdiction over crimes committed by non-Indians on tribal land (25 U.S.C. §§1304(a)–(c)). VAWA 2013 includes an historic provision to address the jurisdictional loophole that has left many Native American women without sufficient protection. The Act recognizes the inherent power of “participating tribes” to exercise “special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction” (SDVCJ) over both Indians and non-Indians who assault Indian spouses, intimate partners, or dating partners, or who violate protection orders, in Indian country. The Act also specifies the rights that a participating tribe must provide to defendants in SDVCJ cases. Three tribes—Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and Tulalip Tribes of Washington—have been chosen as pilot sites and will be the first to implement these new provisions of VAWA 2013.⁴⁸

STOP Program funds have been used to create and strengthen partnerships between tribal and non-tribal stakeholders that have led to improved services, safety, and system response to Native victims, as described in the following examples from STOP administrators:

⁴⁷ More detailed information for (CY) 2011-2012 and (CY) 2013 can be found at <http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/tribal/legacy/2013/05/31/tloa-report-cy-2011-2012.pdf> and <http://www.justice.gov/tribal/docs/icip-rpt-cy2013.pdf>.

⁴⁸ More information on the pilot sites can be found at <http://www.justice.gov/tribal/vawa-pilot-2013.html>

Utah is home to 35 American Indian tribes with an estimated combined population of 29,684, with the Navajo Nation being the largest tribe. In San Juan County, Native Americans are reluctant to report abuse and 47 percent speak only their native tongue. Delivery of services is difficult with both a language and cultural barrier. In Duchesne County, VAWA dollars enabled advocates to provide training to Judges and court personnel in reference to protective orders for tribal members regardless of whether they reside in the county or on the reservation. After much study, research and negotiation, the determination was made to allow tribal members to secure protective orders in the Duchesne County District Court. In this manner, protective orders can now be enforced in either jurisdiction. This decision allows for increased protection for victims and their children.

—STOP administrator, Utah

As a measure of success, advocates are seeing increased communication between tribal and local governments leading to more Native Americans who are willing to seek help on and off the reservations. The domestic violence trainer at the Montana Law Enforcement Academy has recently started training with the US Attorney General's Offices Tribal Liaison in all tribal jurisdictions. County attorneys are meeting weekly with victims/survivors, increasing victims' awareness of offender status in the court system. Additionally, the Montana Legal Services Association's ability to provide assistance to Native American DV Legal Advocates in court has resulted in expanded services on reservations. These efforts demonstrate Montana's commitment to recognize and address the needs of Native American victims and survivors.

—STOP administrator, Montana

A subgrantee in Portland, Oregon engages in collaboration with community partners to ensure that culturally specific services are provided to Native American victims:

The STOP Program funding supports the VAWA Advocate to provide services to Native American survivors. The Advocate works directly with Native American culturally specific service providers in the Portland area. Service collaborations include emergency shelter, case management services, transportation, domestic violence classes, advocacy in courts, crisis management, children's services, enrollment in schools and extended services. VAWA funded staff coordinate shelter access for survivors coming from reservations, chemical dependency treatment centers, motels, or other living situations. This staff has been specifically trained in the complex issues of Native American survivors and completes yearly continuing education in this area.

—The Salvation Army West Women's and Children's Shelter, Oregon

An average of **16** subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding in 2011 and 2012 identified themselves as tribal sexual assault and/or domestic violence programs, tribal coalitions or tribal governments.⁴⁹ An average of **52** subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited **111** unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals comprised 1.9 percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012, with an average of **7,636** victims receiving services. Training on issues specific to American Indian/Alaska Native victims was provided by an average of **123** subgrantees, and **1,088** tribal government and tribal agency staff were trained with STOP funds during 2011 and 2012.

Victims with Disabilities and Older Victims

Studies suggest that women living with a disability are as much as four times more likely than those without disabilities to experience physical and sexual violence (Casteel, Martin, Smith, Gurka, & Kupper, 2008; Scherer, Snyder, & Fisher, 2013). In addition, a higher degree of severity of disability, as well as greater visibility of a disability, may put individuals at increased risk for abuse, with the most severely disabled individuals and those with the most visible disabilities having the highest risk of sexual victimization (Bones, 2013; Mahoney & Poling, 2011).

Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, researchers found that in a population of young adults ages 26 to 32, 25 percent of female respondents reported unwanted sexual experiences, including coerced and forced sex, and 14 percent reported a forced sexual encounter. Women in the study with a physical disability were nearly 50 percent more likely to have experienced a forced sexual encounter than women without a physical disability (Haydon, McRee, & Halpern, 2011). In a nationally representative study of college-aged women, female respondents with disabilities were about twice as likely to have experienced psychological, sexual, or physical abuse in the previous 12 months as those without disabilities (Scherer et al., 2013).

Women with disabilities face significant risks for abuse and barriers to disclosure, including dependence on their caregiver, who may be the perpetrator of the abuse. Victims with disabilities identify forms of abuse such as destruction of their adaptive equipment and financial exploitation by the perpetrator, in addition to physical and sexual abuse (Curry et al., 2009).

⁴⁹ 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 on in the 2010 and 2012 Biennial Reports.

When these victims disclose abuse, they may risk protective intervention that could result in loss of independence or being compelled to leave their own homes, particularly if the abuser is also their caregiver (Curry et al., 2011).

Victim service providers for people with disabilities may perceive their services as being accessible, whereas clients may identify many barriers to access. Cross-training between disability services and victim services organizations should occur in order to serve victims with disabilities more effectively. Because victims with disabilities come from various cultural, racial and ethnic populations, and have a diverse disabilities, it is critical that victim services tailor their programs to appropriately respond to the full spectrum of the assistance these victims need. (Lund, 2011).

Following are examples of how STOP subgrantees have used funds to respond to, and to improve the response to, victims with disabilities in Maine, Massachusetts, and New York:

Because of this program, we have been able to provide direct services to people who are elderly and people who have a developmental disability. Those are people who might have difficulty reaching out for services following a sexual assault, or who may not have known about the services available. With this program, we are bringing services to where they live, thereby reducing some barriers to accessing services.

—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Services, Maine

The Spring 2011 Sexual Assault Counselor Training included professionals who work with Deaf/hard of hearing (HOH) individuals and families in the community. As has been the case in previous such trainings, hearing participants benefitted by receiving needed training on Deaf Culture and by learning effective communication skills. Feedback from evaluations completed after each session showed that all participants felt positively about their experience and learned valuable information. Specifically, hearing participants confirmed how vital it is to understand the unique needs and challenges Deaf/HOH individuals face while trying to gain access to services. They better understood, for example, the need to have access to a sign language interpreter in a hospital or legal situation. They felt more prepared to work with the population and advocate for their needs.

—Rape Crisis of Central Massachusetts/Pathways for Change

Victims of interpersonal violence with disabilities who come into contact with the criminal justice system and are connected with BFJ [Barrier Free Justice] can expect and will have access to working with a collaborative coordinated response team that is disability-informed. The District Attorney's Office social work and legal team provides early intervention, crisis counseling, safety planning, concrete services, provision of expert witnesses and language services when needed, and legal advocacy and guidance. Barrier Free Living offers extensive social services including counseling, support groups, case management, advocacy, Deafness services and more. South Brooklyn Legal Service assists women in obtaining Family Court Orders of Protection and a range of other civil legal issues. These efforts have begun to bridge the still huge gap between research statistics and the number of domestic violence and sexual assault cases reported and being prosecuted.

—*Kings County District Attorney—Barrier Free Justice, New York*

We are living in an aging society: The 2010 U. S. Census recorded the highest number (40.3 million) and percentage (13 percent of the population) of people 65 and older in the history of the Census (Werner, 2011). By 2030, over 20 percent of Americans, or 73 million people, are expected to be 65 or older; approximately 40 million of them will be women (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2012). The implications for protecting this expanding and increasingly vulnerable population—and responding appropriately and effectively to abuse of elders—are critical and compelling.

According to the National Elder Mistreatment Study and the New York State Elder Abuse Prevalence Study, only a small percentage (4 to 7 percent) of abuse incidents, of any nature, against older persons comes to the attention of authorities; victims of these incidents are also less likely to be receiving services. Consistent with other research, those with low social supports are much more likely to report experiencing some form of abuse (Acierno et al., 2010). Elder abuse is primarily the responsibility of adult protective services (APS) agencies, which investigate, prosecute, and protect against abuse, neglect, and/or exploitation of vulnerable adults. Domestic violence services, by comparison, specifically address abuse related to domestic violence, intimate partner sexual assault and/or stalking, and usually integrate feminist empowerment theory into their models, promote self-agency, and define perpetrators primarily as intimate partners (Kilbane & Spira, 2010). Many sexual assault programs are similarly issue-specific and feminist-oriented. Historically, agencies assisting victims of elder abuse, such as Area Agencies on Aging, focus on services associated with family, caregiver, and financial abuse—not with intimate partner or sexual abuse or stalking. Because of this obscuring of intimate partner violence among older victims, confusion can arise about appropriate responses and provision of services. While some services for victims of domestic violence may be appropriate for victims who

are older, the specific and unique needs of this population may not be adequately addressed (Desmarais & Reeves, 2007).

To date, only a limited number of studies have specifically examined the experiences and patterns of intimate partner violence against older women; most research is limited to women seeking medical care or other services for the abuse. A comprehensive review of the research literature observed that non-physical intimate partner violence persists into later life and may become more severe as physical violence decreases (Roberto, McPherson, & Brossoie, 2013). Evidence shows that such violence is often overlooked. Studies both large and small find that 25 to 48 percent of older women report a history of abuse—physical, verbal, psychological, sexual, and/or financial (Bonomi et al., 2007; Fisher, Zink, & Regan, 2011). Fourteen percent of women older than 65 report having been physically or sexually assaulted, or both, by intimate partners during their lifetimes, and many of them exhibit symptoms of PTSD, depression, and anxiety even decades after the trauma (Cook, Pilver, Dinnen, Schnurr, & Hoff, 2013).

Older abused women often have distinct and special needs: Few are employed, and most are receiving public assistance and/or Social Security benefits and/or are dependent upon family members for their care (Lundy & Grossman, 2009). For many, the length of their relationships with the abusers can be a complicating factor. Women who have been married 25 years or more may feel that their options are limited (Leisey, Kupstas, & Cooper, 2009). Given these differences, it is vital that sexual assault and domestic violence agencies create a response that is specific to the needs and disabilities of older victims and that these agencies develop effective ways to collaborate with adult protective services and other service providers targeting older adults.

Following are examples of activities made possible with STOP Program funding that benefit victims who are older:

The STOP Program funding has allowed for me, as a prosecutor, to have someone readily available at all times to help with any issue that may arise in the context of my elder abuse cases and investigations. By having the aid of a Criminal Investigator who can seek out witnesses, gather evidence, and meet with victims, the success of the prosecution of elder abuse cases in Westchester County has skyrocketed. . . . Often, it is the first contact, by either myself or the Investigator which is close in time to the occurrence of the crime, that can maintain an elderly victim of domestic violence to continue with and aid in the prosecution. . . . Armed with stronger cases and strong evidence, I am often able to enter into plea negotiations with defense attorneys that will spare my victims from having to testify—a fear that is real and in the forefront for the majority of my victims.

—*Westchester County District Attorney's Office, New York*

Project Reach has been successful in increasing public awareness of the problem of domestic abuse in later life and the need for services. Those in need of services only need to call the 24-hour hotline. . . . Callers may enter the emergency Safe House right away or make an appointment for an intake into the program with a Project Reach staff person at the Outreach Office in Whiting, NJ. Project Reach staff will go to the Safe House to provide services to residents age 50 and above residing there. . . . The program also assists elderly victims with at-home or off-site visits for those too frail to travel or without transportation.

—*Catholic Charities, Diocese of Trenton, Providence House-Ocean, New Jersey*

Because of the unique challenges and barriers faced by victims with disabilities and victims who are older, it is critical to direct funding to programs that will focus on responding to their needs, as the STOP Program does. An annual average of **212** (9 percent) of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims of domestic violence or sexual assault. Overall, STOP subgrantees reported providing victim services to an average of **26,131** victims with disabilities and **16,828** victims over the age of 60—6 percent and 4 percent, respectively, of all victims served.⁵⁰ 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. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims was provided by an average of **103** subgrantees to other professionals; subgrantees also provided training to **4,229** staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims who are elderly or

⁵⁰ Because data are collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims were both disabled and older than 60. Also, the reporting form that was used to collect data for this report used the category 60+. The next lowest category was age 25 to 59.

who have disabilities were developed or implemented by an average of **152** subgrantees in each reporting year.

Victims Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Women who are refugees and asylum-seekers are often victims of sexual violence, famine, economic displacement, and war in their home countries, and are unable or unwilling to return to their home countries because of fear of persecution or death based on their race, ethnicity, religion, political or social group, or other status (Martin & Yankay, 2013). The violence they suffered may be state-sponsored or organized by sectarian groups (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 2012; Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2009; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2014). Increasingly, human trafficking is the violence from which women immigrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers are fleeing (U.S. Department of State, 2014).

Immigrant and refugee victims of sexual assault and domestic violence face many barriers to safety including lack of English proficiency, lack of knowledge of the systems that are in place to help them, and cultural barriers such as pressure to keep these crimes secret for fear of bringing shame upon the family (Mindlin, Orloff, Pochiraju, & Echevarria, 2013; National Network to End Domestic Violence, 2014b; Yoshihama, Bybee, Dabby, & Blazeovski, 2011). In addition to cultural and linguistic barriers, structural barriers to serving immigrant and refugee victims, such as social inequality and lack of availability of social services, can make it difficult for women to exit abusive relationships and become safe from the violence (M. Lee, 2013). Even where services are available, victims of domestic violence and sexual assault who have limited English proficiency face challenges (e.g., waits of hours, days, or even weeks) in their attempts to access services such as counseling, health care, housing, and education if no qualified interpreter is available or if service providers do not speak their language (N. Lee, Quinones, Ammar, & Orloff, 2013).

In a national survey, providers (at legal services, social services, and domestic violence and sexual assault programs) who serve immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking related that where victims called law enforcement, responding officers were able to identify the language spoken by victims in fewer than half of the cases, and in 30 percent of those cases, unqualified interpreters were used. They further reported that clients experienced bias when courts and law enforcement relied on inappropriate or unqualified interpreters who may intentionally or unintentionally misrepresented the victim's statements. In 24 percent of the

more than 6,000 domestic violence cases in which an unqualified interpreter was used, the interpreter was a child or children of the victim or perpetrator, in 23 percent of these cases it was a friend or neighbor, and in 8 percent of these cases police spoke with the English-speaking perpetrators. Additionally, in sexual assault and domestic violence cases in which a victim called police but no police report was taken, the reason given more than 50 percent of the time was a language barrier (N. Lee et al., 2013).

Fear of deportation is a tremendous concern for some immigrant victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and can result in the victim not calling police for help (Hass, Yang, Monahan, Orloff, & Anver, 2014). The VAWA self-petition and the U and T visas are remedies available to immigrant and refugee victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and other crimes to assist them in obtaining safety and escaping their abusers (Mindlin et al., 2013).

STOP Program funds have been used to provide comprehensive services, including assistance with U visas and language services, to immigrant victims, as illustrated in the following examples:

STOP Grant program funds allow SafePlace to provide comprehensive services that specifically address the needs of Asian immigrants who speak little or no English. We provide advocacy-based counseling, translation, legal advocacy, outreach to the Asian community, and assistance with immigration issues. STOP Grant funds make it possible for us to continue to have a full-time Asian Community Advocate who engages in one-on-one advocacy, systems coordination, outreach and networking, and development and maintenance of partnerships, including legal and immigration-related services.

—Safe Place, Washington

The [STOP] funding we continue to receive allows us to pay more caseworkers so that more immigrant victims can be served. Before receiving STOP funding, we were not filing U Visa applications; now, we file more U Visas than all our other types of immigration applications combined . . . [O]ver 600 of our clients have been granted U Visas and they are working toward qualifying for legal permanent residency. Over 300 U Visa clients have now been granted permanent residency.

—Holy Cross Ministries, Utah

The Chinese Family Violence Awareness Project (CFVAP) increased the number of immigrant survivors who sought legal protection orders. Without the encouragement, assistance, and court accompaniment of the CFVAP advocate these clients would not have obtained their protection orders. The CFVAP advocate was able to explain the process in their own language and make it understandable to them.

—*Hawaii Immigrant Justice Center*

VAWA 2000 included a provision for assistance to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in immigration matters in the purpose areas of the STOP Program, authorizing recipients of these funds to address immigration issues on behalf of victims; more than 13 percent (**335**) of subgrantees, on average, reported addressing this purpose area. Subgrantees overall reported serving an average of **21,993** victims who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 5 percent of all victims served in 2011 and 2012. Training on issues specific to these victims was provided by an average of **281** subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims face are complex and the consequences of reporting their victimization are often more serious than for other victims.

Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and to effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by an average of **100** STOP Program subgrantees in each reporting period and included interpreters, language lines, and the translation of forms, documents, and informational materials into languages other than English. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to develop, translate, and/or distribute **532** unique products in **26** different languages in 2011 and 2012.⁵¹

Victims Who Live in Rural Areas

Research is clear that women residing in rural areas are at elevated risk for sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. In 2011, more than 19 million women 18 and older lived in rural areas, representing 16.7 percent of all adult women (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013). A survey of approximately 1500 battered women attending a family planning clinic in the Midwest revealed that women living in remote,

⁵¹ For a list of the languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 87, the Products section of “STOP Aggregate Accomplishments.”

isolated rural areas are at especially high risk of domestic and sexual violence. More than 60 percent of women living in remote rural areas had been assaulted 4 or more times during the previous 12 months, compared with slightly less than 40 percent of women in urban areas; the severity of abuse was 3 times greater for rural as compared with urban victims (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Another study found that women living in rural areas are more likely to be victims of intimate partner violence than urban or suburban women. Specifically, 25.2 percent of all violence against women in rural areas is perpetrated by an intimate partner in comparison to 19.2 percent for women in urban and 21.0 percent for women in suburban areas (Rennison, DeKeseredy, & Dragiewicz, 2013).

Rural women must travel great distances to reach the services that are available: The distance to services is often three times greater for rural women than for their urban counterparts, with 25 percent traveling more than 40 miles to the closest victim services program (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Beyond the geographical obstacles, research suggests that victims residing in rural areas often face a complex interweaving of cultural, psychological, emotional, and systemic barriers that may prevent them from seeking assistance. Expert legal and advocate service providers working with sexual assault victims in rural Virginia identified confidentiality issues and additional resource needs (e.g., transportation, legal services, mental health professionals, SANEs) specific to rural settings, and low levels of reporting related to victim-blaming (Annan, 2011).

In rural communities, people often place a great deal of value on family privacy, traditional gender roles, and keeping families intact, even when violence is present (Shepard & Hagemester, 2013). Rural culture can reinforce the normative belief that one should not report crime because it is a private concern (Johnson, McGrath, & Miller, 2014). Even in cases where IPV is identified by primary care physicians and resources are available, rural culture and low socioeconomic status persist as barriers to IPV treatment; rural women may be less educated, more economically dependent on their abuser, and more likely to normalize the violence (McCall-Hosenfeld, Weisman, Perry, Hillemeier, & Chuang, 2014).

A literature review of interpersonal violence and disabilities in rural communities identified lack of anonymity as another identified reason that victims may be reluctant to report intimate partner violence. While rural communities have lower population densities, they also have greater acquaintance density (Fitzsimons, Hagemester, & Braun, 2011). It is common in rural communities for family members of the victim and perpetrator to live in close proximity. When children are present, this closeness poses extra complications, because ongoing conflicts over child custody and visitation

arrangements may involve extended family networks within the community (Shepard & Hagemester, 2013).

On a systemic level, rural criminal justice systems may be politicized and unresponsive—a situation that may leave victims vulnerable to retaliation (Fitzsimons et al., 2011). In addition, the rural ideology that facilitates the perception that “home troubles” are private troubles can impede appropriate criminal justice response. Community and social pressure to avoid any criminal justice engagement can also hinder the relationship between the victim and the advocate, who could help initiate contact with the criminal justice system (Johnson, McGrath, & Miller, 2014).

Following are examples of some of the ways in which subgrantees have used STOP Program funds to address the particular challenges they face in rural jurisdictions:

STOP Program funding has provided funding for a trained advocate to travel to a satellite office in a rural community that is next to tribal housing. Many victims who live in the tribal community lack transportation to receive services and with an advocate providing outreach services it increases the chance for the victim to obtain crisis intervention services and the ability to fill out a temporary protective order without traveling 20 miles to the local courthouse. Victims at the satellite office also receive help and information for employment, TANF programs, daycare information and resources that are beneficial to the victim.

—Winner Resource Center for Families, South Dakota

Since this grant covers a rural area, the combination of low income individuals and firearm owners are of great concern. A majority of individuals in this community are hunters. Many abusers have threatened their victims with a firearm. Without this grant, these victims would not have the means to hire an attorney to assist them with orders of protection. Many victims would not seek protection and would continue to be threatened by their abusers, injured, or possibly killed. This grant allows those with little means the opportunity to stop this violence and protect themselves. The revocation of FOID [firearms owner identification] cards is of great importance in removing guns from these violent individuals and deters possible volatile situations from occurring.

—Violence Prevention Center of Southwestern Illinois

STOP Program funding has allowed us to reach areas in Georgia that would have not come together in community coordinated response had it not been for this funding. For example, the Lookout Mountain Judicial Circuit (specifically, Dade County) is a very isolated, rural area in the northwest corner of the state. It is surrounded by mountains, and not readily accessible by interstate. In fact, you must take the interstate into Tennessee, and loop around back into Georgia to access this area. Because of STOP Program funding, Dade County is currently planning to launch a domestic violence docket, and the stakeholders have begun to communicate as a coordinated group to address domestic violence cases in the area. Dade County can serve as a model to other parts of the state with similar populations and/or geographic considerations which doubt that a dedicated docket can work in their area.

—Administrative Office of the Courts of Georgia

STOP funding has enabled our office to create and maintain a Violence Against Women Prosecution Team to prosecute cases in some of South Carolina's rural and most poor counties. Prior to this, domestic violence cases were split among overworked prosecutors who also were responsible for prosecuting murder, robberies, drug distribution, etc. Domestic violence cases were less of a priority to them. The result was that domestic violence cases sat stagnant for months. The longer a case lingers, the less likely the victim is going to participate in the prosecution. Our team now includes 1.5 attorneys and 1 victim advocate. They are able to exclusively prosecute domestic violence, stalking and sexual assaults thanks to this grant funding. In addition, the team works closely with non-profits, government agencies and other interested parties to coordinate victim services throughout the four-county area.

—Fourteenth Circuit Solicitor's Office, South Carolina

STOP Program funds were used to provide services to an average of **112,973** victims who were reported as residing in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country) per reporting period; this number represents more than a quarter (26 percent) of all victims served. Training in issues specific to victims who live in rural areas was provided by an average of **373** subgrantees (37 percent of those using funds for training).

Sexual Assault

VAWA, as amended by VAWA 2013, defines the term “sexual assault” to mean “any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.” 42 USC 13925(a)(29). The NISVS revealed that approximately 18 percent of women and 1.4 percent of men in the United States have been victims of attempted or completed rape. Close to half (44.6 percent) of women and nearly a

quarter (22.2 percent) of men have experienced some other form of sexual violence, including being forced to penetrate, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual contact, and non-contact unwanted sexual experiences (Black et al., 2011). While both women and men are victims of sexual violence, findings suggest that women experience lifetime prevalence of intimate partner sexual violence at significantly higher rates (Breiding et al., 2014).

Sexual assault is perpetrated in a variety of situations and relationships. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reports that in a study of female victims of sexual violence, 78 percent knew their offender. The relationships between the victim and offender ranged from intimate partners and relatives to well-known or casual acquaintances. The other 22 percent of victims reported their perpetrator was a stranger (Planty, Langton, Krebs, Berzofsky, & Smiley-McDonald, 2013). Likewise, according to the NISVS, of all female victims who had experienced rape—whether completed, attempted, or alcohol- or drug-facilitated—51 percent were raped by a current or former intimate partner and 41 percent by an acquaintance (Black et al., 2011).

Age is one of a number of factors that can place a woman at increased risk of sexual assault. According to the NISVS, more than 75 percent of women surveyed who had been victims of a completed rape were first raped before their 25th birthday; 42 percent of these victims experienced their first completed rape before the age of 18. More than 25 percent of male victims were raped before the age of 11. And women who were raped before the age of 18 were twice as likely to be raped as adults: More than 33 percent of women who were raped as minors were also raped as adults compared with 14 percent of women without an early rape history (Black et al., 2011).

As noted in two clinical reviews of practice, the consequences of sexual victimization are considerable. Sexual assault and sexual violence are associated with varied and serious physical, psychological, and emotional health consequences for victims. These include depression, PTSD, shame, and substance abuse. Sexual assault may also result in physical injuries ranging from minor injuries, bite wounds, and bruising to blunt force trauma, defensive injuries, and attempted strangulation. Victims may also suffer internal and anogenital injuries (Linden, 2011; Probst, Turchik, Zimak, & Huckins, 2011). Findings from the Historically Black College and University Campus Sexual Assault Study (HBCU CSA) indicate that students who are victims of sexual assault are more likely to report symptoms of depression and PTSD than those who have not experienced sexual assault (Lindquist et al., 2013).

Despite the high rates of prevalence and adverse consequences, sexual assault remains under-reported, particularly to law enforcement. A BJS study found that reports of sexual assaults to police fell from a high of 56 percent

in 2003 to 35 percent in 2010; and between 2005 and 2010, victims reported that police collected evidence in only 19 percent of the cases to which they responded. Additionally, victims reported that an arrest was made at the scene or during a follow-up investigation 31 percent of the time (Planty et al., 2013).

VAWA permits STOP-funded programs to fund the training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the following areas: Treatment of trauma related to sexual assault; collection, preservation, and analysis of evidence; and providing expert testimony.⁵² In addition, STOP Program subgrantees provide training to increase the understanding of the intersection of domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking. They also may develop and implement policies and protocols that lead to better responses and improved services to victims of sexual assault and stalking.

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and evidence collected, but also to provide victims of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is vital to ensure that victims 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 of sexual assault often were 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. That lack of training compromised the ability of the criminal justice system to prosecute perpetrators successfully. In sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, trained nurse examiners provide prompt, sensitive, supportive, and compassionate care. The nurses also follow forensic protocols, ensuring the highest-quality evidence.

The following three examples illustrate ways in which subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide training to a broad array of professionals responding to sexual assault victims—law enforcement officers, hospital staff, prosecutors, advocates, rape crisis counselors, and sexual assault forensic examiners:

⁵² VAWA 2013 sets out a new requirement regarding the use of STOP Program funds to address sexual assault: “Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, not less than 20 percent of the total amount granted to a State under this subchapter shall be allocated for programs or projects in 2 or more allocations listed in paragraph (4) that meaningfully address sexual assault, including stranger rape, acquaintance rape, alcohol or drug-facilitated rape, and rape within the context of an intimate partner relationship” (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(5)).

The training that was held was focused on understanding and investigating sexual assault. Our focus was to have law enforcement, hospital professionals, prosecuting attorneys, and victims advocates all together in one room to discuss the impact that a sexual assault has on a victim, and sensitive, but effective ways to handle these types of situations. The purpose of everyone being together was to take everyone through the process that a victim goes through after a sexual assault has occurred. We wanted to show everyone where the lack of communication between agencies was, and help them address these issues on a local level. We discovered during this training the many misconceptions and myths believed by these professionals. Since this training, hospital staff have increased their awareness and their willingness to have an understanding of the victim's experience.

—Women's Information Services, Inc., Michigan

The Community Operations Coordinator coordinates the continuing education trainings/opportunities and certification process offered by IowaCASA. There are currently 150 IowaCASA Certified Sexual Abuse Counselors so the trainings provided with the STOP Program funds are critical to keeping advocates in the field up-to-date on sexual assault issues. They also provide much needed training and information to bilingual advocates who are working with a diverse population of survivors.

—Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Experiential Testimony Training provides the opportunity for Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners (SAFE) to offer testimony in an artificial criminal sexual assault trial. It is the expectation that a SAFE will at some point be called upon to provide court testimony on a case. Yet, SAFEs have little if any experience or training with being a witness in court. The testimony training provides that experience in a safe learning environment. It is as realistic as possible—held in a courtroom with attorneys who play the role of prosecutor for direct examination of the witness; defense attorney for cross examination; and a judge to decide on motions and objections. Each SAFE testifies for at least 50 minutes followed by a 'debriefing' where all those in attendance provide feedback on the testimony/constructive feedback for the nurse. Because each nurse is 'on the stand' for an hour, this limits the number of participants. All evaluations, written comments, and oral feedback is extremely positive.

—Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner Program, Office of the Maine Attorney General

Subgrantees used funds to provide critical counseling and support group services for sexual assault victims:

This grant year we had one teen group and 2 adult groups for survivors of sexual assault. These groups reported their feedback via a narrative report. Some comments from group members include: "[T]his was a powerful learning experience—I only wish I had done group work 20 years ago"; "[G]roup therapy has given me many different avenues to deal with what I went through and to know that I have more support than I thought I had"; "Through counseling I have been able to take back control of my life. Counseling saved me!"

—*Foothills Alliance, South Carolina*

WEAVE primarily utilizes intern and licensed therapists to provide the highest-quality services to clients who have a range of co-occurring issues in conjunction with sexual assault. . . . Because many of the staff are trained in mental health and substance abuse issues, our counselors are able to better assess these issues and be responsive with interventions and/or appropriate referrals. We are able to see a broader range of clients and are better able to assess sexual assault in clients who present as interpersonal violence victims. . . . We consistently help eligible clients with their Victim Witness applications and many of them are able to continue longer term therapy after their free sessions have completed. This allows a continuum of care that was not possible previously.

—*Weave, Inc., California*

An average of **219** sexual assault organizations—**175** local programs and **44** state sexual assault coalitions⁵³—received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims made up 12 percent of all victims served with program funds in 2011 and 2012. An average of **1,017** subgrantees provided services to sexual assault victims, **206** engaged in law enforcement activities that addressed sexual assault, and **153** prosecuted sexual assault cases. STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of **4,511** sexual assault cases during 2011 and 2012, and an overall average of **77** percent⁵⁴ of those cases resulted in convictions.

One of the statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program is the training of sexual assault forensic medical examiners: An average of 15 percent (**148**) of

⁵³ Subgrantees also reported that an average of 520 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs, 11 tribal dual programs, and 28 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012.

⁵⁴ This percentage includes cases of deferred adjudications, which represented 3 percent of all sexual assault conviction outcomes.

subgrantees using funds for training reported that they used funds for this purpose and a total of **8,341** SANEs received STOP Program-funded training during 2011 and 2012. STOP Program funds also were used by an average of **53** STOP subgrantees to support **40** FTE SANE staff positions per reporting period and to conduct a total of 17,337 forensic exams by trained SANEs and SAFEs.

An average of **643** subgrantees—64 percent of those using funds for training—provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault, i.e. sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination.

Stalking

OVW defines “stalking” as a pattern of repeated and unwanted attention, harassment, contact, or any other course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear. Stalking may include repeated, unwanted, intrusive, and frightening communications from the perpetrator by phone, mail, and/or email. Perpetrators may leave unwanted items, presents, or flowers; or follow or wait for their victim at locations such as home, school, work, or places of recreation. They may make direct or indirect threats to harm the victim, the victim's children, relatives, friends, or pets; they may damage or threaten to damage personal property. Perpetrators may engage in cyber stalking, which can involve harassing the victim through the Internet, posting information or spreading rumors about the victim on the Internet, obtaining personal information by accessing Internet records, and using GPS and spyware to track the victim's activities and whereabouts (Black et al., 2011; Catalano, 2012; Stalking Resource Center, 2012). More than 75 percent of female victims report having received unwanted phone calls and messages, nearly 60 percent report being contacted at work or at home, and more than 33 percent report being watched, followed, or tracked with some form of device during their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014).

Stalking is challenging to address both civilly and criminally. Approximately 1 in 6 women (16.2 percent) and 1 in 19 men (5.2 percent) in the United States have experienced stalking at some point in their lives and felt afraid or thought someone close to them would be harmed or killed, according to the NISVS (Breiding et al., 2014). The general public may be most familiar with stalking by strangers, but females are stalked by strangers only 9 to 13 percent of the time. The majority of female and male victims are stalked by individuals they know (Breiding et al., 2014; Catalano, 2012). As the NISVS

found, more than two-thirds of female victims reported being stalked by a current or former intimate partner and nearly a quarter reported stalking by an acquaintance. Likewise, approximately four out of ten male victims reported being stalked by an intimate partner and four out of ten reported stalking by an acquaintance. Women who are divorced or separated experience the highest rates of stalking (Black et al., 2011; Breiding et al., 2014; Catalano, 2012).

Stalking is not a singular act: Among stalking victims, nearly half (46 percent) report at least one unwanted contact per week and 11 percent report that they have been stalked by the same person for 5 years or more (Baum et al., 2009; Catalano, 2012).

Age is also a risk factor for stalking. Victims between the ages of 18 and 24 experience the highest levels of stalking, and more than half of female victims report that their first stalking experience occurred before the age of 25 (Breiding et al., 2014; Catalano, 2012). Stalking is more common on college campuses than in the general population. In one study of approximately 1,600 college students, researchers found that the frequency of stalking exceeded 40 percent. However, the victims rarely acknowledged being stalked. Of students reporting behavior that qualified as stalking, only 25 percent self-identified as being stalked and their acknowledgement of the stalking was linked with more severe and injurious offenses by the offenders (McNamara & Marsil, 2012).

Because victims often have to move, cancel cell phone plans, change jobs, and purchase expensive security systems, they face significant financial hardships. A survey of 3.4 million stalking victims found that of those who had jobs and lost time for reasons related to stalking, more than half lost 5 or more days of work during the previous 12 months; approximately 130,000 victims were either asked to resign or were fired from their jobs (Baum et al., 2009). A history of being stalked and experiencing fear and threats was found to be significantly correlated with the severity of PTSD symptoms among post-abuse women (Fleming, Newton, Fernandez-Botran, Miller, & Burns, 2012). The psychological, emotional, and financial devastation to victims can last for months or even years after the stalking ceases (Miller, 2012).

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

A Virginia subgrantee used STOP Program funds to support a stalking-specific subcommittee:

DVIP [Domestic Violence Intervention Project] established a Stalking Subcommittee, which met on numerous occasions throughout 2011. The Stalking Subcommittee's aim is to educate advocates and other allied professionals on new technologies that stalkers are using to prey on their victims. DVIP hosted training for law enforcement, advocates, and prosecutors that emphasized these new technologies, as well as the best way for these agencies to pursue these offenders.

—Alexandria Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney, Virginia

The following subgrantee used STOP Program funds for a stalking advocate and to support a collaborative tasked with improving services to stalking victims:

STOP Program funding allows us to provide a stalking specific victim advocate available at our organization. This is an invaluable position as stalking cases take a longer time to process and to lay out information to bring to the civil court system, law enforcement and legal services due to the great number of stalking incidents each victim is reporting when they access services. STOP Program funding is also providing the ability for a specific collaborative of people to work together, increasing access to services and coordination of services for stalking victims.

—Aid to Victims of Domestic Abuse, Inc., Florida

STOP subgrantees in Pennsylvania and Ohio distributed and trained others on a stalking protocol, provided training to law enforcement officers on how to gather evidence to enable felony stalking charges, and supported a dedicated stalking investigator with their STOP Program funds:

Distributing and training on the stalking protocol has created a greater awareness among police officers in regards to stalking, higher arrests for the crime and greater follow through of prosecuting stalking offenders. Advocates are finding an increase in receptivity towards the protocol among officers. Advocates have strengthened relationships with officers through conversations both at formal roll-call trainings and informal communications at district magistrate offices. CCN [Crisis Center North] advocates were able to train 18 different police departments and 81 officers on the stalking protocol. This strong outreach has continued to strengthen relationships with police officers, court personnel and judges. Advocates also trained 9 district magistrate judges.

—Allegheny County District Attorney's Office, Pennsylvania

The [STOP-funded] Stalking Investigator . . . is trained to deal with the uniquely difficult issues involved in stalking cases. The goal of the investigator is the safety of the victims, not just prosecution of the case. Our Stalking Investigator is able to take the time to conduct surveillance on suspects, liaise with multiple jurisdictions to get the whole picture of the abuse and help victims through the legal process. The Stalking Investigator is able to compile profiles of suspects to share with police agencies. The Stalking Investigator is able to take the time to do those things that local law enforcement and prosecution do not have the resources or the time to do to hold the offenders of stalking accountable and to offer safety to victims.

—*City of Columbus, Department of Public Safety, Ohio*

The stalking trainings sponsored by HAVIN [Helping All Victims in Need] through the grant have taught law enforcement how to take multiple complaints of harassment that occur with domestic violence and build them into felony stalking charges instead of misdemeanor charges. Law enforcement has learned how to go outside of the jurisdiction or to pull from different municipalities to gather information on the offender to charge felony stalking.

—*Helping All Victims in Need, Pennsylvania*

STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, and strengthen programs that address stalking by an average of **317**, or 13 percent, of subgrantees. Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported disposing of a total of **2,125** stalking cases in 2011 and 2012, which constituted 1.1 percent of all cases disposed of. The conviction rate for all stalking cases (including ordinance, misdemeanor, felony, and stalking homicide) was **75 percent**.⁵⁵ Training on stalking issues was provided by an average of **502** subgrantees, or 50 percent of those using funds for training. Training topics included overview and dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

Coordinated Community Response

As communities across the country came to identify domestic and sexual violence as significant concerns, victim advocacy organizations and criminal justice agencies began to collaborate on strategies to stop the violence, protect victims, and hold offenders accountable. This collaboration, a “cornerstone of VAWA,” has come to be known as coordinated community response, or CCR. CCRs initially focused on reforms in the criminal legal

⁵⁵ This percentage includes deferred adjudications, which represented 13 percent of all stalking conviction outcomes.

system, examining and modifying policies, procedures, and rules that guided the practice of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and probation personnel. Criminal justice practitioners and advocates provided and received training on these revisions in practice and established systems to evaluate adherence to the reforms by each sector of the criminal justice and advocacy systems.

Eventually, CCR members discovered that reforms in their individual sectors were not enough, and CCR efforts moved in the direction of cross-disciplinary collaborations to address remaining shortcomings and obstacles to achieving the goals of victim safety and offender accountability. An example of a process developed to promote effective cross-disciplinary collaboration is the “Institutional Analysis/Community Assessment.”⁵⁶ This audit process engages all sectors of the criminal legal system and victim advocacy/service agencies in local, cross-disciplinary teams to do the following: Examine current policies, protocols, guidelines, forms, and work routines; evaluate whether they strengthen or impede safety for victims of battering and sexual assault; and produce recommendations for systemic change (Praxis International, 2010).

Efforts to address sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking have been found to be most effective when they are combined and integrated into a coordinated community response (DePrince et al., 2012; EMT Associates, 2013; Shepard & Pence, 1999). Organizations participating in domestic violence collaboratives were found to have increased knowledge and awareness of which sector does what in their community systems, expanded social capital that results in increased referrals and services for victims, and heightened influence on important decision-making within the legal system (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2011).

The Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) is a broadly implemented example of a coordinated, collaborative community response. Typically, SARTs bring together professionals from the criminal legal, medical, mental health, and advocacy sectors to strengthen resources for victims and enhance each stakeholder’s ability to respond to sexual assault effectively, appropriately, and with sensitivity toward victims. The Sexual Assault Response and Resource Team (SARRT) is a more comprehensive coordinated approach involving a broader range of professionals—the initial responders (i.e., law enforcement, advocates, and health care providers) as well as those providing and coordinating ongoing resources for sexual assault victims

⁵⁶ Materials and tools for Institutional Analysis/Community Assessment can be found on the PRAXIS International website at:
http://www.praxisinternational.org/praxis_institutional_analysis_community_assessment_home.aspx.

within the community (e.g., mental health, public health, substance abuse, and other social services) (Lonsway, Archambault, & Littel, 2013). Through the use of a national protocol for sexual assault forensic examinations,⁵⁷ SARTs/SARRTs are instrumental in assuring victims access to immediate care and services and in facilitating the development of evidence that can be used to support the prosecution of offenders (Littel, 2013). Research suggests that SARTs can improve legal outcomes, help-seeking experiences of victims, and multidisciplinary relationships among responders (Greeson & R. Campbell, 2013).

Illinois' statewide network of family violence coordinating councils is another example of community-based collaboratives that coordinate interagency intervention to address domestic violence. These councils help build stronger relationships and enhanced knowledge among stakeholders. Both the presence and age of these councils are associated with an increased rate at which emergency protection orders became final orders (Allen et al., 2013).

The concept of "community" in "coordinated community response" can and has been broadened by OVW grantees to include schools, workplaces, churches, community groups, neighborhoods, tribes, and families. Including employers in the coordinated response, for example, may contribute to changing social attitudes about intimate partner violence through the implementation of workplace policies and procedures that support victims and hold offenders accountable (Pennington-Zoellner, 2009).

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 effort is exemplified in the implementation planning process that takes place in every state. VAWA requires the state administering agencies to involve nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. Administering agencies are also strongly encouraged to involve Indian tribal governments in the planning process.⁵⁸ The creation of the STOP Program ensured a broad distribution of funds to criminal justice agencies (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation) and victim services organizations.

⁵⁷ The U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women released a second edition of the *National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations Adults/Adolescents* in April 2013. The revised protocol updates the original 2004 protocol to reflect current technology and changes in VAWA 2005 and increases the emphasis on victim-centered care.

⁵⁸ VAWA 2013 requires that states consult and coordinate with enumerated entities, including tribal governments, in the implementation planning process. (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(2)-(3)).

The requirement that STOP Program-funded agencies communicate and collaborate with criminal justice system and community partners leads to the creation and implementation of protocols, changes in practice, and a more timely and comprehensive response to holding offenders accountable and thus keeping victims safe:

After several meetings involving staff from the Probation Department's DV Unit, prosecutors, law enforcement, judiciary (if applicable) and local certified treatment providers that meet monthly, it was determined that cases involving a straight jail sentence were often falling through the cracks as it related to completion of a certified domestic violence treatment program. Through conversations, this was addressed by the judiciary, which is now imposing a suspended jail sentence, on top of the initial jail sentence, on the condition that the offender enroll in and complete a certified program and provide proof to the court. In addition, court reviews are now regularly occurring to ensure compliance.

—District Attorney's Office, 10th Judicial District, Colorado

[The Community Coordinated Response Team members] have scheduled case review on a monthly basis. Due to the communication that our members have with each other, there has been a quicker and more efficient response to offenders' probation violations and our ability to monitor offenders' activities has improved. For example, when an offender fails to comply with the requirements of the batterers' treatment program, the program facilitator will immediately notify the probation officers and the assigned assistant district attorney via e-mail or telephone. This allows for immediate sanctions for violators. Furthermore, we have been able to communicate with community victim advocates in order to ensure education and protection for victims of domestic violence.

—District Attorney #2, Oklahoma

The following example of a STOP Program-funded SART illustrates the significant positive impact of a coordinated, collaborative response:

Since the inception of the SANE Program, victims are now responded to by a SART (sexual assault response team) composed of law enforcement, SANE, and rape crisis advocate. . . . The length of time to perform the forensic examination has been greatly reduced and averages about 2-3 hours [compared to 10-12 hours before the SANE program]. . . . Multidisciplinary meetings with prosecutors, detectives, SANEs, and crisis counselors are scheduled regularly for case reviews so that information about the progress of each case can be shared with counselors who may be providing services to the victim. . . . Since the SANE Program began, the number of sexual assault cases entering the criminal justice system has exceeded the number for any given year in the history of this county.

—Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government Division of Police, Kentucky

In the following example, limited resources necessarily called for increased coordination and collaboration in order to provide needed services:

Despite individual agencies, both governmental and non-governmental, having fewer resources available, we have experienced that sharing, collaborating, and coordinating has become a method of surviving the climate and continuing to provide as many services to survivors as possible. . . .The position that is funded through the VAWA STOP grant allows our shelter to have greater resources for Spanish-speaking survivors of domestic violence. This staff member works closely with culturally specific community agencies, immigration and legal services, while also helping their participants navigate systems that may be even more challenging due to the additional barriers they face.

—*Raphael House of Portland, Oregon*

All STOP subgrantees are required to report on the frequency of their contacts with community partners, both at the victim/case and systems levels. A significant number of subgrantees reported daily contact on specific victims or cases with the following organizations: Law enforcement agencies (an average of **920**, or 38 percent of all subgrantees), domestic violence organizations (**897**, or 37 percent), courts (**720**, or 30 percent), and prosecutors (**601**, or 25 percent).⁵⁹ These interactions may have involved referrals (such as law enforcement referring a victim to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the court for the victim to obtain a protection order) or consultations between victim services and law enforcement (such as sharing information on behalf of a domestic violence victim on an offender’s actions or whereabouts). Significant numbers of subgrantees also reported 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 response to specific victims and crimes, subgrantees also work with community partners on task forces, workgroups, and in other forums on local, regional, and state levels. These groups often develop protocols establishing how organizations or agencies will respond in a coordinated fashion to ensure victim safety and offender accountability and remove barriers in the justice, victim services, and other systems. Ideally, participants are decision makers, able to direct the implementation of protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration.

⁵⁹ More complete data on CCR activities can be found in Tables 12a and 12b on pages 84-85.

These efforts can change attitudes, promote learning and communication, and lead to a better response to victims, including those from underserved populations, and increased accountability for offenders, as described in the three examples below:

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.

—STOP administrator, Florida

The STOP funding has allowed us to increase our collaboration with law enforcement, prosecution, probation and the court system. Through the collaborative team, our opportunity for providing training and technical assistance to the above agencies has been accomplished. This increase in collaboration has given us the ability to improve the case tracking systems used by law enforcement and prosecution to assure that charges requested by law enforcement are tracked through the culmination of the case. This tracking provides better collaborative efforts and the ability to have frank discussions about case outcomes and victim safety. Lastly, this money allows us to provide victim/survivors 24-hour access to paid victim services staff.

**—Skamania County Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault,
Washington**

Through this [STOP] funding, we have increased law enforcement agencies' awareness of immigration remedies available to victims/survivors and the positive effect this could have on community policing efforts. This funding allows us to form strong partnerships with law enforcement agencies and individual officers as well as other community agencies through participation in family violence task forces to increase awareness community-wide and create a workable coordinated community response to this issue. Through the task forces, we have worked with judges, prosecutors and law enforcement personnel to develop and implement protocols that provide for greater victim safety, better accountability for batterers and improved service delivery to immigrant victims/survivors.

—Georgia Mountain Women's Center Inc.

The data in Table 8 reflect the specific community agencies and organizations with which STOP subgrantees met on a weekly or monthly basis to address issues in 2011 and 2012.

Table 8. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2011 and 2012

Agency/organization	Average Subgrantee (N = 2,403)	
	Average	Percent
Domestic violence organization	1,145	47.6
Law enforcement	1,077	44.8
Prosecutor's office	925	38.5
Social service organization	751	31.2
Sexual assault organization	742	30.9
Court	716	29.8
Health/mental health organization	668	27.8

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

Training

CCR participants have discovered that the policies and protocols developed as part of their coordinated response are most effective when participating agencies engage in training and cross-training. Such training creates a heightened awareness for staff members of the new policies and a better understanding of the reasons behind them, and establishes a strong endorsement of management for the changes. The training and cross-training address “best practices” that enable professionals to improve their response to victims, the roles and responsibilities of professionals and agencies, and the mandates of other institutions in the legal and community systems. Training expands substantive and procedural knowledge and offers the opportunity to improve skills.

The STOP Program, like most other OVW grant programs, supports the training of professionals to improve their response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The statutory purpose areas for the STOP Program specifically include the following:

- ▶ training for criminal justice personnel (i.e., law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and other court personnel), including those in specialized units
- ▶ training of sexual assault forensic examiners
- ▶ training for victim advocates providing services to victims of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel

Understanding the causes, circumstances, and consequences of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and/or stalking is critical to an effective response and to preventing further harm and unintended negative consequences. Training may also address policies, protocols, and best practices that enable professionals to improve their own response to victims and to better understand the roles and responsibilities of other professionals and agencies in their community.

Victims may come in contact with a wide variety of professionals, including law enforcement, prosecutors, court personnel, health and mental health professionals, and government agency staff, among others. As a first responder, the law enforcement officer is often the person who can direct the victim to appropriate services and send a clear message that the community views domestic and sexual violence as serious criminal matters. An untrained officer may not be able to identify the predominant aggressor, collect all relevant evidence, and may mistakenly arrest the victim. If the officer sides with the abuser, the victim may not report future assaults. Responding to a sexual assault, a law enforcement officer and emergency personnel may unknowingly re-traumatize the victim or fail to identify, preserve, and collect evidence necessary for a criminal prosecution.

Health care providers can play a critical role by screening for and identifying domestic violence among their patients. When health care providers are given screening questions and are trained to ask about interpersonal violence during confidential, routine medical examinations, the door opens for a victim to disclose the abuse and receive appropriate services and referrals. Without training on how to screen and what safety precautions to take during visits, many providers will not ask the prescribed questions. Such training has been shown to support an increase in the identification of domestic violence victims, to improve attitudes and comfort in asking about violence in the home, and to improve documentation of screening (McColgan et al., 2010). Specialized training for nurses and other forensic medical professionals who examine and treat victims of sexual assault is essential to assure appropriate and accurate collection and storage of forensic evidence; provision of information and treatment on related medical issues; coordination with advocates to ensure that crisis intervention, advocacy, and support services are offered before, during, and after the exam; heightened understanding of common trauma responses to sexual assault; and being prepared to offer testimony in court, if necessary (Littel, 2013).

Professionals involved in divorce, custody, or child protection cases—e.g., guardians ad litem, custody evaluators, psychological evaluators, case workers, parent coordinators, attorneys, and judges—may make inappropriate or even harmful recommendations and decisions in situations

where the presence of domestic violence is minimized or not recognized at all. Their actions or inaction may further expose children to an abusive parent, place the victim in danger, or not safeguard the domestic violence victim against an abuser who uses the court or child protective systems to continue the abuse. For example, training attorneys on risk assessment and safety planning is especially important in domestic violence and intimate partner sexual assault cases because victims may face greater danger when they attempt to leave.

Training plays a crucial role in preparing these and other professionals to respond to a victim of abuse in an appropriate and helpful manner. It is also an integral component of an effective coordinated community response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

In the following example, STOP Program funds were used to provide training on the needs of sexual assault victims with disabilities to a multidisciplinary SART in Georgia:

The Boren Center has provided in service training to a multidisciplinary team on appropriate protocols for addressing the needs of persons with disabilities. We have trained the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) to make sure needs of sexual assault survivors with disabilities are being incorporated into their service efforts. This has been accomplished by inviting people with disabilities and disability advocacy organizations to be part of the SART, educating members of local hospital SARTs on working with people with disabilities, ensuring exam tables are accessible to sexual assault survivors with physical disabilities, and ensuring that advocates receive yearly training on dealing with persons with disabilities.

—Lily Pad Center d/b/a Boren Center, Georgia

STOP Program funds were used to train faith-based leaders and social service agency staff, as a way to reach sexual assault victims in a very poor community in St. Louis, Missouri:

The training provided by VAWA STOP-funded staff were given to faith based leaders and members in the E. St. Louis community. The training gave these individuals information on how to address disclosures by friends, family and members of the community as well as signs one can look for in victims of sexual assault. There is a strong connection between the churches in E. St. Louis and the community. Working with these individuals could result in an increase in services in that many members of the community will turn to their church before turning to anyone else. The trainings provided to social service agencies were very similar to the trainings offered to the faith based organizations. Making a connection with other social service agencies can also lead to more referrals to our program as many members of the E. St. Louis community are connected with at least one social service agency. This funding allows us to continue services in a very impoverished community that would not otherwise have services for victims of sexual assault.

—Call for Help, Inc., Missouri

A state coalition used STOP Program funds to provide statewide training on sexual violence investigation and response:

Over the 2012 STOP sub grant cycle, ACASA has successfully facilitated 32 sexual violence trainings for law enforcement, advocacy programs, and other victim service professionals. In total ACASA has trained 644 professional in the areas of sexual violence investigation and response. This incredible year of training has spanned all five regions of the state, including facilitation in counties that have never received sexual violence training before. . . . Training evaluations provided feedback of an above average to excellent training experience and a high interest in receiving more training from ACASA.

—Arkansas Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Law enforcement officers as a group are the most frequent recipients of training provided with STOP Program dollars.

Peace over Violence (POV) has successfully trained local law enforcement officers at briefings/roll calls, and encouraged them to utilize POV services. During role calls POV staff provide the 24-hour hotline numbers, basic tools when responding to sexual assault victims and important resources in the community to help navigate when needed. Now, law enforcement and other professionals are more cooperative and have a better understanding of the importance of advocacy. The opportunity to provide ongoing training to law enforcement and other professionals has allowed POV to build stronger working relationships with collaborative leaders in the West San Gabriel area to better serve victims in the community.

—Peace over Violence, West San Gabriel Valley, California

Table 9. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012

Position	2011 People Trained (N = 224,938)		2012 People Trained (N = 214,269)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	64,245	28.6	60,389	28.2
Victim advocates (governmental and nongovernmental)	27,521	12.2	26,262	12.3
Health/mental health professionals, including forensic nurse examiners	25,177	11.2	24,051	11.2
Court personnel	10,037	4.5	8,157	3.8
Educators	8,805	3.9	8,215	3.8
Social service organization staff	8,839	3.9	6,782	3.2
Prosecutors	6,977	3.1	7,520	3.5
Attorneys/law students/legal services staff	6,032	2.7	5,307	2.5
Government agency staff	5,188	2.3	5,658	2.6
Faith-based organization staff	5,078	2.3	3,962	2.3

NOTE: A number of categories above combine professional categories from the STOP Program subgrantee reporting form: Health/mental health professionals combines the reported categories of health professionals, mental health professionals, and sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners; victim advocates combines governmental and nongovernmental victim advocates and victim assistants; 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.

After victim services, training is the most frequent STOP Program-funded activity engaged in by subgrantees: An average of **997** subgrantees (42 percent) used their STOP Program funds to provide training in each reporting period. A total of **439,207** professionals were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2 years covered by this report. More than a quarter (28 percent) of those trained were law enforcement officers. Victim advocates (governmental and nongovernmental) made up the second largest category⁶⁰ with 12.2 percent of those trained, and health/ mental health professionals as the third largest category of professionals trained in 2011 and 2012.

Remaining Areas of Need

STOP administrators are asked to report on the most significant areas of remaining need in their states, for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and for offender accountability. In

⁶⁰ The category “multidisciplinary” technically had the second-highest number of people reported as trained; this category is chosen when subgrantees do not know the specific professions of people who received training, but do know that they are professionals serving or responding to victims.

their reports for calendar years 2011 and 2012, administrators regularly cited the following as remaining unmet needs:

- ▶ Sustaining and enhancing organizational capacity, including retaining and hiring staff
- ▶ Maintaining core services for victims
- ▶ Providing legal representation for victims in cases involving divorce, custody, and visitation, especially for those who are immigrants or living in rural areas
- ▶ Addressing victims' basic needs for food, shelter and long-term housing, employment, transportation, etc.
- ▶ Providing culturally- and linguistically-competent services
- ▶ Ensuring sufficient opportunities for training of first responders
- ▶ Ensuring sufficient opportunities for training on sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking, particularly to criminal justice professionals
- ▶ Making services available to address substance abuse and mental health issues that co-occur with, or result from, victimization

STOP administrators point out that even after nearly 20 years of STOP funding, they regularly hear from their subgrantees and other stakeholders that much remains to be done. Victims do not understand their rights, do not have the resources to leave abusive relationships, face poverty and homelessness when they do leave, and need many supports and services beyond what is currently funded by the STOP Program. Victims living in rural areas face additional challenges, since services may not be available where they live and they often lack transportation and resources to travel to locations where services are available.

It is not unusual for victims of domestic violence to seek assistance from victim service agencies, law enforcement, and prosecutors, only to return to their abusers. One of the biggest reasons for this is their inability to get a divorce and fight for custody of their children.

—***STOP administrator (OK)***

Victims of crime enter the Utah criminal justice system confused, afraid and often still exhibiting financial and emotional trauma from the crime committed against them. Few victims have the resources or knowledge to fully exercise their rights; and, when their rights are violated they are often untrained to seek remedies on their own.

—***STOP administrator (UT)***

Victims repeatedly stated they were not sure where to seek assistance except for calling the police. If they chose not to call the police, they turned to family and friends; and if they did not have that support, they remained in the abusive relationship. Housing, counseling, job placement, legal/court advocacy, and access to interpreters were mentioned time after time by victims as services and resources lacking in their communities.

—***STOP administrator (OH)***

We need more follow up care beyond crisis intervention for victims. There is a huge need for jobs, housing, transportation, career and life skills training, legal services, substance abuse treatment, more effective batterer intervention, and more sexual assault services from certified providers of sexual assault forensic exams to more advocacy and training.

—***STOP administrator (NV)***

Limited resources for victims such as counseling or support groups, housing, and sufficient paying jobs to support their children often drive them back to their batterer. Due to long distances and lack of transportation, access to crisis programs, visitation centers, SANE programs, and batterers' treatment is often unreachable to residents affected by violence living in rural communities.

—***STOP administrator (ND)***

One of the most pronounced needs our clients have . . . is a lack of access to legal services. Clients who need an attorney for a divorce, child custody and child support issues are usually financially unable to obtain legal counsel. Many times abusers will have jobs and will completely control marital assets (and hide them from their victims) and will have prevented their victim from obtaining employment. In cases where a victim works, her abuser will still often maintain complete financial control. In these scenarios, the abuser has funds for an attorney and the victim does not.

—***STOP administrator (TN)***

Many STOP administrators addressed the need for training, particularly for criminal justice professionals, as a priority—sometimes to improve the professionals’ basic understanding of the dynamics of sexual or domestic violence, dating violence, stalking and other times to inform their response to particular crimes and populations.

Fundamental changes are needed in the criminal justice response to sexual violence. Law enforcement officers need training and accountability related to competent, bias-free investigation of sex crimes. Evidence kits need to be handled with assiduous attention to maintain the chain of evidence, and the kits need to be processed. Prosecutors need to take sexual assault cases seriously and broaden their perspective regarding what constitutes a credible victim.

Another area of significant need is providing cultural competency training to advocates, law enforcement officers, prosecutors and attorneys of underserved populations and in less populated areas. Victims/survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault are very diverse in terms of culture, language, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age and ability. It is imperative that we train participants to not only understand the unique barriers of underserved populations experience but to provide them with the tools to better assist victims/survivors. In addition, bilingual/bicultural services need to be expanded.

—STOP administrator (IL)

Even when a civil protective order or criminal no contact order is in place, a lack of clarity in the order, along with inexperienced officers, leads to problems with interpretation in the field and a reluctance by officers to enforce the order. There needs to be better training for judges in issuing clear and effective orders, and better training for officers to improve investigation and identify violations of the order in common, but challenging situations, for example, in third-party contact situations.

—STOP administrator (MN)

The most significant area of need is the ongoing training for those whose work brings them into contact with victims of domestic abuse and dating violence. The training should include judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, probation and parole personnel, mental health providers, and direct service providers working in the victims’ shelter.

—STOP administrator (LA)

Responding to the specific needs of and decreasing the barriers faced by victims from underserved populations (particularly those who are immigrants, have limited English proficiency, and/or who live in rural areas) are ongoing challenges discussed by nearly all administrators.

Programs are scrambling to find bi-lingual and bicultural staff to best serve victims that have language barriers. Programs continuously report that more funding is needed to hire more staff that have these specialized linguistic and cultural attributes and skills. Rural localities in Virginia report the same problems: unemployment, lack of affordable housing, and inadequate transportation. These issues continue to make it more difficult for victims to maintain safety and reach out for services.

—STOP administrator (VA)

Increased access to translation services is another significant area of remaining need with regard to improving services to survivors, followed by the need for increased support on immigration issues and transportation. . . . Clients are typically required to travel long distances to meet with nonprofit immigration lawyers. In addition, clients needing support with immigration issues require a great deal of time. . . . There are fewer medical facilities, nearly no access to SANE services and response times are longer for law enforcement in rural areas.

—STOP administrator (WA)

Conclusion

The data from subgrantees included in the STOP Program 2014 Report show that STOP Program funding makes a difference in the way that communities across the United States help victims and hold offenders accountable. During calendar years 2011 and 2012, states awarded STOP program funding to an average of 2,400 subgrantees each year. More than 1.75 million services were provided to victims as they coped with the immediate and long-term impact of violence in their lives, to help victims stay safe and establish independence after leaving an abusive relationship and to connect victims with resources to support their recovery. On average, supportive services such as shelter, crisis intervention, and advocacy were provided to more than half a million (526,819) individuals every year.

It is critical that each person working directly with victims responds appropriately, makes informed decisions, and prevents further harm. To further this goal, grantees used funds to train a total of 439,207 service providers, criminal justice personnel, and other professionals to improve their response to victims. In addition, subgrantees' reports demonstrate that STOP Program-funded criminal justice solutions are evolving alongside the changing dynamics of violence and victimization. During the 2-year report period, law enforcement made 61,486 arrests and prosecutors disposed of 187,084 criminal cases, of which 70 percent resulted in convictions.

This STOP Program 2014 Report reflects 2 years of collective efforts to respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking across the nation. It describes significant accomplishments that would not have been possible in the absence of STOP Program funding, and it highlights where much work remains to be done.

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 in 2011 and 2012.

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

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for staff:⁶¹ **2,786** (95 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2011 and 2012

Staff	2011		2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All staff	2,841	100	2,732	100
Victim advocate (nongovernmental)	715	25.2	736	26.9
Victim assistant (governmental)	326	11.5	311	11.4
Program coordinator	309	10.9	305	11.2
Prosecutor	300	10.6	275	10.1
Law enforcement officer	274	9.6	253	9.2
Counselor	181	6.4	153	5.6
Legal advocate	158	5.6	133	4.9
Support staff	130	4.6	129	4.7
Administrator	87	3.1	92	3.4
Attorney	88	3.1	88	3.2
Trainer	57	2.0	58	2.1
Investigator (prosecution-based)	56	2.0	46	1.7
Sexual assault nurse examiner/sexual assault forensic examiner (SANE/SAFE)	40	1.4	40	1.5
Probation officer/offender monitor	30	1.1	32	1.2

⁶¹ Averages, unless otherwise indicated, are for one reporting period, which is one calendar year.

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2011 and 2012

Staff	2011		2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Paralegal	31	1.1	25	0.9
Court personnel	24	0.8	22	0.8
Information technology staff	7	0.2	7	0.3
Translator/interpreter	5	0.2	5	0.2
Other	23	0.8	21	0.8

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 and 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.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for training: **977** (42 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Total number⁶² of people trained: **439,207**
- ▶ Total number of training events: **23,791**

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012

People trained	2011 and 2012	
	Number	Percent
All people trained	439,207	100
Law enforcement officers	124,634	28.4
Multidisciplinary	63,134	14.4
Victim advocates	48,086	10.9
Health professionals	29,942	6.8
Court personnel	18,194	4.1
Volunteers	17,990	4.1
Educators	17,020	3.9
Social service organization staff	15,621	3.6
Prosecutors	14,497	3.3
Mental health professionals	10,945	2.5

⁶² "Total" numbers are combined totals for 2011 and 2012.

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2011 and 2012

People trained	2011 and 2012	
	Number	Percent
Government agency staff	10,846	2.5
Attorneys/law students	9,448	2.2
Faith-based organization staff	9,040	2.1
Corrections personnel	8,428	1.9
Sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners	8,341	1.9
Victim assistants	5,697	1.3
Advocacy organization staff	3,677	0.8
Military command staff	2,782	0.6
Immigrant organization staff	2,500	0.6
Elder organization staff	2,486	0.6
Batterer intervention program (BIP) staff	2,043	0.5
Legal services staff	1,891	0.4
Disability organization staff	1,743	0.4
Substance abuse organization staff	1,737	0.4
Tribal government/Tribal government agency staff	1,088	0.2
Translators/interpreters	668	0.2
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	542	0.1
Sex offender treatment providers	408	0.1
Other	5,779	1.3

The most common topics of training events were domestic violence overview, dynamics, and services; advocate response; safety planning for victims; law enforcement response; sexual assault overview, dynamics, and services; confidentiality; and domestic violence statutes/codes.

Coordinated Community Response

STOP administrators engage in an inclusive and collaborative planning process to improve their state's responses to victims 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 referrals, consulting, providing technical assistance, and/or attending meetings with other agencies or organizations.

Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2011

Agency/organization	Victim referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Advocacy organization	72	128	270	24	216	192
Batterer intervention program	97	302	377	93	365	259
Corrections	162	350	526	66	486	390
Court	730	682	281	203	514	445
Domestic violence organization	899	570	326	368	775	475
Educational institution/organization	76	289	514	41	332	377
Faith-based organization	60	266	497	25	264	323
Government agency	283	464	369	49	387	297
Health/mental health organization	281	626	569	73	614	434
Law enforcement	927	654	315	336	741	479
Legal organization	284	518	428	57	397	343
Prosecutor's office	608	600	379	298	656	402
Sex offender management	17	49	153	15	108	109
Sexual assault organization	358	404	487	200	560	437
Social service organization	427	590	400	98	674	394
Tribal government/tribal government agency	9	42	138	8	77	82
Other	29	47	41	16	80	48

Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2012

Agency/organization	Victim referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Advocacy organization	51	116	266	25	210	184
Batterer intervention program	90	271	373	81	335	252
Corrections	154	352	494	70	451	371
Court	709	665	302	221	494	449
Domestic violence organization	894	561	358	374	773	475
Educational institution/organization	70	271	511	28	334	335
Faith-based organization	56	232	521	16	268	290
Government agency	253	472	376	42	375	270
Health/mental health organization	269	657	568	70	579	412
Law enforcement	913	677	293	336	741	484
Legal organization	272	505	417	55	376	349
Prosecutor's office	594	572	391	292	603	454
Sex offender management	23	51	158	11	106	111
Sexual assault organization	331	414	486	190	534	456
Social service organization	410	644	392	87	642	385
Tribal government/tribal government agency	9	47	134	6	72	92
Other	18	39	39	15	74	43

Policies

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

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: **422** (18 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 13a. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2011

Policy/protocol	2011 Subgrantees using funds (N = 430)	
	Number	Percent
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)	165	38.4
Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)	146	34.0
Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)	144	33.5
Confidentiality (victim services)	138	32.1
Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)	137	31.9
Mandatory training standards (victim services)	107	24.9
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)	100	23.3
Immediate access to protection order information (law enforcement)	101	23.5
Protection order enforcement (law enforcement)	93	21.6
Advocate response to emergency room (health care)	90	20.9

Table 13b. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2012

Policy/protocol	2012 Subgrantees using funds (N = 414)	
	Number	Percent
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)	168	40.6
Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)	157	37.9
Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)	146	35.3
Confidentiality (victim services)	148	35.7
Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)	131	31.6
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)	110	26.6
Mandatory training standards (victim services)	107	25.8
Advocate response to emergency room (health care)	106	25.6
Immediate access to protection order information (law enforcement)	91	22.0
Protection order enforcement (law enforcement)	94	22.7

Products

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

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for products: **433** (18 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Number of products developed or revised:⁶³ **2,672**
- ▶ Number of products distributed: **2,672,603**

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, distributed, and/or translated **532** products in the following **26** languages in 2011 and 2012:

Amharic	Hindi	Russian
Arabic	Hmong	Somali
Bosnian	Karen	Spanish
Cape Verdean Creole	Khmer	Tagalog
Chinese	Korean	Thai
Creole	Mohawk	Tigrinya
English	Moldovan	Urdu
Farsi	Portuguese	Vietnamese
French	Punjabi	

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.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: **230** (10 percent of all subgrantees)

⁶³ These products included brochures, manuals, and training curricula and materials, including those developed for websites.

Table 14. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2011 and 2012

Activity	Subgrantees using funds			
	2011 (N = 228)		2012 (N = 231)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Manage data collection and communication	132	57.9	133	57.6
Expand existing data collection/communication systems	100	43.9	94	40.7
Share information with other community partners	96	42.1	82	35.5
Develop new data collection/communication systems	51	22.4	50	21.6
Purchase computers/other equipment	48	21.1	53	22.9

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

Table 15. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2011 and 2012

Purpose	2011	2012
	Subgrantees reporting	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	135	138
Protection orders	121	110
Arrests/charges	108	111
Incident reports	109	104
Evaluation/outcome measures	87	89
Violations of protection orders	87	85

Specialized Units

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

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for specialized units: **546** (23 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 16a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2011

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	23	16	4	4
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	252	320	41	46
Train a specialized unit	52	34	6	8
Other	6	4	6	0

Table 16b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2012

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	16	14	2	1
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	253	278	42	41
Train a specialized unit	44	25	10	8
Other	7	5	2	0

Table 17a. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2011

Victimization	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Sexual assault	208	234	34	24
Domestic violence/dating violence	273	330	48	46
Stalking	190	237	31	23

Table 17b. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2012

Victimization	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Sexual assault	206	211	40	23
Domestic violence/dating violence	264	290	51	44
Stalking	180	208	35	24

System Improvement

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

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for system improvement: **201** (8 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 18a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2011

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	62	40	27	21	15
Interpreters	62	21	13	15	0
Language lines	19	3	2	3	0
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	16	8	5	7	2
Safety audits	9	11	4	3	2
Security personnel or equipment	4	4	0	2	3
Translation of forms and documents	67	19	13	15	2
Other	25	20	15	13	8

Table 18b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2012

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	64	45	30	25	17
Interpreters	47	12	14	18	0
Language lines	14	2	1	2	0
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	18	10	7	7	4
Safety audits	13	15	8	7	5
Security personnel or equipment	7	12	5	3	2
Translation of forms and documents	56	13	12	14	4
Other	15	13	11	8	5

Victim Services

During the two 12-month reporting periods, an average of **1,616** subgrantees (67 percent) used funds for victim services in 2011 and 2012. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of **431,244** victims (99 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence; only 1 percent of victims seeking services from funded programs

did not receive services from those programs.⁶⁴ (See Tables 19a, 19b, 20, and 21 for information on the level of service provided, the types of victims served, and the reasons victims were partially served or not served by subgrantees in 2011 and 2012.)

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for victim service: **1,616** (67 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011, 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	437,411	100	372,592	100	54,021	100	10,798	100
Not served	5,274	1.2	4,754	1.3	425	0.8	95	0.9
Served	420,702	96.2	358,005	96.1	52,242	96.7	10,455	96.8
Partially Served	11,435	2.6	9,833	2.6	1,354	2.5	248	2.3

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

Table 19b. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2012, 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	436,894	100	375,076	100	52,053	100	9,765	100
Not served	6,544	1.5	5,635	1.5	773	1.5	136	1.4
Served	418,778	95.9	359,692	95.9	49,693	95.5	9,393	96.2
Partially Served	11,572	2.6	9,749	2.6	1,587	3.0	236	2.4

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

⁶⁴ “Not served” victims did not receive any of the services they requested that were STOP Program-funded; “partially served” victims received some, but not all, of the services they requested that were STOP Program-funded.

Table 20. Victims receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012, by type of victimization

Type of Victimization	Victims served			
	2011		2012	
All victimization	432,137	100	430,350	100
Domestic violence/dating violence	367,838	85.1	369,441	85.8
Sexual Assault	53,596	12.4	51,280	11.9
Stalking	10,703	2.5	9,629	2.2

Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees⁶⁵

Reason	Subgrantees reporting	
	2011	2012
Program reached capacity	129	142
Did not meet statutory requirements	126	119
Services not appropriate for victim	110	116
Program unable to provide service due to limited resources/priority-setting	108	115
Conflict of interest	105	111
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims with mental health issues	75	86
Program rules not acceptable to victim	76	67
Transportation	69	71

Demographics of Victims Served

Of the average **431,244** victims served in 2011 and 2012 for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (56-57 percent), female (90 percent), and age 25 to 59 (67-68 percent).

⁶⁵ Although STOP subgrantees do not report a reason for not serving or for partially serving individual victims, they report reasons for not serving or partially serving victims in general by checking all reasons that apply.

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012

Characteristics	Victims receiving services			
	2011		2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,493	1.9	7,779	2.0
Asian	5,531	1.4	5,982	1.5
Black or African-American	88,381	22.4	85,402	21.7
Hispanic or Latino	73,197	18.5	72,527	18.4
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1,455	0.4	1,588	0.4
White	220,900	55.9	223,174	56.6
Unknown	37,192	NA	36,049	NA
Gender				
Female	380,182	90.3	377,589	89.9
Male	41,061	9.7	42,436	10.1
Unknown	10,894	NA	10,325	NA
Age				
0–12	NA	NA	NA	NA
13–17	19,071	4.8	17,763	4.5
18–24	93,568	23.7	93,678	23.5
25–59	265,482	67.4	269,289	67.6
60+	15,903	4.0	17,753	4.5
Unknown	38,113	NA	31,867	NA
Other demographics				
People with disabilities	25,815	6.0	26,446	6.1
People with limited English proficiency	34,215	7.9	38,203	8.9
People who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	21,452	5.0	22,534	5.2
People who live in rural areas	113,208	26.2	112,737	26.2

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims for whom the information was known. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of 431,244 victims. Because victims 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 served and the sum of percentages for race/ethnicity may be greater than 100. Percentages for age may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 23a. Relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds in 2011

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence/dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	249,488	71.5	10,209	21.4	5,790	51.4
Other family or household member	34,272	9.8	11,143	23.3	944	8.4
Dating relationship	60,320	17.3	5,083	10.6	2,086	18.5
Acquaintance	4,409	1.3	15,402	32.2	1,964	17.4
Stranger	357	0.1	5,931	12.4	473	4.2
Unknown	24,815	NA	9,922	NA	1,548	NA
Total (excluding unknown)	348,846	100	47,768	100	11,257	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims 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 reported as served for that victimization. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 23b. Relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds in 2012

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence/dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	236,068	68.7	9,831	21.3	5,594	49.3
Other family or household member	39,371	11.5	10,643	23.1	825	7.3
Dating relationship	62,387	18.1	4,952	10.7	2,183	19.2
Acquaintance	5,705	1.7	14,948	32.4	2,227	19.6
Stranger	236	<0.1	5,792	12.5	523	4.6
Unknown	31,227	NA	9,155	NA	1,276	NA
Total (excluding unknown)	343,767	100	46,166	100	11,352	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims 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 reported as served for that victimization. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Types of Services Provided to Victims

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and resources, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (help navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. In addition to the services listed in Table 24, STOP Program subgrantees routinely provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims as needed.

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2011 and 2012

Type of service	Victims served			
	2011 (N = 432,137)		2012 (N = 430,350)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	230,617	53.4	221,329	51.4
Crisis intervention	201,634	46.7	191,778	44.6
Criminal justice advocacy/court accompaniment	149,574	34.6	152,960	35.5
Civil legal advocacy/court accompaniment	118,324	27.4	108,306	25.2
Counseling services/support group	112,052	25.9	103,360	24.0
Transportation	24,340	5.6	22,338	5.2
Civil legal assistance	18,837	4.4	18,567	4.3
Language services	15,000	3.5	16,338	3.8
Hospital/clinic/other medical response	14,155	3.3	13,689	3.2
Other victim service	2,567	0.6	3,861	0.9

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

Number receiving shelter services and number of bed nights in 2011 and 2012:

- ▶ An annual average of **19,680** victims and **18,281** family members received a total of **1,636,077** emergency shelter bed nights.
- ▶ An annual average of **595** victims and **787** family members received a total of **261,926** transitional housing bed nights.

Total number of hotline calls in 2011 and 2012:

- ▶ From victims: **687,832**

- ▶ From all callers, including victims: **1,215,428**

Total number of victim-witness notification/outreach activities: **387,868**

Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims 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 in the protection order process. In 2011 and 2012, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims in obtaining **365,867** temporary and final protection orders.

Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2011 and 2012

Provider	Total	2011		2012	
		Temp	Final	Temp	Final
All providers	365,867	117,256	69,615	112,675	66,321
Victim services staff	240,353	71,196	50,453	69,085	49,619
Law enforcement	60,397	24,446	11,386	16,443	8,122
Prosecution	65,117	21,614	7,776	27,147	8,580

An average of **459** (46 percent of all subgrantees using funds for training) addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and an average of **172** developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders in 2011 and 2012. 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: **116** subgrantees reported this, making it the second most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

Criminal Justice

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

Law Enforcement

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

Tables 26a and 26b summarize STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2011 and 2012. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: **321** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 26a. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2011⁶⁶

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Incident reports	3,869	87,201	1,263	92,333
Cases/incidents investigated	6,305	83,398	1,430	91,133
Calls for assistance	3,435	61,526	1,215	66,176
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	1,898	40,498	606	43,002
Arrests	1,192	31,530	482	33,204
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	258	19,317	299	19,874
Enforcement of warrants	633	7,709	128	8,470
Protection orders issued	91	3,670	19	3,780
Arrests for violation of protection order	13	3,128	108	3,249
Forensic medical evidence	1,022	NA	NA	1,022
Arrests for violation of bail bond	19	674	3	696
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutors	2	47	0	49

NA = Not applicable

⁶⁶ 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 for assistance or incidents reports, unless those activities also were supported by STOP Program funds or required match.

Table 26b. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2012⁶⁷

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Cases/incidents investigated	5,378	80,189	1,555	87,122
Incident reports	3,668	74,097	1,591	79,356
Calls for assistance	3,412	62,584	1,440	67,436
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	1,789	36,123	613	38,525
Arrests	1,119	26,808	355	28,282
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	237	17,172	457	17,866
Enforcement of warrants	401	9,524	122	10,047
Protection orders issued	23	3,436	35	3,494
Arrests for violation of protection order	47	3,174	99	3,320
Arrests for violation of bail bond	45	1,032	45	1,122
Forensic medical evidence	1,037	NA	NA	1,037
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	2	44	0	46

NA = Not applicable

Prosecution

After police arrest a suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to prosecute the case. However, in some states and local jurisdictions, police officers both arrest and charge offenders and grand juries are responsible for deciding whether felonies will be prosecuted. Generally, city and county prosecutors handle ordinance-level offenses in municipal courts, misdemeanors in district courts, and felony offenses in superior courts.

Table 27 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases during 2011 and 2012.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: **306** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

⁶⁷ See previous footnote.

Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, stalking and related cases by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2011 and 2012

Type of case	2011			2012		
	Total disposed	Number convicted	Percent convicted ⁶⁸	Total disposed	Number convicted	Percent convicted ⁶⁹
Domestic violence/ dating violence ordinance	9,372	5,484	58.5	9,896	6,152	62.2
Misdemeanor domestic violence/dating violence	55,810	38,488	69.0	55,519	37,602	67.7
Felony domestic violence/dating violence	12,613	9,630	76.3	13,844	10,535	76.1
Domestic violence/ dating violence homicide	68	66	97.1	57	55	96.5
Misdemeanor sexual assault	505	344	68.1	557	418	75.0
Felony sexual assault	1,533	1,243	81.1	1,907	1,460	76.6
Sexual assault homicide	6	6	100	3	2	66.7
Stalking ordinance	54	38	70.4	125	77	61.6
Misdemeanor stalking	660	518	78.5	639	452	70.7
Felony stalking	346	273	78.9	301	239	79.4
Stalking homicide	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
Violation of bail	723	678	93.8	848	701	82.7
Violation of probation or parole	2,038	1,831	89.8	2,219	1,995	89.9
Violation of protection order	8,384	6,225	74.2	7,462	5,487	73.5
Violation of other court order	739	548	74.2	716	580	81.0
Other	83	29	34.9	57	27	47.4
Total	92,934	65,401	70.4	94,150	65,782	69.9

Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking—administrative and judicial. In their

⁶⁸ These percentages include deferred adjudications, which represented 17.3% of all conviction outcomes in 2011.

⁶⁹ These percentages include deferred adjudications, which represented 18.4% of all conviction outcomes in 2012.

administrative role, judges are responsible for overseeing court dockets, activities, and services and for ensuring that court houses are accessible, safe, and user friendly for all who have business in the courts. In their judicial role, judges are responsible for presiding over court hearings and ensuring that due process is accorded to victims and defendants in criminal proceedings and to all parties in civil litigation. They have broad powers to hold offenders accountable and improve the safety of victims through rejecting or approving negotiated pleas, convicting or acquitting defendants in criminal cases after hearing, and rendering decisions in civil matters. They exercise significant discretion in sentencing, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Courts may monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with conditions of both civil (e.g., protection from abuse) and criminal (e.g., probation) court orders.

Of the **18** courts (or court-based programs) that received STOP funding to conduct court activities each year,⁷⁰ **9** used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders' compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- ▶ An annual average of **6,577** offenders were monitored in 2011 and 2012.
- ▶ A total of **31,532** individual judicial review hearings were held in 2011 and 2012.

The data in Tables 28a and 28b reflect the consequences imposed by STOP Program-funded courts for violations of probation and other court orders. In 2011, **42** percent of all violations disposed of resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2012, **49** percent had this result.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for court: **18** (1 percent of all subgrantees)

⁷⁰ Although an average of 54 courts received STOP funding in 2011 and 2012, only 18 of those courts used funds specifically for court activities. Other activities that court subgrantees conducted with STOP funding included training, CCR, policies, products, data/communication systems, security, interpreters/translators, and language lines.

Table 28a. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2011⁷¹

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 = 104)	2	1.9	50	48.1	19	18.3	0	0.0	33	31.7
New criminal behavior (N = 289)	10	3.5	156	54.0	90	31.1	33	11.4	0	0.0
Failure to attend BIP (N = 715)	272	38.0	115	16.1	147	20.6	0	0.0	181	25.3
Other conditions (N = 731)	99	13.5	443	60.6	189	25.9	0	0.0	0	0.0

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

Table 28b. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2012⁷²

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 = 107)	2	1.9	30	28.0	39	36.4	1	0.9	35	32.7
New criminal behavior (N = 79)	0	0	36	43.9	43	54.4	0	0	0	0.0
Failure to attend BIP (N = 413)	215	52.1	80	19.4	62	15.0	0	0	56	13.6
Other conditions (N = 441)	13	2.9	360	81.6	68	15.4	0	0	0	0.0

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

⁷¹ The category "Failure to attend mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)" was not included in Table 28a because of a low *N* (25); none of the dispositions for this violation category resulted in partial or full revocation.

⁷² The category "Failure to attend other mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)" was not included in Table 28b because of a low *N* (34); 74 percent of the dispositions for this violation category resulted in partial or full revocation.

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 imposed, a short period of incarceration (i.e., partial probation revocation), or full 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 average number of offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff during 2011 and 2012 was **7,392**; of those, **7,193** were being supervised for domestic violence or dating violence offenses, **164** for sexual assault offenses, and **35** for stalking offenses. These offenders received a total of **138,090** contacts, as shown in Table 29. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. An annual average of **2,365** victims received a total of **12,010** contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2011 and 2012.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for probation: **28** (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2011 and 2012, by type and number of contacts

Type of contact	2011		2012	
	Number of offenders	Number of contacts	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	2,732	24,046	3,496	32,437
Telephone	1,832	23,316	3,120	22,018
Unscheduled surveillance	1,487	18,353	2,678	17,920

- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation without violations: **970** (57 percent of those completing probation)
- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation with violations: **739** (43 percent)

The data in Tables 30a and 30b reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2011 and 2012. Offenders received partial or full revocation when protection orders were violated (an average of 81 percent of protection order violation dispositions), when they failed to attend batterer intervention programs (47 percent), or when they engaged in new criminal behavior (57 percent).

Table 30a. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2011

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 = 104)	8	7.7	76	73.1	8	7.7	0	0.0	12	11.5
New criminal behavior (N = 447)	8	1.8	238	53.2	31	6.9	11	2.5	159	35.6
Failure to attend BIP (N = 454)	42	9.3	210	46.3	85	18.7	24	5.3	93	20.5
Failure to attend MOT (N = 666)	378	56.8	80	12.0	7	1.1	164	24.6	37	5.6
Other conditions (N = 1,032)	322	31.2	414	40.1	173	16.8	89	8.6	34	3.3

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 because of rounding. MOT = mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP).

Table 30b. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2012

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 = 185)	5	2.7	158	85.4	20	10.8	2	1.1	0	0.0
New criminal behavior (N = 589)	7	1.2	348	59.1	33	5.6	10	1.7	191	32.4
Failure to attend BIP (N = 667)	155	23.2	317	47.5	48	7.2	46	6.9	101	15.1
Failure to attend MOT (N = 391)	116	29.7	182	46.5	23	5.9	64	16.4	6	1.5
Other (N = 1,306)	197	15.1	902	69.1	114	8.7	41	3.1	52	4.0

NOTE: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding. MOT = mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP).

Batterer Intervention Program

- ▶ Average number of individual subgrantees using STOP Program funds for batterer intervention programs (BIP): **22** (1 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Average annual number of offenders in BIP: **2,136**
- ▶ Average number of continuing offenders from last reporting period: **935**
- ▶ Average number of offenders entering during current reporting period: **1,201**

Table 31. Outcomes for offenders in STOP-funded BIP programs in 2011 and 2012

Type of outcome	2011	2012
	Number of offenders	Number of offenders
Completed program	614	625
Terminated from program	377	384
Returned to program after termination	84	132
Other ⁷³	36	0

⁷³ Other outcomes included the following: Transferred, deceased, referred to other court.

References

- Acierno, R., Hernandez, M. A., Amstadter, A. B., Resnick, H. S., Steve, K., Muzzy, W., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2010). Prevalence and correlates of emotional, physical, sexual, and financial abuse and potential neglect in the United States: The national elder mistreatment study. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(2), 292–297. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.163089
- Adams, M., & Campbell, J. (2012). Being undocumented & intimate partner violence (IPV): Multiple vulnerabilities through the lens of feminist intersectionality. Retrieved from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/32411>
- Allen, N. E., Todd, N. R., Anderson, C. J., Davis, S. M., Javdani, S., Bruehler, V., & Dorsey, H. (2013). Council-based approaches to intimate partner violence: Evidence for distal change in the system response. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 52*(1-2), 1–12. doi:10.1007/s10464-013-9572-8
- American Probation and Parole Association, National Center for State Courts, & Pew Charitable Trust. (2013). *Effective responses to offender behavior: Lessons learned for probation and parole supervision*. Retrieved from <http://www.appa-net.org/eWeb/docs/APPA/pubs/EROBLLPPS-Report.pdf>
- Annan, S. L. (2011). “It’s not just a job. This is where we live. This is our backyard”: The experiences of expert legal and advocate providers with sexually assaulted women in rural areas. *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association, 17*(2), 139–147. doi:10.1177/1078390311401024
- Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009, January). *National crime victimization survey: Stalking victimization in the United States* (Report No. NCJ 224527). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ovw/legacy/2012/08/15/bjs-stalking-rpt.pdf>
- Beichner, D., & Spohn, C. (2012). Modeling the effects of victim behavior and moral character on prosecutors’ charging decisions in sexual assault cases. *Violence and Victims, 27*(1), 3–24.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., . . . Stevens, M. R. (2011, November). *National intimate partner*

- and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_Report2010-a.pdf
- Bones, P. D. C. (2013). Perceptions of vulnerability: A target characteristics approach to disability, gender, and victimization. *Deviant Behavior, 34*(9), 727–750. doi:10.1080/01639625.2013.766511
- 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.
- Breiding, M., Chen, J., & Black, M. (2014, February). *Intimate partner violence in the United States - 2010*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/cdc_nisvs_ipv_report_2013_v17_single_a.pdf
- California District Attorneys Association & Training Institute on Strangulation Prevention. (2013). *The investigation and prosecution of strangulation cases* [Manual]. Retrieved from <http://www.strangulationtraininginstitute.com/index.php/publications.html>
- Campbell, J., & Chatman, S. (2013, July). Bench guide for recognizing dangerousness in domestic violence cases. Retrieved from http://www.vawaandcourts.org/states/~media/Microsites/Files/VAWA/California%20Products/Bench%20Guide_Recognizing%20Dangerousness.ashx
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Bybee, D. (2012). Prosecution of adult sexual assault cases: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Program. *Violence Against Women, 18*(2), 223–244. doi:10.1177/1077801212440158
- Casteel, C., Martin, S. L., Smith, J. B., Gurka, K., & Kupper, L. L. (2008). National study of physical and sexual assault among women with disabilities. *Injury Prevention, 14*(2), 87–90. doi:10.1136/ip.2007.016451
- Catalano, S. (2012). *Stalking victims in the United States - revised* (Report No. NCJ 224527). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/svus_rev.pdf
- Center for Court Innovation. (2014). Youth Domestic Violence Court [Organization]. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://www.courtinnovation.org/project/youth-domestic-violence-court>
- Cho, H. (2012). Racial differences in the prevalence of intimate partner violence against women and associated factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(2), 344–363. doi:10.1177/0886260511416469

- Cissner, A., Labriola, M., & Rempel, M. (2013). *Testing the effects of New York's domestic violence courts: A state wide impact evaluation*. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/statewide_evaluation_dv_courts.pdf
- Cook, J. M., Pilver, C., Dinnen, S., Schnurr, P. P., & Hoff, R. (2013). Prevalence of physical and sexual assault and mental health disorders in older women: Findings from a nationally representative sample. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 21*(9), 877–886. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2013.01.016
- Curry, M., Renker, P., Hughes, R. B., Robinson-Whelen, S., Oschwald, M. M., Swank, P., & Powers, L. E. (2009). Development of measures of abuse among women with disabilities and the characteristics of their perpetrators. *Violence Against Women, 15*(9), 1001–1025.
- Curry, M., Renker, P., Robinson-Whelen, S., Hughes, R. B., Swank, P., Oschwald, M., & Powers, L. E. (2011). Facilitators and barriers to disclosing abuse among women with disabilities. *Violence and Victims, 26*(4), 430–444.
- DePrince, A., Belknap, J., Labus, L., Buckingham, S., & Gover, A. (2012). The impact of victim-focused outreach on criminal legal system outcomes following police-reported intimate partner abuse. *Violence Against Women, 18*(9), 861–881.
- Desmarais, S. L., & Reeves, K. A. (2007). Gray, black, and blue: The state of research and intervention for intimate partner abuse among elders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25*(3), 377–391. doi:10.1002/bsl.763
- EMT Associates. (2013, July). *Final evaluation results: Phase II California family justice initiative: Statewide evaluation*. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/familyjusticecenteralliance/docs/evaluation___outcomes_-_cfji_final_
- Finn, M. (2013). Evidence-based and victim-centered prosecutorial policies. *Criminology & Public Policy, 12*(3), 443–472. doi:10.1111/1745-9133.12049
- Fisher, B. S., Zink, T., & Regan, S. L. (2011). Abuses against older women: Prevalence and health effects. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(2), 254–268.
- Fitzsimons, N., Hagemester, A., & Braun, E. (2011). Interpersonal violence against people with disabilities: Understanding the problem from a rural context. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation, 10*(3), 166–188. doi:10.1080/1536710X.2011.596437
- Fleming, K., Newton, T., Fernandez-Botran, R., Miller, J., & Burns, V. (2012). Intimate partner stalking victimization and posttraumatic stress symptoms in post-abuse women. *Violence Against Women, 18*(12), 1368–1389. doi:10.1177/1077801212474447
- Gies, S., Gainey, R., Cohen, M., Healy, E., Duplantier, D., Yeide, M., . . . Hopps, M. (2012). *Monitoring high-risk sex offenders with GPS technology: An evaluation of the California supervision program, final*

- report (Report No. 238481). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=260526>
- Glass, N., Laughon, K., Campbell, J., Block, C., Hanson, G., Sharps, P., & Taliaferro, E. (2008). Non-fatal strangulation is an important risk factor for homicide of women. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 35(3), 329–335. doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2007.02.065
- Greeson, M. R., & Campbell, R. (2013). Sexual assault response teams (SARTs): An empirical review of their effectiveness and challenges to successful implementation. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 14(2), 83–95. doi:10.1177/1524838012470035
- Grossman, S. F., & Lundy, M. (2011). Characteristics of women who do and do not receive onsite shelter services from domestic violence programs. *Violence Against Women*, 17(8), 1024–1045. doi:10.1177/1077801211414169
- Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., & Turner, H. (2014). Intervention following family violence: Best practices and helpseeking obstacles in a nationally representative sample of families with children. *Psychology of Violence*. Advance online publication. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/vio-a0036224.pdf>
- Harmon, D., & Miller, M. (2013, August). *Recidivism trends of domestic violence offenders in Washington state* (Report No. 13-08-1201). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1541>
- Hass, Yang, Monahan, Orloff, & Anver. (2014). Barriers and successes in u visas for immigrant victims: The experiences of legal assistance for victims grantees. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, S1:500, 1-20. doi:10.4172/2151-6200.S1-005
- Haydon, A. A., McRee, A.-L., & Halpern, C. T. (2011). Unwanted sex among young adults in the United States: The role of physical disability and cognitive performance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(17), 3476–3493. doi:10.1177/0886260511403756
- Hovda, J. (2012). Efficacy of Idaho’s domestic violence courts: An opportunity for the court system to effect social change. *Idaho Law Review*, 48, 587–619.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. (2012). *World disasters report 2012: Focus on forced migration and displacement*. Retrieved from <http://www.ifrcmedia.org/assets/pages/wdr2012/resources/1216800-WDR-2012-EN-FULL.pdf>
- Johnson, M., McGrath, S. A., & Miller, M. H. (2014). Effective advocacy in rural domains: Applying an ecological model to understanding advocates’ relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(12), 1–26. doi:10.1177/0886260513516862
- Kilbane, T., & Spira, M. (2010). Domestic violence or elder abuse? Why it matters for older women. *Families in Society: The Journal of*

- Contemporary Social Services*, 91(2), 165–170. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.3979
- Klein, A., Centerbar, D., Keller, S., & Klein, J. (2014, January). *Impact of differential sentencing severity for domestic violence offenses and all other offenses over abusers' life spans* (Report No. 244757). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=266838>
- Klein, A., Salomon, A., Elwyn, L., Barasch, A., Powers, J., Maley, M., . . . Exner-Cortens, D. (2013, May). *An exploratory study of juvenile orders of protection as a remedy for dating violence* (Report No. 242131). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/242131.pdf>
- Klein, A., Salomon, A., Huntington, N., Dubois, J., & Lang, D. (2009, September). *A statewide study of stalking and its criminal justice response* (Report No. NCJ 228354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Labriola, M., Bradley, S., O'Sullivan, C., Rempel, M., & Moore, S. (2010, February). *A national portrait of domestic violence courts* (Report No. 229659). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/229659.pdf>
- Labriola, M., Cissner, A., Davis, R., & Rempel, M. (2012, December). *Testing the efficacy of judicial monitoring: A randomized trial at the Rochester, New York Domestic Violence Courts*. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/Testing_Efficacy_Judicial_Monitoring.pdf
- Lee, M. (2013). Breaking barriers: Addressing structural obstacles to social service provision for Asian survivors of domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 19(11), 1350–1369. doi:10.1177/1077801213514486
- Lee, N., Quinones, D. J., Ammar, N., & Orloff, L. E. (2013, April). *National survey of service providers on police response to immigrant crime victims, U Visa certification and language access*. Retrieved from <http://www.masslegalservices.org/system/files/library/Police%20Response%20U%20Visas%20Language%20Access%20Report%20NIWAP%20%204%2016%2013%20FINAL.pdf>
- Leisey, M., Kupstas, P. K., & Cooper, A. (2009). Domestic violence in the second half of life. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect*, 21, 141–155.
- Leventhal, J., Angiolillo, D., & D'Emic, M. (2014). The trials, tribulations, and rewards of being first. *The Judges' Journal*, 53(2), 8–10.
- Linden, J. A. (2011). Care of the adult patient after sexual assault. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 365(9), 834–841. doi:10.1056/NEJMcp1102869
- Lindquist, C. H., Barrick, K., Krebs, C., Crosby, C. M., Lockard, A. J., & Sanders-Phillips, K. (2013). The context and consequences of sexual assault among undergraduate women at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(12), 2437–2461. doi:10.1177/0886260513479032

- Lippman, J. (2012). Ensuring victim safety and abuser accountability: Reforms and revisions in New York courts' response to domestic violence. *Albany Law Review*, 76(3), 1417–1443.
- Littel, K. (2013, April). *A national protocol for sexual assault medical forensic examinations adults/adolescents: Second edition* (Report No. NCJ 228119). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ovw/241903.pdf>
- Logan, T. K. (2010, October). *Research on partner stalking: Putting the pieces together*. Retrieved from <http://www.victimsofcrime.org/docs/Common%20Documents/Research%20on%20Partner%20Stalking%20Report.pdf?sfvrsn=0>
- Lonsway, K., Archambault, S., & Littel, K. (2013, June). *Sustaining a coordinated community response: Sexual assault response and resource teams (SARRT)*. Retrieved from <http://www.evawintl.org/>
- Lund, E. M. (2011). Community-based services and interventions for adults with disabilities who have experienced interpersonal violence: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 12(4), 171–182. doi:10.1177/1524838011416377
- Lundy, M., & Grossman, S. F. (2009). Domestic violence service users: A comparison of older and younger women victims. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(5), 297–309. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9230-y
- Lyon, E., Bradshaw, J., & Menard, A. (2012, February). *Meeting survivors' needs through non-residential domestic violence services & supports: Results of a multi-state study* (Report No. NCJ 237328). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237328.pdf>
- Mahoney, A., & Poling, A. (2011). Sexual abuse prevention for people with severe developmental disabilities. *Journal of Developmental & Physical Disabilities*, 23(4), 369–376. doi:10.1007/s10882-011-9244-2
- Mandatory domestic violence training for judges [Chart]. (2013). Retrieved from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Courts Judges website: <http://www.ncjfcj.org/sites/default/files/chart-mandatory-dv-training-for-judges.pdf>
- Martin, D. C., & Yankay, J. E. (2013, April). *Refugees and asylees: 2012*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_rfa_fr_2012.pdf
- Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence. (2012). Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence: What is LAP? Retrieved from <http://mnadv.org/lethality/what-is-lap/>
- McCall-Hosenfeld, J. S., Weisman, C. S., Perry, A. N., Hillemeier, M. M., & Chuang, C. H. (2014). "I just keep my antennae out": How rural primary care physicians respond to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi:10.1177/0886260513517299

- McColgan, M. D., Cruz, M., McKee, J., Dempsey, S. H., Davis, M. B., Barry, P., . . . Giardino, A. P. (2010). Results of a multifaceted intimate partner violence training program for pediatric residents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 34*(4), 275–283. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.07.008
- McKay, K. (2014). A voice from the field. *IDVSA Voice, 9*(1), 5–7.
- McNamara, C. L., & Marsil, D. F. (2012). The prevalence of stalking among college students: The disparity between researcher-and self-identified victimization. *Journal of American College Health, 60*(2), 168–174.
- Messing, J., Campbell, J., Wilson, J., Brown, S., Patchell, B., & Shall, C. (2014, March). *Police departments' use of the lethality assessment program: A quasi-experimental evaluation*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/app/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=269556>.
- Miller, L. (2012). Stalking: Patterns, motives, and intervention strategies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(6), 495–506. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.07.001
- Mindlin, J., Orloff, L. E., Pochiraju, S., & Echevarria, E. (2013). *Dynamics of sexual assault and implications for immigrant women* [Manual]. Retrieved from <http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/cultural-competency/dynamics-of-violence-against-immigrant-women/1-Dynamics-MANUAL-ES.pdf/view>
- Moore, S. (2009, November). *Two Decades of Specialized Domestic Violence Courts: A Review of the Literature*. Retrieved from <http://www.courtinnovation.org/research/two-decades-specialized-domestic-violence-courts-review-literature>
- National Center for State Courts. (2012). Problem solving court: Domestic violence. Retrieved July 9, 2014, from <http://www.ncsc.org/Topics/Human-Resources/Job-Descriptions/Specialized-and-Problem-Solving-Courts/Domestic-Violence.aspx>
- National Network to End Domestic Violence. (2014a). *Domestic Violence Counts 2013: A 24-Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services*. Retrieved from http://nnev.org/downloads/Census/DVCounts2013/Census13_FullReport_forweb_smallestFileSizeWhiteMargins.pdf
- National Network to End Domestic Violence. (2014b). National Network to End Domestic Violence policy issues: Immigration. Retrieved from <http://nnev.org/policy/issues/immigration.html?highlight=WyJpbW1pZ3JhbnQiXQ==>
- Norris, T., Vines, P. L., & Hoeffel, E. M. (2012). *The American Indian and Alaska Native population: 2010* (Census Brief No. C2010BR-10). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf>
- Nowell, B., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2011). Examining multi-sector community collaboratives as vehicles for building organizational capacity.

- American Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(3-4), 193–207.
doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9364-3
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2009). *Fifteen years of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, its causes and consequences*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women. Retrieved from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/women/rapporteur/docs/15YearReviewofVAWMandate.pdf>
- Parks, S., Johnson, L., McDaniel, D., & Gladden, M. (2014). Surveillance for violent deaths - national violent death reporting system, 16 states, 2010. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Surveillance Summaries*, 63(1), 1–32.
- Peek-Asa, C., Wallis, A., Harland, K., Beyer, K., Dickey, P., & Saftlas, A. (2011). Rural disparity in domestic violence prevalence and access to resources. *Journal of Women's Health*, 20(11), 1743–1749.
- Pennington-Zoellner, K. (2009). Expanding “community” in the community response to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(8), 539–545. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9252-5
- Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S., & Hollywood, J. S., (2013). *Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR233.html (Original work published 2013)
- Peterson, R. (2012, January). *The Kings County District Attorney's video statement program for domestic violence cases*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=262015>
- Peterson, R. (2013, January). *The Eve Project* (Report No. 31). Retrieved from http://www.nycja.org/lwdcms/doc-view.php?module=reports&module_id=624&doc_name=doc.
- Peterson, R. (2014, January). *The impact of the Kings County integrated domestic violence court on case processing*. Retrieved from http://www.nycja.org/lwdcms/doc-view.php?module=reports&module_id=656&doc_name=doc.
- Petillo, J. (2013). Domestic violence in Indian Country: Improving the federal government's response to this grave epidemic. *Connecticut Law Review*, 45(5), 1841–1874.
- Planty, M., Langton, L., Krebs, C., Berzofsky, M., & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2013, March). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010* (Report No. NCJ 240655). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Praxis International. (2010). *Safety and accountability audit: Institutional analysis/community assessment*. Retrieved from http://www.praxisinternational.org/praxis_institutional_analysis_community_assessment_home.aspx
- Probst, D. R., Turchik, J. A., Zimak, E. H., & Huckins, J. L. (2011). Assessment of sexual assault in clinical practice: Available screening tools for use

- with different adult populations. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 20(2), 199–226. doi:10.1080/10926771.2011.546754
- Rennison, C., DeKeseredy, W., & Dragiewicz, M. (2013). Intimate relationship status variations in violence against women: Urban, suburban, and rural differences. *Violence Against Women*, 19(11), 1312–1330. doi:10.1177/1077801213514487
- Rennison, C., DeKeseredy, W. S., & Dragiewicz, M. (2012). Urban, suburban, and rural variations in separation/divorce rape/sexual assault: Results from the national crime victimization survey. *Feminist Criminology*. doi:10.1177/1557085111435660
- Reyns, B., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. (2012). Stalking in the twilight zone: Extent of cyberstalking victimization and offending among college students. *Deviant Behavior*, 33(1), 1–25.
- Richards, T., Jennings, W., Tomsich, E., & Gover, A. (2013). A longitudinal examination of offending and specialization among a sample of Massachusetts domestic violence offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(3), 643–663. doi:10.1177/0886260512455519
- Roberto, K. A., McPherson, M. C., & Brossoie, N. (2013). Intimate partner violence in late life: A review of the empirical literature. *Violence Against Women*, 19(12), 1538–1558. doi:10.1177/1077801213517564
- Rosay, A., Wood, D., Rivera, M., Postle, G., & TePas, K. (2011, November). *Investigation and prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking* (Report No. NCJ 236429) Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236429.pdf>
- Scherer, H. L., Snyder, J. A., & Fisher, B. S. (2013). A gendered approach to understanding intimate partner victimization and mental health outcomes among college students with and without disability. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 23(3), 209–231.
- Schlueter, M., Wicklund, P., Adler, R., Owen, J., & Halvorsen, T. (2011, December). *Bennington County integrated domestic violence docket project: Outcome evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.vcjr.org/reports/reportscrimjust/reports/idvdreport.html>
- Shepard, M. F., & Hagemester, A. K. (2013). Perspectives of rural women: Custody and visitation with abusive ex-partners. *Affilia*, 28(2), 165–176. doi:10.1177/0886109913490469
- Shepard, M. F., & Pence, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Spohn, C., & Tellis, K. (2012). *Policing and prosecuting sexual assault in Los Angeles City and County: A collaborative study in partnership with the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office* (Report No. NCJ 237582). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237582.pdf>

- Stalking Resource Center. (2012). The use of technology to stalk. Retrieved May 15, 2014, from <http://www.victimsofcrime.org/our-programs/stalking-resource-center/stalking-information/the-use-of-technology-to-stalk>
- Stover, C. (2012). Police-advocacy partnerships in response to domestic violence. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, 12(2), 183–198. doi:10.1080/15332586.2012.717031
- Tasca, M., Rodriguez, N., Spohn, C., & Koss, M. (2013). Police decision making in sexual assault cases: Predictors of suspect identification and arrest. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(6), 1157–1177.
- Truman, J., Langton, L., & BJS Statisticians. (2014). *Criminal victimization, 2013*. (Report No. NCJ 247648). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv13.pdf>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2014, June). *UNHCR global trends 2013: War's human cost*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/5399a14f9.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Selected population profile in the United States: 2012 American community survey 1-year estimates* [Table of data]. Retrieved from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>
- U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. (2012). *Table 12. Projections of the population by age and sex for the United States: 2015 to 2060 (NP2012-T12)* [Table of data]. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/data/national/2012/summarytables.html>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2013). *Women's health USA 2013: Rural and urban women* [Illustrated collection of data]. Retrieved from <http://www.mchb.hrsa.gov/whusa13/population-characteristics/p/rural-urban-women.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2012). *U.S. Department of Justice Indian Country investigations and prosecutions 2011-2012*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/tribal/tloa-report-cy-2011-2012.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2013). *U.S. Department of Justice Indian Country Investigations and Prosecutions 2013*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/tribal/legacy/2014/08/26/icip-rpt-cy2013.pdf>
- U.S. Department of State. (2014, June). *Trafficking in persons report 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2014/>
- Werner, C. (2011, November). *The older population: 2010: 2010 Census briefs* (Report No. C2010BR-09). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-09.pdf>

Williams, T. (2012, February 21). Justice Department declines over 50% of tribal violence, rape cases. *The Bulletin*. Retrieved from <http://www.bendbulletin.com/article/20120221/NEWS0107/202210409/>

Yoshihama, M., Bybee, D., Dabby, C., & Blazeovski, J. (2011, October). *Lifecourse experiences of intimate partner violence and help-seeking among Filipina, Indian, and Pakistani women: Implications for justice system responses* (Report No. 236174). U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236174.pdf>

Appendix A 2011

Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2011⁷⁴

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Alabama	43	12	8	20	3	0	650,307	554,701	623,478	231,723	0	2,060,209	142,560
Alaska	14	4	4	2	3	1	186,901	364,083	35,437	80,585	2,678	669,684	72,455
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	51	16	21	10	4	0	964,765	484,701	802,860	107,851	0	2,360,177	157,533
Arkansas	45	3	10	8	2	22	339,500	380,034	346,881	139,118	302,535	1,508,068	63,260
California	82	26	23	23	10	0	3,545,668	2,959,272	3,603,967	1,214,980	0	11,323,887	1,278,508
Colorado	36	12	8	10	2	4	712,445	577,913	480,547	107,960	64,296	1,943,161	0
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	9	1	3	2	1	2	149,695	138,598	138,598	27,720	82,158	536,769	61,599
Connecticut	16	8	4	2	2	0	341,578	246,844	455,310	61,875	0	1,105,607	0
Delaware	14	7	5	1	1	0	311,401	137,543	211,602	40,683	0	701,229	44,547
District of Columbia	10	1	4	2	1	2	216,349	203,306	180,291	36,058	108,174	744,178	68,777
Florida	7	3	2	1	1	0	3,509,061	1,505,034	1,505,034	301,007	0	6,820,136	302,856
Georgia	79	33	21	19	6	0	1,433,993	1,189,115	845,857	285,939	0	3,754,904	488,432
Guam	34	22	3	3	3	3	532,077	443,397	443,397	88,680	266,039	1,773,590	197,067
Hawaii	22	8	9	4	1	0	499,780	420,865	230,632	46,127	0	1,197,404	95,828
Idaho	23	10	5	3	1	4	297,700	248,084	248,084	49,617	148,850	992,335	74,971
Illinois	36	2	11	5	4	14	1,308,612	1,760,816	892,432	180,764	534,495	4,677,119	706,482
Indiana	80	44	7	28	1	0	1,415,025	376,440	913,122	93,790	0	2,798,377	271,983
Iowa	67	30	21	12	2	2	618,726	392,448	385,301	92,237	58,553	1,547,265	76,703
Kansas	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	1,000	83,839
Kentucky	39	12	10	9	2	6	599,620	563,137	428,840	54,060	286,831	1,932,488	28,966
Louisiana	91	39	24	21	4	3	645,203	612,155	620,522	124,245	174,594	2,176,719	207,348
Maine	33	16	9	8	0	0	467,611	253,998	232,948	0	0	954,557	73,958
Maryland	119	45	30	18	1	25	701,863	551,269	555,032	111,359	338,659	2,258,182	53,605
Massachusetts	67	23	29	8	3	4	810,400	686,968	652,090	155,400	331,000	2,635,858	180,663
Michigan	370	92	94	94	90	0	1,589,269	882,928	882,928	176,585	0	3,531,710	122,015
Minnesota	121	9	54	50	8	0	943,158	846,646	1,108,361	205,674	0	3,103,839	184,130
Mississippi	77	52	13	10	2	0	762,485	387,588	349,350	70,630	0	1,570,053	0
Missouri	67	43	12	8	3	1	1,032,435	488,333	515,787	172,446	44,187	2,253,188	68,490
Montana	26	8	6	8	2	2	340,983	204,694	208,526	41,002	22,812	818,017	64,682

⁷⁴ Data in Table A1 are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2011.

Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2011⁷⁴

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Nebraska	34	12	13	5	2	2	429,082	267,029	267,029	79,265	50,567	1,092,972	97,642
Nevada	54	14	15	11	6	8	378,492	422,542	329,738	101,605	202,200	1,434,577	120,290
New Hampshire	28	10	8	9	1	0	340,654	256,874	202,554	60,000	0	860,082	64,545
New Jersey	82	34	20	27	1	0	992,344	683,140	508,520	149,736	0	2,333,740	310,386
New Mexico	42	19	16	5	2	0	410,506	318,058	309,773	55,569	0	1,093,906	92,895
New York	130	59	40	27	1	3	2,437,887	1,621,072	1,611,720	316,918	178,979	6,166,576	704,262
North Carolina	26	9	8	3	1	5	1,103,715	916,382	827,990	166,257	498,142	3,512,486	528,513
North Dakota	77	21	16	15	6	19	230,828	189,156	204,316	36,414	110,564	771,278	80,436
Ohio	255	75	49	56	16	59	2,765,497	2,237,781	2,292,909	321,442	1,862,110	9,479,739	0
Oklahoma	38	13	9	7	4	5	423,307	384,118	408,075	71,395	214,663	1,501,558	312,724
Oregon	65	39	10	11	3	2	751,760	458,775	468,857	118,597	3,781	1,801,770	0
Pennsylvania	95	31	31	31	2	0	1,881,404	1,079,978	1,101,878	230,890	0	4,294,150	477,127
Puerto Rico	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Rhode Island	10	4	4	1	1	0	383,701	134,163	212,845	42,569	0	773,278	20,866
South Carolina	71	35	17	12	3	4	832,447	537,089	583,989	105,787	81,047	2,140,359	211,484
South Dakota	36	26	2	6	1	1	235,664	210,670	211,429	42,286	95,082	795,131	52,271
Tennessee	7	1	1	3	2	0	42,808	19,997	110,935	17,667	0	191,407	43,092
Texas	116	34	29	35	11	7	2,776,077	2,448,864	2,453,707	836,880	560,024	9,075,552	888,234
Utah	101	32	32	25	3	9	374,561	330,854	359,353	67,337	164,033	1,296,138	0
Vermont	30	12	8	9	1	0	295,838	171,075	234,140	40,259	0	741,312	38,332
Virgin Islands	3	1	0	2	0	0	16,142	0	290,189	0	0	306,331	62,894
Virginia	93	36	21	19	5	12	961,465	718,332	718,325	143,663	331,523	2,873,308	202,936
Washington	98	37	23	37	1	0	174,676	233,875	181,507	124,313	0	714,371	428,732
West Virginia	63	19	20	16	1	7	409,113	299,433	332,965	55,767	171,635	1,268,913	83,951
Wisconsin	42	20	8	9	4	1	815,205	405,250	469,355	92,241	4,423	1,786,474	213,188
Wyoming	62	23	7	2	23	7	201,337	169,491	169,491	34,869	101,491	676,679	77,518
TOTAL	3,338	1,197	857	773	265	246	44,591,120	32,374,908	32,759,803	7,609,842	7,396,125	124,731,798	10,283,575

Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2011

State	Sexual Assault	Domestic Violence	Stalking	Total
Alabama	30	70	0	100
Alaska	20	76	4	100
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Arizona	19	79	2	100
Arkansas	13	86	1	100
California	36	60	4	100
Colorado	24	73	3	100
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	10	90	0	100
Connecticut	38	62	0	100
Delaware	25	70	5	100
District of Columbia	58	35	7	100
Florida	48	52	0	100
Georgia	30	64	6	100
Guam	33	34	33	100
Hawaii	43	56	1	100
Idaho	30	65	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	20	78	2	100
Iowa	23	74	3	100
Kansas	15	75	10	100
Kentucky	30	60	10	100
Louisiana	22	74	4	100
Maine	35	60	5	100
Maryland	31	66	3	100
Massachusetts	20	75	5	100
Michigan	29	68	3	100
Minnesota	50	50	0	100
Mississippi	49	50	1	100
Missouri	18	80	2	100
Montana	38	52	10	100
Nebraska	19	75	6	100
Nevada	21	73	6	100
New Hampshire	20	70	10	100
New Jersey	60	40	0	100
New Mexico	22	58	20	100
New York	29	69	2	100

Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2011

State	Sexual Assault	Domestic Violence	Stalking	Total
North Carolina	30	55	15	100
North Dakota	24	75	1	100
Ohio	15	75	10	100
Oklahoma	24	72	4	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100
Pennsylvania	30	66	4	100
Puerto Rico	100	0	0	100
Rhode Island	17	81	2	100
South Carolina	45	45	10	100
South Dakota	11	81	8	100
Tennessee	18	78	4	100
Texas	19	78	3	100
Utah	14	80	6	100
Vermont	20	75	5	100
Virgin Islands	15	79	6	100
Virginia	16	80	4	100
Washington	17	79	4	100
West Virginia	24	68	8	100
Wisconsin	76	24	0	100
Wyoming	6	82	12	100

Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2011

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Alabama	650,307	504,257	77.5
Alaska	186,901	16,117	8.6
American Samoa	0	0	0.0
Arizona	964,765	85,133	8.8
Arkansas	339,500	79,000	23.3
California	3,545,668	1,196,902	33.8
Colorado	712,445	108,689	15.3
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	149,695	16,632	11.1
Connecticut	341,578	43,800	12.8
Delaware	311,401	48,571	15.6
District of Columbia	216,349	216,349	100.0
Florida	3,509,061	180,604	5.1
Georgia	1,433,993	383,168	26.7
Guam	532,077	274,975	51.7
Hawaii	499,780	84,780	17.0
Idaho	297,700	127,386	42.8
Illinois	1,308,612	1,308,616	100.0
Indiana	1,415,025	210,641	14.9
Iowa	618,726	65,678	10.6
Kansas	0	0	0.0
Kentucky	599,620	156,225	26.1
Louisiana	645,203	55,956	8.7
Maine	467,611	75,716	16.2
Maryland	701,863	288,658	41.1
Massachusetts	810,400	124,300	15.3
Michigan	1,589,269	119,951	7.6
Minnesota	943,158	720,052	76.3
Mississippi	762,485	150,524	19.7
Missouri	1,032,435	124,837	12.1
Montana	340,983	34,098	10.0
Nebraska	429,082	32,043	7.5
Nevada	378,492	109,992	29.1
New Hampshire	340,654	40,000	11.7
New Jersey	992,344	134,500	13.6
New Mexico	410,506	73,074	17.8
New York	2,437,887	425,557	17.5

Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2011

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
North Carolina	1,103,715	283,274	25.7
North Dakota	230,828	13,892	6.0
Ohio	2,765,497	785,151	28.4
Oklahoma	423,307	37,771	8.9
Oregon	751,760	57,207	7.6
Pennsylvania	1,881,404	708,571	37.7
Puerto Rico	0	0	0.0
Rhode Island	383,701	25,541	6.7
South Carolina	832,447	119,874	14.4
South Dakota	235,664	33,693	14.3
Tennessee	42,808	0	0.0
Texas	2,776,077	524,149	18.9
Utah	736,685	85,663	11.6
Vermont	295,838	30,000	10.1
Virgin Islands	16,142	16,142	100.0
Virginia	961,465	92,068	9.6
Washington	174,676	4,327	2.5
West Virginia	409,113	21,891	5.4
Wisconsin	815,205	283,828	34.8
Wyoming	201,337	13,250	6.6
TOTAL	44,953,244	10,753,076	23.9

Appendix B 2011

Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011

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	30	11	4	7	4	8	5	18	8	8	0	0	0
Alaska	4	4	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	18	14	6	9	2	4	3	13	2	3	1	2	0
Arkansas	28	8	4	2	1	22	2	13	12	4	0	0	0
California	83	49	15	18	7	24	5	67	11	11	0	7	1
Colorado	33	11	5	3	2	7	1	24	1	5	0	0	0
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	6	3	2	1	2	4	0	3	0	1	1	0	0
Connecticut	14	4	2	4	2	12	4	4	0	10	0	0	3
Delaware	12	4	1	0	2	2	0	8	2	1	1	1	0
District of Columbia	5	4	0	1	0	3	0	4	1	1	0	0	0
Florida	69	22	7	10	2	21	3	53	14	9	1	0	0
Georgia	47	18	8	9	3	16	9	24	9	8	0	0	0
Guam	11	4	0	5	2	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	12	5	1	1	0	6	2	5	2	3	0	0	0
Idaho	17	7	5	3	2	3	1	15	2	2	0	0	0
Illinois	43	26	1	5	1	5	1	48	4	5	0	4	0
Indiana	73	36	16	15	9	19	8	50	6	19	0	0	0
Iowa	61	24	15	8	3	20	4	32	16	10	0	0	0
Kansas	26	7	2	6	4	8	0	14	2	6	1	0	1
Kentucky	33	9	5	7	1	9	3	24	8	4	0	0	0
Louisiana	72	19	8	6	11	28	3	39	19	12	2	0	0
Maine	30	11	10	5	7	9	4	17	10	1	0	0	1
Maryland	64	18	17	10	7	18	10	47	3	5	0	0	1
Massachusetts	56	25	5	16	2	6	7	49	3	3	0	0	0
Michigan	50	24	15	7	7	5	6	48	2	4	0	0	0
Minnesota	31	18	16	10	6	4	10	11	2	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	36	9	0	1	2	0	0	21	11	2	0	0	0

S•T•O•P Program

Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Missouri	68	20	13	5	4	17	5	47	11	7	2	0	3
Montana	24	14	1	6	1	5	3	15	4	1	0	0	0
Nebraska	17	12	8	4	2	8	4	11	3	6	0	2	3
Nevada	33	10	4	7	2	5	4	29	1	1	1	1	0
New Hampshire	23	13	9	5	3	6	2	12	4	5	0	0	0
New Jersey	102	48	19	19	8	1	5	95	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	32	16	6	7	3	6	5	18	2	4	0	0	0
New York	114	75	35	38	19	28	10	92	11	21	0	3	2
North Carolina	55	29	20	14	13	20	7	25	13	3	2	0	2
North Dakota	38	13	7	5	6	2	4	29	2	0	0	0	2
Ohio	101	31	12	14	8	32	9	70	19	14	2	0	0
Oklahoma	33	14	2	3	3	13	4	15	7	6	0	3	0
Oregon	56	19	9	6	1	4	9	50	0	3	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	31	28	20	11	4	24	8	29	18	20	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	16	1	1	0	0	3	0	12	1	3	0	0	0
Rhode Island	9	6	2	1	1	2	0	6	0	1	1	0	0
South Carolina	40	22	12	13	8	10	4	29	4	5	1	0	1
South Dakota	36	9	7	4	1	6	4	31	0	6	0	0	1
Tennessee	49	20	3	12	2	12	3	31	7	7	0	0	0
Texas	132	43	22	11	13	51	6	80	21	23	2	3	0
Utah	41	28	9	11	5	7	5	32	5	2	0	0	0
Vermont	11	6	3	1	1	7	1	9	5	5	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Virginia	94	62	15	61	11	22	8	65	13	11	0	1	0
Washington	82	26	3	2	9	5	4	61	13	6	0	0	0
West Virginia	21	7	6	3	2	2	2	15	15	9	0	0	1
Wisconsin	36	21	8	5	3	5	6	12	2	4	0	0	0
Wyoming	30	4	2	2	3	1	1	30	0	1	0	0	0
Total	2,292	993	430	441	228	567	216	1,611	331	311	18	27	24

Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	30	18	5,658	5,590	61	7	5,651	5,126	463	62
Alaska	5	1	752	501	39	212	540	497	36	7
Arizona	18	13	4,842	4,787	49	6	4,836	4,319	452	65
Arkansas	30	13	3,837	3,751	86	0	3,837	3,636	195	6
California	87	67	15,711	14,705	668	338	15,373	11,193	3,944	236
Colorado	33	24	8,816	8,571	70	175	8,641	7,993	603	45
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	8	3	168	150	18	0	168	147	20	1
Connecticut	17	4	1,821	1,821	0	0	1,821	0	1,821	0
Delaware	13	8	2,136	2,113	3	20	2,116	1,894	219	3
District of Columbia	6	4	376	254	4	118	258	166	45	47
Florida	73	53	19,656	19,203	415	38	19,618	17,744	1,514	360
Georgia	47	24	9,263	8,642	203	418	8,845	5,978	2,678	189
Guam	12	7	736	736	0	0	736	630	96	10
Hawaii	15	5	239	235	4	0	239	85	153	1
Idaho	18	15	1,548	1,532	1	15	1,533	1,254	205	74
Illinois	54	48	25,032	24,573	363	96	24,936	22,908	2,025	3
Indiana	74	50	10,381	10,094	177	110	10,271	9,187	618	466
Iowa	62	32	5,280	5,114	33	133	5,147	4,460	647	40
Kansas	28	14	4,926	4,926	0	0	4,926	4,562	244	120
Kentucky	35	24	7,748	7,647	67	34	7,714	7,310	380	24
Louisiana	77	39	11,901	11,786	113	2	11,899	9,967	1,550	382
Maine	37	17	4,776	4,275	493	8	4,768	3,474	1,250	44
Maryland	65	47	10,338	9,872	241	225	10,113	9,265	772	76
Massachusetts	56	49	10,638	10,128	361	149	10,489	10,021	359	109
Michigan	50	48	16,004	15,309	437	258	15,746	13,427	1,718	601
Minnesota	32	11	1,906	1,860	46	0	1,906	1,373	533	0
Mississippi	37	21	5,286	5,243	39	4	5,282	4,523	688	71
Missouri	68	47	10,705	10,116	313	276	10,429	7,820	1,797	812
Montana	25	15	3,331	3,241	52	38	3,293	2,632	450	211
Nebraska	17	11	5,148	4,889	247	12	5,136	4,567	228	341

S•T•O•P Program

Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Nevada	35	29	12,407	12,198	184	25	12,382	11,575	340	467
New Hampshire	23	12	1,977	1,858	45	74	1,903	1,456	352	95
New Jersey	104	95	20,559	20,387	152	20	20,539	16,497	3,989	53
New Mexico	36	18	2,145	2,074	24	47	2,098	1,568	440	90
New York	114	92	26,093	23,037	2,362	694	25,399	21,925	3,267	207
North Carolina	61	25	5,212	5,154	43	15	5,197	4,430	398	369
North Dakota	43	29	1,528	1,516	10	2	1,526	1,192	315	19
Ohio	102	70	24,532	23,973	419	140	24,392	20,785	2,725	882
Oklahoma	34	15	2,953	2,928	25	0	2,953	2,602	232	119
Oregon	56	50	8,066	7,500	164	402	7,664	5,915	1,582	167
Pennsylvania	32	29	12,797	12,565	218	14	12,783	9,803	2,797	183
Puerto Rico	17	12	6,515	6,515	0	0	6,515	6,413	23	79
Rhode Island	9	6	8,077	6,753	946	378	7,699	7,452	237	10
South Carolina	42	29	8,785	8,395	351	39	8,746	6,863	1,642	241
South Dakota	36	31	5,678	5,646	25	7	5,671	4,186	396	1,089
Tennessee	49	31	4,430	4,292	69	69	4,361	3,759	488	114
Texas	138	80	32,959	31,877	845	237	32,722	29,781	2,346	595
Utah	42	32	9,678	9,472	162	44	9,634	7,918	988	728
Vermont	12	9	1,348	1,332	13	3	1,345	1,123	165	57
Virgin Islands	5	2	420	394	26	0	420	399	20	1
Virginia	96	65	15,091	14,610	247	234	14,857	12,819	1,867	171
Washington	91	61	4,802	4,759	2	41	4,761	4,452	263	46
West Virginia	23	15	5,710	5,687	11	12	5,698	5,165	444	89
Wisconsin	39	12	4,217	3,669	465	83	4,134	1,563	2,410	161
Wyoming	30	30	2,473	2,447	24	2	2,471	2,039	167	265
TOTAL	2,398	1,611	437,411	420,702	11,435	5,274	432,137	367,838	53,596	10,703

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Alabama	5,651	8	17	2,315	135	1	3,045	152	4,982	662	7	125	1,013	2,926	202	1,385
Alaska	540	49	83	30	100	29	202	51	497	40	3	24	65	437	8	6
Arizona	4,836	130	45	154	1,749	8	1,873	877	3,763	924	149	466	726	2,978	293	373
Arkansas	3,837	16	23	1,039	214	14	2,491	40	3,133	684	20	311	818	2,354	144	210
California	15,373	522	373	2,036	4,669	120	4,000	3,655	11,233	1,527	2,613	1,020	3,152	7,457	251	3,493
Colorado	8,641	101	53	523	1,831	43	3,605	2,512	7,456	767	418	155	1,423	4,288	118	2,657
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	168	0	67	0	0	27	59	15	136	17	15	2	22	124	5	15
Connecticut	1,821	6	12	235	329	2	1,112	125	1,590	227	4	358	323	867	27	246
Delaware	2,116	7	10	554	152	2	1,282	112	1,894	162	60	55	350	1,572	79	60
District of Columbia	258	0	4	129	108	1	13	4	233	25	0	2	33	211	10	2
Florida	19,618	35	115	5,873	3,043	30	9,916	662	16,442	2,967	209	604	4,985	12,467	965	597
Georgia	8,845	6	139	3,110	604	8	3,103	1,896	8,154	611	80	366	1,306	4,533	524	2,116
Guam	736	0	108	11	45	524	30	18	613	122	1	94	124	426	12	80
Hawaii	239	4	55	11	13	74	47	35	228	11	0	79	40	87	10	23
Idaho	1,533	37	9	12	309	0	1,133	33	1,448	85	0	61	301	997	106	68
Illinois	24,936	114	200	9,257	4,368	21	10,397	1,064	22,968	1,963	5	992	4,759	16,823	1,547	815
Indiana	10,271	15	81	2,214	1,547	6	6,047	522	9,637	563	71	366	2,265	6,569	268	803
Iowa	5,147	109	96	462	756	8	3,545	171	4,661	479	7	220	1,128	3,464	85	250
Kansas	4,926	33	58	1,005	567	9	3,022	238	4,211	713	2	76	1,288	3,209	157	196
Kentucky	7,714	13	51	1,158	528	2	5,526	436	7,251	457	6	71	2,028	5,081	131	403
Louisiana	11,899	52	63	5,737	307	14	5,334	392	10,118	1,558	223	785	2,456	7,121	311	1,226
Maine	4,768	26	24	146	36	1	3,717	823	4,299	452	17	254	884	2,930	201	499
Maryland	10,113	6	125	3,582	1,606	5	4,189	601	9,254	795	64	324	2,130	6,887	198	574
Massachusetts	10,489	18	192	1,367	2,607	5	5,648	793	9,651	816	22	431	2,171	7,414	385	88
Michigan	15,746	248	95	4,460	1,926	10	8,485	539	14,609	1,063	74	471	3,969	10,555	379	372
Minnesota	1,906	648	29	249	303	2	572	103	1,803	103	0	227	643	861	71	104
Mississippi	5,282	46	30	2,517	137	1	2,398	153	5,027	238	17	198	1,278	3,332	160	314
Missouri	10,429	48	33	1,920	437	13	7,788	296	9,849	554	26	318	2,327	7,224	268	292

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Montana	3,293	483	13	27	108	21	2,442	267	2,819	425	49	248	726	1,925	161	233
Nebraska	5,136	141	39	282	830	16	3,629	199	4,516	620	0	496	1,360	2,830	114	336
Nevada	12,382	351	218	1,320	3,753	54	6,323	371	10,565	1,553	264	228	2,990	7,928	737	499
New Hampshire	1,903	7	17	57	233	3	1,481	148	1,627	260	16	126	373	1,216	40	148
New Jersey	20,539	14	724	3,825	4,286	22	8,420	3,255	16,381	2,027	2,131	1,067	3,620	10,181	1,179	4,492
New Mexico	2,098	141	11	25	1,155	3	487	276	1,909	184	5	71	399	1,307	47	274
New York	25,399	264	661	5,812	4,114	40	13,178	1,529	22,855	2,324	220	1,465	6,061	15,635	1,066	1,172
North Carolina	5,197	22	101	1,727	387	6	2,798	192	4,147	1,007	43	582	1,001	2,999	265	350
North Dakota	1,526	212	10	55	52	3	1,178	20	1,418	108	0	88	431	963	41	3
Ohio	24,392	223	93	6,647	1,057	10	13,641	2,771	22,866	1,470	56	792	5,578	14,220	599	3,203
Oklahoma	2,953	420	6	237	401	12	2,034	14	2,804	149	0	83	634	2,169	60	7
Oregon	7,664	303	62	158	1,277	51	4,919	942	6,950	709	5	254	1,532	5,119	412	347
Pennsylvania	12,783	23	91	1,005	759	5	9,414	1,529	11,780	803	200	811	2,970	7,923	413	666
Puerto Rico	6,515	0	0	0	6,044	0	200	272	6,377	138	0	115	1,604	4,409	198	189
Rhode Island	7,699	29	72	546	670	1	4,874	1,507	6,297	1,294	108	242	2,729	3,352	298	1,078
South Carolina	8,746	36	34	3,439	284	4	3,972	977	7,165	1,049	532	531	1,527	5,464	128	1,096
South Dakota	5,671	1,692	26	206	96	5	3,064	705	4,594	968	109	442	1,114	3,469	173	473
Tennessee	4,361	7	36	868	227	6	3,177	40	3,975	384	2	119	1,111	2,949	140	42
Texas	32,722	125	356	6,074	13,187	52	9,331	3,683	27,262	2,776	2,684	781	6,873	20,317	662	4,089
Utah	9,634	257	99	219	2,485	77	6,045	452	9,010	591	33	219	2,155	6,583	339	338
Vermont	1,345	11	7	35	16	0	1,141	135	1,285	58	2	66	294	756	92	137
Virgin Islands	420	1	2	290	80	0	16	31	294	124	2	132	77	204	7	0
Virginia	14,857	23	297	4,080	1,216	9	8,625	669	13,480	1,151	226	535	2,851	10,346	487	638
Washington	4,761	180	134	171	666	58	3,552	0	4,063	698	0	170	1,056	3,164	371	0
West Virginia	5,698	11	18	400	25	3	4,485	756	4,937	677	84	472	1,253	3,199	173	601
Wisconsin	4,134	125	198	689	1,081	4	1,936	101	3,483	641	10	436	718	1,885	672	423
Wyoming	2,471	95	16	81	282	10	1,959	33	2,183	288	0	45	524	1,776	114	12
TOTAL	432,137	7,493	5,531	88,381	73,197	1,455	220,900	37,192	380,182	41,061	10,894	19,071	93,568	265,482	15,903	38,113

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/ asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	244	80	56	1,477
Alaska	52	169	198	308
Arizona	214	627	705	376
Arkansas	83	105	1	787
California	799	1,485	659	1,266
Colorado	843	845	428	2,098
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	2	53	47	62
Connecticut	294	115	15	140
Delaware	113	60	70	584
District of Columbia	13	125	131	0
Florida	1,239	1,653	1,376	2,938
Georgia	428	801	475	1,870
Guam	10	5	0	102
Hawaii	24	23	12	111
Idaho	141	191	224	1,027
Illinois	798	1,373	680	2,655
Indiana	595	1,235	714	2,330
Iowa	450	570	599	3,021
Kansas	129	91	7	1,640
Kentucky	779	349	145	3,899
Louisiana	956	207	77	4,798
Maine	361	162	79	2,994
Maryland	462	1,409	862	2,981
Massachusetts	510	1,641	1,043	892
Michigan	1,168	875	342	4,185
Minnesota	200	235	143	1,235
Mississippi	247	49	37	770
Missouri	1,128	353	282	5,311
Montana	210	19	10	2,272
Nebraska	133	560	204	3,384
Nevada	638	2,777	1,300	2,640
New Hampshire	193	74	113	260
New Jersey	982	3,094	1,633	730
New Mexico	51	486	441	953
New York	1,911	2,559	2,035	5,871
North Carolina	334	289	122	809

S•T•O•P Program

North Dakota	130	21	22	559
Ohio	1,582	623	377	5,445
Oklahoma	301	270	225	1,851
Oregon	565	865	410	4,432
Pennsylvania	1,121	497	53	4,961
Puerto Rico	517	61	314	1,703
Rhode Island	0	169	0	0
South Carolina	276	221	121	1,937
South Dakota	159	72	67	1,809
Tennessee	392	156	103	2,607
Texas	1,762	2,933	2,093	6,422
Utah	390	1,553	909	2,526
Vermont	211	15	17	1,170
Virgin Islands	2	72	18	0
Virginia	843	842	702	4,613
Washington	193	216	105	2,315
West Virginia	293	31	15	2,939
Wisconsin	240	807	621	228
Wyoming	104	47	15	915
TOTAL	25,815	34,215	21,452	113,208

Table B5a. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2011

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Alabama	2,284	487	871	171	31	1,807
Alaska	462	48	16	11	4	14
Arizona	3,340	781	210	252	50	248
Arkansas	1,603	568	1,203	85	27	351
California	5,903	1,169	2,185	1,246	654	4,379
Colorado	7,021	114	919	355	79	161
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	96	27	26	7	15	0
Connecticut	134	484	125	627	178	273
Delaware	1,803	130	113	92	22	72
District of Columbia	221	12	40	2	3	32
Florida	12,139	2,062	3,378	595	173	1,425
Georgia	5,103	639	398	474	77	2,204
Guam	312	147	218	48	6	17
Hawaii	54	38	46	51	13	40
Idaho	1,009	156	383	86	49	38
Illinois	14,622	3,295	6,576	1,438	576	1,043
Indiana	6,853	882	1,738	438	47	448
Iowa	3,586	525	464	202	43	331
Kansas	3,455	520	628	186	39	98
Kentucky	6,079	491	803	113	43	197
Louisiana	6,637	1,928	2,227	464	156	744
Maine	3,236	235	369	579	31	420
Maryland	8,055	349	1,047	343	127	446
Massachusetts	5,374	1,235	3,457	358	66	259
Michigan	8,934	867	4,821	871	316	353
Minnesota	1,061	312	192	149	181	11
Mississippi	3,737	575	573	252	27	131
Missouri	6,600	971	1,688	992	408	281
Montana	1,915	320	353	128	44	551
Nebraska	2,917	265	1,718	81	11	194
Nevada	8,466	990	2,249	224	80	513
New Hampshire	1,071	314	387	142	23	112
New Jersey	10,291	1,707	3,001	1,243	513	4,149
New Mexico	1,445	118	142	134	44	217
New York	16,242	3,073	3,592	1,304	551	787

S•T•O•P Program

Table B5a. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2011

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
North Carolina	2,531	627	1,021	310	164	552
North Dakota	1,021	106	175	121	29	77
Ohio	14,622	3,303	4,295	1,246	249	1,391
Oklahoma	2,692	780	921	556	248	239
Oregon	4,960	553	1,039	500	115	526
Pennsylvania	8,253	1,776	953	896	259	778
Puerto Rico	6,119	5	206	77	5	111
Rhode Island	3,950	1,087	2,563	118	30	14
South Carolina	5,347	437	842	595	235	1,329
South Dakota	2,532	339	138	116	58	2,632
Tennessee	3,048	433	512	233	46	133
Texas	19,806	4,909	4,150	645	193	4,163
Utah	6,536	1,110	893	659	99	367
Vermont	1,029	134	153	89	9	14
Virgin Islands	261	200	29	27	3	0
Virginia	11,338	1,877	709	850	162	281
Washington	3,195	784	684	97	17	3
West Virginia	3,598	841	1,106	121	24	269
Wisconsin	1,256	925	570	603	98	697
Wyoming	1,333	299	374	173	11	363
TOTAL	265,487	46,359	67,489	21,775	6,761	36,285

Appendix A 2012

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2012⁷⁵

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Alabama	37	24	4	5	1	3	851,983	244,184	353,542	16,567	0	1,466,276	131,316
Alaska	14	2	5	4	2	1	215,833	323,109	363,770	16,348	26,256	945,316	11,365
American Samoa	8	4	2	1	1	0	217,497	155,356	155,355	31,071	0	559,279	62,142
Arizona	56	22	15	15	4	0	1,177,085	770,337	662,361	205,770	0	2,815,553	258,184
Arkansas	35	8	10	9	1	7	628,886	378,262	357,180	68,063	299,099	1,731,490	134,065
California	63	25	20	15	3	0	3,436,003	4,667,825	2,871,976	1,073,349	0	12,049,153	1,249,131
Colorado	37	11	8	10	2	6	632,104	575,621	453,090	107,960	240,842	2,009,617	243,759
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	11	2	3	1	1	4	165,969	138,277	138,307	27,662	82,984	553,199	61,469
Connecticut	8	4	2	1	1	0	596,811	255,300	396,000	79,062	0	1,327,173	26,671
Delaware	16	6	8	1	1	0	338,669	230,889	214,956	42,321	0	826,835	44,693
District of Columbia	18	8	4	3	3	0	888,675	578,879	507,782	107,759	0	2,083,095	239,465
Florida	10	3	3	2	2	0	3,995,038	1,542,377	1,553,057	321,195	0	7,411,667	199,612
Georgia	75	33	17	18	7	0	1,087,886	1,019,383	853,900	267,182	0	3,228,351	0
Hawaii	14	4	5	4	1	0	445,359	258,264	231,202	46,240	0	981,065	81,249
Idaho	22	9	4	4	1	4	299,232	249,360	249,360	49,872	149,616	997,440	101,954
Illinois	37	2	11	6	4	14	1,314,546	1,651,062	860,555	181,491	483,261	4,490,915	671,303
Indiana	77	42	8	25	2	0	1,306,740	231,756	688,135	121,720	0	2,348,351	538,693
Iowa	85	34	34	12	2	3	488,791	397,308	389,123	76,366	196,958	1,548,546	78,599
Kansas	66	24	17	16	5	4	1,151,637	896,843	817,344	184,857	205,007	3,255,688	107,774
Kentucky	38	12	10	8	4	4	639,213	567,518	563,009	177,652	279,284	2,226,676	77,657
Louisiana	82	34	26	19	2	1	598,145	594,489	577,746	119,957	22,207	1,912,544	0
Maine	33	13	9	7	4	0	420,323	253,277	223,566	126,384	0	1,023,550	0
Maryland	117	46	35	18	1	17	751,686	515,758	420,485	112,127	317,576	2,117,632	70,654
Massachusetts	59	20	22	7	3	7	732,500	620,100	620,000	128,000	364,900	2,465,500	276,718
Michigan	369	90	95	94	90	0	1,420,431	1,064,251	981,268	186,856	0	3,652,806	144,336
Minnesota	34	11	10	10	3	0	1,053,360	277,500	277,500	132,447	0	1,740,807	200,209
Mississippi	39	19	11	7	2	0	637,515	351,955	339,488	50,578	0	1,379,536	117,077
Missouri	102	65	20	11	5	1	1,601,040	760,553	924,207	301,640	86,380	3,673,820	257,924
Montana	27	10	7	6	1	3	340,983	202,718	203,707	40,516	22,812	810,736	94,095
Nebraska	36	10	13	5	2	6	322,041	268,368	268,368	53,674	161,021	1,073,472	73,554

⁷⁵ Data in Table A1 are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2012.

S•T•O•P Program

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2012⁷⁵

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Nevada	50	21	10	12	4	3	454,247	299,806	433,000	80,737	95,000	1,362,790	134,339
New Hampshire	27	10	6	9	2	0	325,500	305,344	272,000	73,440	0	976,284	0
New Jersey	113	26	21	40	1	25	1,038,670	785,018	940,996	159,362	624,307	3,548,353	219,971
New Mexico	37	17	13	5	2	0	430,040	280,897	281,626	74,223	0	1,066,786	136,622
New York	130	59	38	28	1	4	2,461,770	1,650,232	1,640,642	316,918	264,164	6,333,726	704,262
North Carolina	36	10	13	7	3	3	1,265,157	1,136,812	903,493	176,169	339,284	3,820,915	330,567
North Dakota	72	19	15	14	6	18	217,678	183,487	181,398	62,257	124,038	768,858	80,436
Ohio	238	74	45	45	16	58	2,583,975	2,087,359	2,034,908	387,180	1,821,968	8,915,390	0
Oklahoma	39	15	9	7	4	4	454,463	408,901	388,407	86,228	167,507	1,505,506	223,007
Oregon	71	39	12	13	4	3	735,660	455,267	436,623	121,664	3,790	1,753,004	159,039
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273,223
Puerto Rico	89	77	3	4	1	4	459,408	347,330	553,379	9,577	189,679	1,559,373	27,645
Rhode Island	18	3	13	1	1	0	365,411	166,402	213,191	42,638	0	787,642	100,724
South Carolina	44	21	11	8	2	2	762,447	478,089	542,989	95,787	69,047	1,948,359	211,484
South Dakota	35	27	2	6	0	0	251,890	256,746	281,179	0	0	789,815	41,047
Tennessee	39	18	11	8	2	0	765,288	555,522	607,033	45,491	0	1,973,334	207,576
Texas	110	28	30	33	7	12	2,583,944	2,588,889	2,519,314	533,047	747,311	8,972,505	988,467
Utah	45	15	16	8	1	5	456,747	352,844	375,585	68,423	167,686	1,421,285	106,502
Vermont	31	12	10	8	1	0	320,309	215,075	243,796	39,943	0	819,123	27,951
Virgin Islands	5	3	0	0	0	2	225,624	0	0	0	40,000	265,624	0
Virginia	90	36	21	17	5	11	954,206	661,162	688,112	143,663	318,997	2,766,140	322,191
Washington	172	63	56	45	1	7	871,537	799,036	796,474	125,724	191,050	2,783,821	319,581
West Virginia	57	20	20	13	1	3	390,951	264,130	299,394	55,927	82,191	1,092,593	77,413
Wisconsin	73	20	29	18	5	1	918,161	767,453	701,049	143,356	4,324	2,534,343	122,445
Wyoming	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	3,247	1,230	842	693	232	250	47,049,064	35,086,680	32,850,927	7,296,441	8,188,546	130,471,658	10,368,160

Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2012

State	Sexual Assault	Domestic Violence	Stalking	Total
Alabama	30	70	0	100
Alaska	19	77	4	100
American Samoa	50	50	0	100
Arizona	9	87	4	100
Arkansas	20	77	3	100
California	9	89	2	100
Colorado	31	66	3	100
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	15	85	0	100
Connecticut	30	70	0	100
Delaware	70	25	5	100
District of Columbia	53	40	7	100
Florida	38	53	9	100
Georgia	33	61	6	100
Hawaii	25	74	1	100
Idaho	12	83	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	23	74	3	100
Iowa	24	73	3	100
Kansas	9	86	5	100
Kentucky	24	75	1	100
Louisiana	24	72	4	100
Maine	14	83	3	100
Maryland	30	67	3	100
Massachusetts	20	75	5	100
Michigan	30	67	3	100
Minnesota	49	49	2	100
Mississippi	42	56	2	100
Missouri	18	80	2	100
Montana	23	73	4	100
Nebraska	18	76	6	100
Nevada	14	84	2	100
New Hampshire	23	72	5	100
New Jersey	60	40	0	100
New Mexico	24	64	12	100
New York	29	69	2	100
North Carolina	24	71	5	100
North Dakota	12	88	0	100

Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2012

State	Sexual Assault	Domestic Violence	Stalking	Total
Ohio	14	80	6	100
Oklahoma	18	77	5	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100
Pennsylvania	30	66	4	100
Puerto Rico	15	80	5	100
Rhode Island	19	80	1	100
South Carolina	46	51	3	100
South Dakota	18	70	12	100
Tennessee	12	85	3	100
Texas	20	77	3	100
Utah	7	85	8	100
Vermont	20	75	5	100
Virgin Islands	13	83	4	100
Virginia	19	77	4	100
Washington	15	80	5	100
West Virginia	25	68	7	100
Wisconsin	47	50	3	100
Wyoming	33	33	34	100

Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2012

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs.
Alabama	\$851,983.00	\$63,628.00	7.5
Alaska	\$215,833.00	\$21,583.00	10.0
American Samoa	\$217,497.00	\$217,497.00	100.0
Arizona	\$1,177,085.00	\$80,802.00	6.9
Arkansas	\$628,886.00	\$138,377.00	22.0
California	\$3,436,003.00	\$1,180,071.00	34.3
Colorado	\$632,104.00	\$102,089.00	16.2
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	\$165,969.00	\$16,597.00	10.0
Connecticut	\$596,811.00	\$125,241.00	21.0
Delaware	\$338,669.00	\$48,571.00	14.3
District of Columbia	\$888,675.00	\$307,456.00	34.6
Florida	\$3,995,038.00	\$182,260.00	4.6
Georgia	\$1,087,886.00	\$289,224.00	26.6
Hawaii	\$445,359.00	\$90,511.00	20.3
Idaho	\$299,232.00	\$98,329.00	32.9
Illinois	\$1,314,546.00	\$1,314,550.00	100.0
Indiana	\$1,306,740.00	\$239,974.00	18.4
Iowa	\$488,791.00	\$48,438.00	9.9
Kansas	\$1,151,637.00	\$90,250.00	7.8
Kentucky	\$639,213.00	\$192,415.00	30.1
Louisiana	\$598,145.00	\$56,413.00	9.4
Maine	\$420,323.00	\$72,765.00	17.3
Maryland	\$751,686.00	\$283,903.00	37.8
Massachusetts	\$732,500.00	\$119,500.00	16.3
Michigan	\$1,420,431.00	\$119,951.00	8.4
Minnesota	\$1,053,360.00	\$240,468.00	22.8
Mississippi	\$637,515.00	\$121,144.00	19.0
Missouri	\$1,601,040.00	\$223,033.00	13.9
Montana	\$340,983.00	\$34,098.00	10.0
Nebraska	\$322,041.00	\$32,204.00	10.0
Nevada	\$454,247.00	\$80,000.00	17.6
New Hampshire	\$325,500.00	\$40,000.00	12.3
New Jersey	\$1,038,670.00	\$135,000.00	13.0
New Mexico	\$430,040.00	\$68,074.00	15.8
New York	\$2,461,770.00	\$425,557.00	17.3
North Carolina	\$1,265,157.00	\$89,702.00	7.1

Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state, 2012

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs.
North Dakota	\$217,678.00	\$29,311.00	13.5
Ohio	\$2,583,975.00	\$585,923.00	22.7
Oklahoma	\$454,463.00	\$46,044.00	10.1
Oregon	\$735,660.00	\$57,207.00	7.8
Pennsylvania	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0
Puerto Rico	\$459,408.00	\$213,244.00	46.4
Rhode Island	\$365,411.00	\$12,750.00	3.5
South Carolina	\$762,447.00	\$111,874.00	14.7
South Dakota	\$251,890.00	\$30,000.00	11.9
Tennessee	\$765,288.00	\$27,173.00	3.6
Texas	\$2,583,944.00	\$382,190.00	14.8
Utah	\$456,747.00	\$89,988.00	19.7
Vermont	\$320,309.00	\$38,214.00	11.9
Virgin Islands	\$225,624.00	\$225,624.00	100.0
Virginia	\$954,206.00	\$92,068.00	9.6
Washington	\$871,537.00	\$75,436.00	8.7
West Virginia	\$390,951.00	\$45,126.00	11.5
Wisconsin	\$918,161.00	\$303,406.00	33.0
Wyoming	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0
TOTAL	\$47,049,064.00	\$9,355,255.00	20.0

Appendix B 2012

Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2012

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	33	13	7	7	5	9	2	22	9	8	0	0	0
Alaska	4	3	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	25	17	9	11	4	6	6	19	2	4	1	2	0
Arkansas	33	4	2	4	1	12	1	20	11	3	0	0	0
California	53	34	12	15	12	22	2	39	8	10	0	6	1
Colorado	33	16	8	4	1	5	4	20	1	5	0	0	0
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	7	6	4	1	3	3	2	3	0	1	1	2	0
Connecticut	23	1	0	1	0	1	1	22	0	1	0	0	1
Delaware	16	5	2	2	2	5	0	10	3	1	1	2	0
District of Columbia	4	3	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	0	0
Florida	75	21	7	17	3	20	3	59	14	9	1	0	0
Georgia	44	21	11	10	5	13	5	24	7	8	1	1	0
Guam	12	4	0	8	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	19	11	5	1	1	9	1	7	3	3	0	0	0
Idaho	17	9	4	4	3	3	2	15	2	2	0	0	0
Illinois	41	18	2	3	3	4	1	46	5	5	0	4	0
Indiana	76	30	13	11	6	21	6	52	8	19	0	0	0
Iowa	63	28	14	8	4	21	5	33	18	10	0	0	0
Kansas	30	12	5	7	2	10	1	19	2	7	1	0	1
Kentucky	34	16	6	10	4	12	3	22	6	4	0	0	0
Louisiana	74	23	8	6	9	25	4	46	22	11	1	0	0
Maine	25	8	10	9	4	5	4	15	7	2	0	0	1
Maryland	69	21	16	13	5	13	7	47	4	4	0	0	1
Massachusetts	57	22	4	19	3	8	3	49	4	3	0	0	0
Michigan	50	29	12	3	6	6	5	47	2	5	0	0	0
Minnesota	34	19	20	13	10	4	12	10	2	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	39	4	1	1	2	1	1	23	11	4	0	0	0
Missouri	58	13	9	4	3	11	4	45	6	6	1	0	2
Montana	23	15	3	5	0	5	4	15	4	1	0	0	0

Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2012

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Nebraska	15	10	7	4	3	7	3	11	3	5	0	1	4
Nevada	37	14	8	2	3	7	6	33	1	1	1	1	0
New Hampshire	24	14	8	6	4	10	2	12	4	7	1	0	0
New Jersey	112	50	12	17	7	4	4	107	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	30	15	6	2	4	6	3	19	2	4	0	0	0
New York	110	72	30	34	14	28	8	90	11	20	0	3	2
North Carolina	59	34	15	16	11	14	7	32	9	5	2	0	2
North Dakota	37	14	4	5	5	1	1	30	2	0	0	0	2
Ohio	73	22	12	9	4	23	6	54	13	9	0	0	0
Oklahoma	33	15	2	2	2	13	1	15	8	6	0	3	0
Oregon	56	13	6	3	2	4	7	50	0	3	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	31	27	22	14	3	25	7	29	17	20	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	11	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	1	2	0	0	0
Rhode Island	10	8	2	0	1	1	1	9	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	36	20	10	9	9	10	3	22	4	6	2	0	1
South Dakota	36	9	5	4	1	6	4	32	0	6	0	0	0
Tennessee	48	20	7	12	2	13	3	30	7	7	0	0	0
Texas	124	44	18	10	9	45	4	67	18	21	2	3	0
Utah	40	24	9	8	6	5	4	31	6	1	0	0	0
Vermont	12	8	3	2	2	5	1	9	5	5	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1
Virginia	88	57	10	55	11	22	4	61	13	10	0	0	0
Washington	81	50	4	2	15	4	5	62	9	6	0	0	0
West Virginia	22	5	2	3	2	1	0	14	14	11	0	0	1
Wisconsin	40	22	10	4	5	8	6	14	3	5	0	0	0
Wyoming	38	6	4	2	3	3	3	38	0	1	0	0	0
Total	2,277	1,001	414	424	231	525	185	1,620	312	300	17	28	20

Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2012

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	33	22	6,923	6,719	204	0	6,923	6,193	713	17
Alaska	4	1	512	254	28	230	282	265	15	2
Arizona	25	19	6,591	6,534	34	23	6,568	5,987	439	142
Arkansas	33	20	4,765	4,528	215	22	4,743	4,392	316	35
California	54	39	7,354	6,440	504	410	6,944	4,090	2,752	102
Colorado	33	20	7,073	6,964	101	8	7,065	6,371	610	84
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	8	3	130	123	7	0	130	103	27	0
Connecticut	24	22	3,189	3,189	0	0	3,189	2,264	925	0
Delaware	18	10	2,262	2,251	11	0	2,262	2,052	200	10
District of Columbia	5	3	885	460	2	423	462	250	185	27
Florida	75	59	19,728	19,361	322	45	19,683	17,618	1,642	423
Georgia	44	24	4,433	4,348	60	25	4,408	2,692	1,604	112
Guam	14	6	1,001	865	134	2	999	859	120	20
Hawaii	24	7	514	510	0	4	510	460	50	0
Idaho	18	15	2,648	2,626	5	17	2,631	2,208	292	131
Illinois	49	46	25,702	25,512	135	55	25,647	23,846	1,798	3
Indiana	76	52	11,352	10,809	335	208	11,144	9,631	979	534
Iowa	66	33	5,149	4,779	76	294	4,855	4,030	771	54
Kansas	32	19	5,475	5,452	11	12	5,463	5,068	201	194
Kentucky	37	22	6,349	6,114	91	144	6,205	5,791	379	35
Louisiana	83	46	14,833	14,513	28	292	14,541	12,326	2,072	143
Maine	30	15	3,507	3,220	272	15	3,492	2,939	504	49
Maryland	71	47	11,561	10,967	327	267	11,294	10,152	990	152
Massachusetts	57	49	11,439	10,900	386	153	11,286	10,524	694	68
Michigan	50	47	14,786	14,467	133	186	14,600	12,553	1,584	463
Minnesota	34	10	1,973	1,952	12	9	1,964	1,259	691	14
Mississippi	39	23	5,449	5,361	73	15	5,434	4,563	830	41
Missouri	58	45	12,089	10,583	676	830	11,259	8,968	1,389	902
Montana	24	15	3,383	3,335	43	5	3,378	2,432	792	154
Nebraska	15	11	6,710	6,546	155	9	6,701	6,011	337	353
Nevada	41	33	13,827	13,384	165	278	13,549	12,960	333	256

Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2012

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Hampshire	25	12	2,129	1,926	67	136	1,993	1,505	318	170
New Jersey	113	107	24,811	24,591	105	115	24,696	20,556	4,077	63
New Mexico	34	19	2,412	2,305	41	66	2,346	1,878	396	72
New York	110	90	25,411	22,884	1,919	608	24,803	21,319	3,384	100
North Carolina	71	32	6,989	6,596	321	72	6,917	5,969	576	372
North Dakota	43	30	1,120	1,116	2	2	1,118	969	121	28
Ohio	74	54	16,217	15,563	408	246	15,971	13,654	1,813	504
Oklahoma	34	15	3,169	3,101	68	0	3,169	2,876	210	83
Oregon	56	50	7,998	7,705	150	143	7,855	6,150	1,442	263
Pennsylvania	31	29	13,455	13,045	245	165	13,290	9,984	3,129	177
Puerto Rico	13	8	5,050	5,050	0	0	5,050	4,917	34	99
Rhode Island	10	9	5,923	4,688	1,076	159	5,764	5,494	268	2
South Carolina	37	22	7,094	6,692	346	56	7,038	5,453	1,405	180
South Dakota	36	32	6,264	6,235	26	3	6,261	4,740	636	885
Tennessee	48	30	5,308	5,137	35	136	5,172	4,616	402	154
Texas	128	67	32,956	31,971	898	87	32,869	30,244	2,257	368
Utah	41	31	12,274	11,644	470	160	12,114	10,380	919	815
Vermont	13	9	1,445	1,423	1	21	1,424	1,074	283	67
Virgin Islands	4	2	78	78	0	0	78	73	4	1
Virginia	88	61	14,372	13,829	340	203	14,169	12,590	1,464	115
Washington	120	62	6,214	6,135	78	1	6,213	5,748	410	55
West Virginia	23	14	6,986	6,858	86	42	6,944	6,229	562	153
Wisconsin	44	14	4,834	4,372	320	142	4,692	1,913	2,701	78
Wyoming	38	38	2,793	2,768	25	0	2,793	2,253	235	305
TOTAL	2,408	1,620	436,894	418,778	11,572	6,544	430,350	369,441	51,280	9,629

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Alabama	6,923	4	16	2,898	206	3	3,989	268	6,218	670	35	217	1,423	4,244	243	796
Alaska	282	53	8	10	19	15	132	59	275	4	3	2	34	223	4	19
Arizona	6,568	240	52	270	2,275	16	2,812	928	5,065	1,252	251	224	772	3,658	1,264	650
Arkansas	4,743	22	46	1,159	356	3	3,019	138	4,035	707	1	546	1,026	2,768	342	61
California	6,944	313	209	670	1,810	23	2,350	1,571	5,459	643	842	550	1,467	3,385	148	1,394
Colorado	7,065	61	40	449	1,631	14	3,231	1,656	6,373	676	16	147	1,268	4,093	320	1,237
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	130	0	42	1	17	68	1	1	116	14	0	0	26	98	2	4
Connecticut	3,189	12	24	923	771	6	1,333	120	2,676	504	9	237	607	2,095	75	175
Delaware	2,262	14	12	635	280	3	1,280	43	2,035	227	0	74	362	1,748	67	11
District of Columbia	462	2	4	219	167	0	45	26	420	33	9	2	86	343	22	9
Florida	19,683	66	150	5,680	2,836	34	9,865	1,052	16,618	2,956	109	581	4,563	12,823	813	903
Georgia	4,408	3	109	1,152	392	5	2,182	624	3,723	240	445	316	787	2,367	203	735
Guam	999	0	180	11	2	714	50	42	860	137	2	112	239	554	9	85
Hawaii	510	3	109	12	35	126	83	143	507	3	0	16	56	272	10	156
Idaho	2,631	38	10	16	637	4	1,860	73	2,452	178	1	88	509	1,892	102	40
Illinois	25,647	97	311	9,696	4,441	31	9,466	1,966	23,618	1,917	112	738	5,456	16,665	785	2,003
Indiana	11,144	23	102	2,512	1,197	11	6,816	492	10,063	1,008	73	564	2,579	7,076	306	619
Iowa	4,855	97	105	532	547	7	3,248	324	4,540	315	0	273	1,254	2,867	255	206
Kansas	5,463	24	66	861	583	7	3,439	495	4,567	896	0	60	1,423	3,727	145	108
Kentucky	6,205	11	43	650	490	3	4,111	897	5,777	418	10	87	1,294	4,272	204	348
Louisiana	14,541	144	70	6,389	478	5	7,202	329	13,302	1,171	68	924	3,247	9,554	512	304
Maine	3,492	17	19	99	61	2	3,128	166	3,102	390	0	88	678	2,188	139	399
Maryland	11,294	4	159	4,209	1,621	11	4,630	664	9,881	999	414	274	2,389	7,997	323	311
Massachusetts	11,286	23	296	1,611	2,423	5	6,136	930	10,119	1,080	87	463	2,593	7,663	433	134
Michigan	14,600	193	54	4,121	1,993	12	7,613	639	13,594	920	86	459	2,712	10,537	523	369
Minnesota	1,964	715	16	243	219	0	575	196	1,840	113	11	115	649	933	81	186
Mississippi	5,434	109	40	2,619	130	1	2,417	119	4,984	450	0	146	1,263	3,506	150	369
Missouri	11,259	55	53	2,207	483	11	8,249	240	10,533	645	81	310	2,519	7,756	312	362

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Montana	3,378	419	14	21	96	24	2,463	389	3,023	335	20	483	768	1,661	98	368
Nebraska	6,701	147	57	359	1,270	4	4,456	478	5,958	735	8	477	1,481	3,975	106	662
Nevada	13,549	430	314	1,378	4,216	31	6,860	341	11,317	1,794	438	308	3,138	7,709	1,839	555
New Hampshire	1,993	3	14	42	160	2	1,455	317	1,661	292	40	89	356	1,185	44	319
New Jersey	24,696	27	698	4,320	4,033	14	9,873	5,732	18,060	2,433	4,203	598	4,209	12,913	668	6,308
New Mexico	2,346	129	13	37	1,356	2	590	219	2,142	184	20	65	477	1,554	46	204
New York	24,803	251	708	4,966	3,753	32	14,099	1,143	22,135	2,325	343	1,469	5,918	15,602	952	862
North Carolina	6,917	7	85	1,996	1,310	3	2,818	702	5,781	1,091	45	425	1,439	4,577	221	255
North Dakota	1,118	170	12	69	51	7	788	26	1,003	115	0	43	303	705	55	12
Ohio	15,971	38	73	3,691	554	21	9,376	2,292	14,614	1,136	221	545	3,874	8,320	698	2,534
Oklahoma	3,169	387	11	255	603	5	1,893	21	3,005	160	4	63	630	2,333	106	37
Oregon	7,855	348	109	166	1,212	100	5,215	754	7,159	690	6	295	1,680	5,229	367	284
Pennsylvania	13,290	34	116	1,348	1,051	10	9,296	1,448	12,116	1,054	120	892	3,201	8,088	528	581
Puerto Rico	5,050	0	1	0	4,634	0	125	290	4,934	116	0	68	1,337	3,267	158	220
Rhode Island	5,764	62	76	556	755	1	3,845	473	5,050	714	0	379	2,537	2,497	344	7
South Carolina	7,038	72	36	2,498	272	1	3,499	863	6,022	840	176	422	1,218	4,486	138	774
South Dakota	6,261	2,065	39	241	117	5	3,270	565	5,181	819	261	312	1,362	4,189	141	257
Tennessee	5,172	5	47	1,028	337	3	3,714	40	4,573	599	0	209	1,635	3,078	203	47
Texas	32,869	95	294	6,477	13,567	36	10,134	2,286	28,193	3,644	1,032	1,008	6,822	21,364	833	2,842
Utah	12,114	320	158	247	3,189	76	7,116	1,010	11,274	765	75	319	2,752	7,395	511	1,137
Vermont	1,424	12	21	46	24	2	1,083	246	1,320	97	7	57	261	976	28	102
Virgin Islands	78	16	0	34	26	0	7	0	74	4	0	0	4	61	13	0
Virginia	14,169	37	264	4,236	1,055	12	7,571	1,111	12,108	1,594	467	579	2,643	9,525	603	819
Washington	6,213	147	139	412	1,014	46	4,455	0	5,434	779	0	185	1,303	4,489	236	0
West Virginia	6,944	9	20	547	26	0	5,854	488	6,244	681	19	389	1,310	4,216	661	368
Wisconsin	4,692	106	304	502	1,442	3	1,851	510	3,998	539	155	374	1,162	2,700	160	296
Wyoming	2,793	100	14	76	304	8	2,206	104	2,458	335	0	97	577	1,891	204	24
TOTAL	430,350	7,779	5,982	85,402	72,527	1,588	223,174	36,049	377,589	42,436	10,325	17,763	93,678	269,289	17,753	31,867

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	288	151	95	1,742
Alaska	27	21	18	191
Arizona	398	734	773	715
Arkansas	116	249	161	840
California	375	698	410	544
Colorado	815	560	213	1,791
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	1	42	47	64
Connecticut	338	245	123	114
Delaware	66	173	155	606
District of Columbia	10	174	192	0
Florida	1,363	2,084	1,141	1,938
Georgia	387	509	389	1,435
Guam	4	1	0	35
Hawaii	18	37	33	91
Idaho	299	433	526	1,895
Illinois	1,031	2,738	623	2,864
Indiana	828	868	694	2,691
Iowa	391	477	418	2,100
Kansas	101	85	20	1,936
Kentucky	745	404	143	3,208
Louisiana	978	303	242	7,721
Maine	398	150	99	1,658
Maryland	565	1,433	1,059	2,961
Massachusetts	730	1,519	815	831
Michigan	1,086	705	324	3,376
Minnesota	387	119	101	1,042
Mississippi	283	70	40	1,059
Missouri	1,059	380	372	5,732
Montana	176	30	7	2,439
Nebraska	179	1,093	329	4,286
Nevada	531	3,196	1,577	3,002
New Hampshire	175	46	73	202
New Jersey	845	2,559	1,395	426
New Mexico	97	567	503	1,170
New York	2,018	2,519	2,226	6,096

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
North Carolina	356	924	977	1,334
North Dakota	103	20	34	404
Ohio	782	299	121	4,740
Oklahoma	243	349	315	1,786
Oregon	830	739	330	4,140
Pennsylvania	1,415	729	134	4,317
Puerto Rico	453	906	193	588
Rhode Island	13	166	3	0
South Carolina	192	198	168	1,046
South Dakota	133	55	62	2,799
Tennessee	386	221	228	2,126
Texas	1,714	4,003	2,165	6,771
Utah	609	1,979	1,135	3,326
Vermont	214	32	37	976
Virgin Islands	1	2	0	0
Virginia	860	737	615	3,957
Washington	225	340	115	2,527
West Virginia	406	58	6	3,236
Wisconsin	266	1,016	544	946
Wyoming	137	58	16	917
TOTAL	26,446	38,203	22,534	112,737

Table B5b. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2012

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Alabama	3,327	534	1,277	293	69	1,491
Alaska	275	6	14	3	0	3
Arizona	3,693	1,037	420	403	89	1,012
Arkansas	2,312	744	968	128	26	584
California	2,430	543	794	924	436	1,957
Colorado	4,863	147	1,254	205	62	540
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	80	18	10	21	1	2
Connecticut	1,705	682	234	302	99	167
Delaware	1,852	120	232	91	33	22
District of Columbia	258	23	39	56	32	54
Florida	11,792	2,228	2,924	662	311	1,922
Georgia	1,566	470	581	565	166	1,132
Guam	458	203	219	70	14	35
Hawaii	463	9	1	18	11	13
Idaho	1,802	236	456	147	65	69
Illinois	15,064	3,294	5,875	1,175	487	2,098
Indiana	6,842	1,127	2,280	689	68	500
Iowa	2,943	217	527	264	76	903
Kansas	3,721	519	809	171	32	211
Kentucky	4,984	576	398	100	50	119
Louisiana	7,877	1,624	2,443	731	257	2,042
Maine	2,446	244	539	97	10	282
Maryland	7,598	250	1,291	326	138	1,847
Massachusetts	5,222	1,715	3,178	728	121	511
Michigan	7,934	3,589	1,795	608	288	669
Minnesota	987	314	332	225	146	54
Mississippi	3,454	676	773	434	58	66
Missouri	7,560	1,052	1,362	1,132	323	400
Montana	2,186	446	437	203	68	138
Nebraska	4,219	482	1,854	155	22	268
Nevada	8,837	1,456	2,314	407	55	581
New Hampshire	1,136	273	325	124	27	195
New Jersey	10,378	2,357	3,857	1,476	237	6,842
New Mexico	1,714	112	133	136	53	200

Table B5b. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2012

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
New York	14,504	3,140	4,237	1,555	561	955
North Carolina	3,872	783	1,318	394	287	328
North Dakota	735	72	205	81	12	17
Ohio	8,173	2,078	3,776	868	321	928
Oklahoma	2,728	656	894	401	193	140
Oregon	4,923	754	1,350	339	120	387
Pennsylvania	7,610	1,771	1,515	1,069	185	1,216
Puerto Rico	5,277	12	441	80	7	148
Rhode Island	2,851	536	2,269	130	30	20
South Carolina	4,126	367	1,156	461	133	902
South Dakota	3,180	479	413	204	51	2,008
Tennessee	2,967	616	1,442	141	46	170
Texas	18,738	5,161	5,673	1,210	155	3,528
Utah	7,447	1,520	964	643	100	1,520
Vermont	1,092	111	179	145	16	26
Virgin Islands	78	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	9,687	2,370	838	891	166	509
Washington	3,625	970	1,310	213	59	96
West Virginia	4,825	1,069	711	342	19	143
Wisconsin	1,627	784	274	467	140	1,400
Wyoming	1,450	267	612	177	20	288
TOTAL	251,493	50,839	69,522	22,880	6,551	41,658



United States Department of Justice

Office on Violence Against Women

Working Together to End the Violence

Recovery Act S•T•O•P Program

Services • Training • Officers
• Prosecutors

Part B

Contents

Contents	i
List of Tables	iii
Background	1
Statutory Purpose Areas of the Recovery Act STOP Program	2
Allocation and Distribution of Recovery Act STOP Program Funds	5
Eligibility Requirements	6
Reporting Requirements and Methods.....	7
Recovery Act STOP Program 2009 to 2012: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds	8
Sources of Data	8
How Recovery Act STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators.....	8
How Recovery Act STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees	10
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed	11
Types of Agencies Receiving Recovery Act STOP Program Funds	11
Recovery Act STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments.....	12
Training.....	14
Victim Services	16
Demographics of Victims Served.....	17
Types of Services Provided to Victims.....	19
Protection Orders.....	21
Criminal Justice.....	22
Law Enforcement.....	23
Prosecution	25
Courts.....	26
Probation	28
Batterer Intervention Program.....	31
Conclusion.....	32
Appendix A 2009–2012.....	33
Appendix B 2009	41
Appendix B 2010	51
Appendix B 2011	61
Appendix B 2012	73

List of Tables

Table 1. Number and distribution of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrant awards, 2009–2012	9
Table 2. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Recovery Act Program, 2009–2012	12
Table 3. People trained with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012	14
Table 4. Provision of victim services by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012, by level of service and type of victimization (annual averages).....	16
Table 5. Victims receiving services from Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012, by type of victimization (annual averages).....	17
Table 6. Demographic characteristics of victims served by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012 (annual averages).....	17
Table 7. Relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012 (annual averages).....	18
Table 8. Victim services provided by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012	19
Table 9. Protection orders granted with assistance of Recovery Act STOP Program-funded staff, 2009–2012	21
Table 10. Law enforcement activities provided with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012	23
Table 11. Disposition of cases by prosecutors funded by Recovery Act STOP Program, 2009–2012.	25
Table 12. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Recovery Act Program-funded courts, 2009–2012	27
Table 13. Offender monitoring by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff 2009–2012, by type and number of contacts	29
Table 14. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff, 2009–2012	30
Table A1: Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009–2012	35
Table A2. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state: 2009–2012.....	38
Table B1a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009.....	43
Table B2a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009....	45

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009..... 47

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009..... 49

Table B5a. Victims’ relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2009 50

Table B1b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010..... 53

Table B2b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010.... 55

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010..... 57

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010..... 59

Table B5b. Victims’ relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2010 60

Table B1c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011..... 63

Table B2c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011.... 66

Table B3c. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011..... 67

Table B4c. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011..... 69

Table B5c. Victims’ relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2011 71

Table B1d. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2012..... 75

Table B2d. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2012.... 76

Table B3d. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012..... 77

Table B4d. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012..... 78

Table B5d. Victims’ relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2012 79

Background

The Office on Violence Against Women received \$225 million of the Federal aid issued through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act). OVW distributed Recovery Act funds by awarding formula and discretionary grants to local governments, including Indian tribal governments, as well as private and nonprofit organizations throughout the country to reduce violence against women and administer justice for, and strengthen services to, all victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Under the Recovery Act, OVW received \$140 million for the Recovery Act *STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors)* Program. This report has been prepared to reflect the aggregate accomplishments of funds awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women under the Recovery Act STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (Recovery Act STOP Program). This report is based on data submitted by STOP administrators and STOP subgrantees reflecting Recovery Act STOP Program awards made and activities engaged in during calendar years (CYs) 2009 to 2012.⁷⁶

The section entitled “Background” (page 1) sets out the statutory origins and outlines the Recovery Act STOP Program—the Program’s goals, the allocation and distribution of Program funds, and states’ eligibility, reporting requirements, and reporting methods.⁷⁷ “Recovery Act STOP Program 2009 to 2012: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 8) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during those years—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities in which they engaged. “Recovery Act STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 12) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail. Finally, Appendix A and Appendix B present data on the number and amounts of awards in the mandated allocation categories (i.e., victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and courts), amounts of

⁷⁶ Only one state and six subgrantees submitted Recovery Act STOP Program data for calendar year 2013; those data are not included in this report.

⁷⁷ Throughout this report, the word “state” is intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP awards—i.e., the 50 states, the 5 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia.

culturally specific awards, types of activities engaged in, and the number and characteristics of victims⁷⁸ served on a state-by-state basis.

In-depth discussion of the prevalence of violence against women and what research and practice have shown to be effective strategies for responding to the violence can be found in the *2014 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act (2014 Biennial Report)*.⁷⁹

Statutory Purpose Areas of the Recovery Act STOP Program

The Recovery Act STOP Program was created with funding made available to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the “Recovery Act”) (Public Law 111-5). More specifically, under the Recovery Act STOP Program, funds were provided to states and territories to make awards that would enhance offender accountability in cases involving violence against women and to increase the availability of victim services in those cases.

In keeping with the purposes of the Recovery Act, OVW encouraged states to use this funding to hire and retain criminal justice and victim services personnel who respond to violent crimes against women and to support other strategies to create and preserve jobs and promote economic growth while also improving responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. States were also encouraged to support projects that would develop or improve protection order registries compatible with the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Protection Order File.

Recovery Act STOP Program funds could be used for any of the following purposes, as set out in the OVW STOP Program statute:

- ▶ 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

⁷⁸ The term “victim” is used in this report instead of “survivor” to emphasize that violence and abuse are criminal in nature and to account for victims who survive violence and those who do not.

⁷⁹ The 2014 Biennial Report, as well as previous biennial reports (including STOP and SASP reports to Congress) can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/ovwrptcongress.htm>.

- ▶ 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 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

Allocation and Distribution of Recovery Act STOP Program Funds

The United States Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administered the Recovery Act STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including the U.S. territories⁸⁰ and the District of Columbia, were eligible to apply for Recovery Act STOP Program grants to address the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Funds were distributed to the states according to the following formula: A base award of \$600,000 was made to each state and territory. Funds remaining after the allocated base amount were distributed among states and territories according to population (not including populations of Indian tribes) (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(b)(5) and (6)).

Recovery Act STOP Program funds granted to the states and territories were 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 determined the process by which it awarded subgrants.⁸¹ Except where the state received a waiver due to economic hardship, Recovery Act STOP Program awards could support up to 75 percent of the costs of all projects receiving subgrants, including the cost of administering those subgrants; nonfederal match sources were required to cover the remaining 25 percent of costs.⁸²

⁸⁰ The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands declined to apply for the Recovery Act STOP Program award for which they were eligible.

⁸¹ The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the “STOP administrator(s).”

⁸² VAWA 2005, as amended, contains a 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 both by Recovery Act STOP Program funding and by required nonfederal match sources.

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

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive Recovery Act STOP Program funds, states were required to meet all application requirements and certify that they were in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA. First, the states' laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence to incur costs related to prosecution, or victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to obtaining protection orders; and second, states must certify that a government entity incurs the 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 Recovery Act STOP Program funding was required to include documentation from prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs that demonstrated the need for grant funds, how they intended 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 (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-(d)(4)).

Within 120 days of receiving a Recovery Act STOP Program grant, states were required to submit implementation plans specifying how the planned activities would create or retain jobs and stimulate economic growth. States were required to meaningfully consult and collaborate with nonprofit, nongovernmental domestic violence and sexual assault services programs and coalitions, when developing their implementation plans. States were

strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes and to consider the needs of Indian tribes in developing strategies.

The implementation plans described how states would achieve and ensure the following:

- ▶ Equitable distribution of funds on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of various geographic sizes; and
- ▶ Recognition and meaningful response to the needs of underserved populations and ensuring that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally specific services and activities for underserved populations would be distributed equitably among those populations.

In addition to describing the involvement of victim services providers and advocates, tribes, and diverse populations in the planning process, state implementation plans also described how funds would be distributed to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim services categories and to administrative costs according to the required percentages and how the success of grant-funded activities would be evaluated.

Reporting Requirements and Methods

Recovery Act STOP administrators submitted annual reports online through the Office of Justice Program's Grants Management System; Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees reported their annual progress to their state Recovery Act STOP administrators electronically. States were required to submit both the state STOP Administrator report and the state STOP subgrantee reports reflecting Recovery Act STOP Program funding and activities annually until the funds were fully expended. Data from these reports is the basis for what is reported in the sections that follow.

In addition, state recipients of Recovery Act STOP Program funding were required to report quarterly on federalreporting.gov on the following: amount of funds received, amount of funds expended or obligated, and a detailed list of projects (including the project name, description, completion status, and number of jobs created and retained by the project; the purpose, cost and rationale, contact information and concerns, if any, regarding infrastructure investments); and detailed information on subcontracts or subgrants as prescribed by the Office of Management and Budget. Information submitted on federalreporting.gov is not reported here.

Recovery Act STOP Program 2009 to 2012: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on aggregate data submitted by subgrantees⁸³ from all 50 states, 4 of the 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by **55** STOP administrators⁸⁴ about the distribution and use of program funds during each of the 4 calendar years from 2009 to 2012.⁸⁵ Under a cooperative agreement with OVW, the Muskie School has analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from two sources: Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.⁸⁶

How Recovery Act STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program, which also applies to the Recovery Act 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)).⁸⁷ States are also allowed to retain up to 10% for the costs of administering the program. Table 1 shows the aggregate distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories as reported from 2009 to 2012.

⁸³ Following are the numbers of subgrantees that submitted data: **1,120** subgrantees in 2009, **1,580** in 2010, **1,094** in 2011, and **120** subgrantees in 2012.

⁸⁴ The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands declined Recovery Act STOP Program funds.

⁸⁵ Only one state and its six subgrantees reported on activities under the Recovery Act STOP Program for calendar year 2013; those data are not included in this report.

⁸⁶ The two forms can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulaform.htm>.

⁸⁷ STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim assistants/victim-witness specialists in those agencies.

Table 1. Number and distribution of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrant awards, 2009–2012 ⁸⁸

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	209	7,356,453	5.1
Law enforcement	657	35,183,591	24.4
Prosecution	584	34,469,235	23.9
Victim services	1,265	49,255,478	34.2
Discretionary	136	7,710,094	5.4
Administration	NA	10,129,226	7.0
Total	2,851	144,104,077	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is presented in Appendix A.

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

recognize and meaningfully respond 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)(B)).

Between 2009 and 2012, states and territories reported Recovery Act STOP Program awards totaling \$9,981,452 to culturally specific, community-based victim services organizations, accounting for **20.3%** percent of funds awarded for victim services.

⁸⁸ Because STOP administrators made subawards on a fiscal year basis and reported this information on a calendar year basis, and because funds that were returned could be re-awarded, the percentages shown in Table 1 may not accurately reflect the percentages originally allocated to the requisite categories from the Recovery Act STOP Program award.

How Recovery Act STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantee agencies and organizations used funds to support a total of 3,267 FTEs.⁸⁹ Of those, 54% represented staff providing direct services to victims.

From 2009 to 2012, Recovery Act 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. An average of approximately **91,100** victims received services supported by Recovery Act STOP Program funds each year. Although the majority were white (54 percent), female (91 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (66 percent), subgrantees reported that 22 percent of the victims they served were black or African-American, and 20 percent were Hispanic or Latino.⁹⁰ Twenty-two percent of the victims served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims used victim advocacy (**190,875**), crisis intervention (**154,868**), and criminal justice advocacy (**109,386**) in greater numbers than any other services.⁹¹ In addition, a total⁹² of more than **243,400** hotline calls were received from primary victims from 2009 through 2012.

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. Thirty-two percent of all people trained with Recovery Act STOP Program funds (a total of more than **57,900** individuals) during this 4-year period were law enforcement officers; this reflects the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Victim advocates comprised the next largest category, with a total of more than **17,200** trained. A total of **180,000** professionals and volunteers acting in the role of a professional were trained with Recovery Act STOP Program funds during the 4-year period.

⁸⁹ One FTE represents one full-time equivalent staff funded for 1 year.

⁹⁰ For more information on the races/ethnicities and other demographic characteristics of victims served, see Table 6. To see this information displayed by state, see Tables B3a, B3b, B3c, and B3d in Appendix B. These percentages are based on the number of victims for whom race/ethnicity was known and victims may identify with more than one race/ethnicity.

⁹¹ Because victims were reported only once for each type of service received during each calendar year and may have received multiple services during each year, these numbers represent the minimum number of services provided to victims during the 4-year report period.

⁹² Throughout this report, unless otherwise indicated, "total" represents combined totals from 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used Recovery Act STOP Program funds to respond to more than **42,900** calls for assistance, to investigate more than **44,700** incidents of violence, and to serve nearly **9,000** protection orders during the 4-year period. Recovery Act STOP Program-funded officers arrested more than **17,800** offenders.⁹³

Prosecutors. Recovery Act STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of a total of more than **70,600** cases during calendar years 2009 through 2012, with an overall conviction rate of 71 percent.⁹⁴ Approximately **40,000** of the cases disposed of were domestic violence misdemeanor cases, of which 69 percent resulted in convictions.

Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

Subgrantees reported using Recovery Act STOP Program funds for **14** statutory purposes. The purpose areas most frequently reported during calendar years 2009 to 2012 are listed below. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services programs.

- ▶ Victim services programs
- ▶ Training law enforcement officers, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors
- ▶ Police, court and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services
- ▶ Specialized units (law enforcement, judges, court personnel, prosecutors)

Types of Agencies Receiving Recovery Act STOP Program Funds

Dual programs (programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault) were the most frequent recipients of Recovery Act STOP Program funding, followed by domestic violence programs, prosecution agencies, law enforcement agencies, and sexual assault programs.

⁹³ Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees reported only on funded activities. For example, law enforcement agencies using these funds for investigators reported only incidents/cases investigated, and did not report calls for assistance or arrests.

⁹⁴ This percentage includes cases of deferred adjudication, which represented 22.4 percent of all conviction outcomes.

Recovery Act STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the Recovery Act STOP Program and as reported by all states, four of the five U.S. territories,⁹⁵ and the District of Columbia, from 2009 through 2012.

Recovery Act STOP Program-funded staff members provided training and victim services and engaged in law enforcement, prosecution, court, and probation activities to increase victim safety and offender accountability.

- ▶ Average number of staff FTEs funded: **817**⁹⁶
- ▶ Total number of staff FTEs funded: **3,267**⁹⁷

Table 2. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Recovery Act Program, 2009–2012

Staff	Total full-time equivalent staff funded	
	Number	Percent
All staff	3,267	100
Victim advocate	1,003	30.7
Program coordinator	373	11.4
Prosecutor	273	8.3
Victim assistant	254	7.8
Law enforcement officer	227	6.9
Counselor	211	6.5
Legal advocate	159	4.9
Support staff	132	4.1
Attorney	125	3.8
Administrator	87	2.7
Trainer	81	2.5

⁹⁵ The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not report on Recovery Act STOP Program activities.

⁹⁶ Averages, unless otherwise indicated, are for one reporting period, which is one calendar year.

⁹⁷ "Total" numbers are combined totals for 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. One FTE represents one full-time equivalent staff funded for 1 year.

Table 2. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Recovery Act Program, 2009–2012

Staff	Total full-time equivalent staff funded	
	Number	Percent
Investigator	62	1.9
Sexual assault nurse examiner	56	1.7
Paralegal	47	1.4
Probation officer	41	1.2
Information technology staff	30	0.9
Court personnel	26	0.8
Translator/interpreter	12	0.4
Other	68	2.1

Without ARRA funds, many victim services positions would have been lost. ARRA funds gave programs the "breathing space" to adjust to fund losses and redesign service provision to continue to meet the needs of survivors. . . . ARRA funds have allowed us to sustain the Wisconsin Department of Justice (WI DOJ) Violence Against Women Resource Prosecutor position at WI DOJ. This resource continues to be essential to the ability of district attorneys (DAs) and assistant DAs to respond to these crimes.

—*STOP administrator, Wisconsin*

North Country HealthCare houses the Northern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault, which serves a large rural section of northern Arizona, including five tribal communities. They received [ARRA] funding for a full-time Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) who provides forensic exams as well as coordinates services in 3 additional clinics outside of Flagstaff. . . . Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office created a Domestic Violence Unit with a full-time prosecutor and victim advocate. Against Abuse, Inc. created two new full-time advocate positions each with an emphasis on doing outreach and direct services with under served communities (one focuses on tribal and the other on limited English proficiency). Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse has hired a full-time position in their shelter to specifically address mental health and substance abuse for victims seeking safety.

—*STOP administrator, Arizona*

Recovery Act funds were critical to many agencies in savings jobs and stabilizing services in a time of economic instability. . . . New initiatives were supported such as a SART Coordinator on the Northern Neck, a bilingual/bicultural court advocate in the Shenandoah Valley, and a Domestic Violence Probation Officer in Henrico County.

—*STOP administrator, Virginia*

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 and 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.

- ▶ Total number⁹⁸ of people trained: **180,000**
- ▶ Total number of training events: **10,107**

Table 3. People trained with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012

People trained	2009–2012	
	Number	Percent
All people trained	180,000	100.0
Law enforcement officers	57,912	32.2
Multidisciplinary	21,386	11.9
Victim advocates	17,221	9.6
Health professionals	9,667	5.4
Volunteers	9,078	5.0
Educators	8,036	4.5
Social service organization staff	7,294	4.1
Corrections personnel	6,135	3.4
Prosecutors	5,321	3.0
Court personnel	4,529	2.5
Government agency staff	3,800	2.1
Faith-based organization staff	3,633	2.0
Mental health professionals	3,470	1.9
Attorneys/law students	3,380	1.9
Victim assistants	3,081	1.7
Advocacy organization staff	2,169	1.2
Sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners	2,146	1.2
Legal services staff	1,141	0.6
Disability organization staff	1,048	0.6
Elder organization staff	1,029	0.6
Military command staff	807	0.4

⁹⁸ “Total” numbers are combined totals for 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012.

Table 3. People trained with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012

People trained	2009–2012	
	Number	Percent
Batterer intervention program staff	680	0.4
Substance abuse organization staff	623	0.3
Immigrant organization staff	621	0.3
Tribal government/Tribal government agency staff	544	0.3
Translators/interpreters	538	0.3
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	174	0.1
Sex offender treatment providers	155	0.1
Other	4,382	2.4`

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

Without the recovery funds, family court judges would not have the opportunity to attend highly specialized domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence training, and they would not be receiving the invaluable bench book series of educational instruction for handling highly sensitive sexual assault cases.

—STOP administrator, Florida

With ARRA STOP VAWA funding, three new legal advocates were hired and one was retained. This funding has allowed the four domestic violence agencies in Allegheny County (Women's Center & Shelter, Alle-Kiski Area Hope Center, Crisis Center North, and Womansplace) to work collaboratively to deliver updated protocols and provide training to the 129 municipal police departments and magisterial district judges (MDJs) in Allegheny County, and to provide services to 768 victims in the 55 MDJ offices in Allegheny County.

—Women's Center & Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

STOP Recovery Program funding has allowed the Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit to train officers from the county's rural law enforcement departments to be domestic violence resource officers. Training was primarily conducted at the State's Attorney's Office, Family Court, District Court and the Women's Crisis Center. Training sections included writing affidavits and supplemental affidavits to conform to the requirements of the prosecution, the discovery process, arraignment strategy, photographing victims and crime scenes, obtaining relief from abuse orders, victim safety, and understanding why victims of domestic violence make certain decisions. It is envisioned that, after training, the DV officers will serve as a resource to personnel in their respective agencies.

—*Windham County State's Attorney Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit, Vermont*

Victim Services

During the four 12-month reporting periods, subgrantees provided services to an average of **91,112** victims, to help them become and remain safe from violence, with a maximum of 199,571 victims receiving services in 2010; only 2 percent of victims seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs.⁹⁹ (See Tables 4 and 5 for information on the level of service provided and the types of victims served by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees from 2009 through 2012.)

Table 4. Provision of victim services by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012, by level of service and type of victimization (annual averages)

Level of service	Annual average of victims		Domestic violence/ dating violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	93,430	100	80,059	100	11,732	100	1,539	100
Served	88,309	94.5	75,578	94.4	11,293	96.3	1,438	93.4
Partially served	2,803	3.0	2,474	3.1	255	2.2	75	4.8
Not served	2,218	2.4	2,007	2.5	185	1.6	27	1.7

NOTE: Partially served victims received some, but not all, of the services they sought through Recovery Act STOP Program-funded programs. Some of these victims may have received other requested services from other agencies. Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

⁹⁹ “Not served” victims did not receive any of the services they requested that were STOP Program-funded; “partially served” victims received some, but not all, of the services they requested that were Recovery Act STOP Program-funded.

Table 5. Victims receiving services from Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012, by type of victimization (annual averages)

Type of victimization	Victims served 2009–2012	
	Average number	Percent
All victimizations	91,112	100
Domestic violence/dating violence	78,051	85.7
Sexual assault	11,547	12.7
Stalking	1,513	1.7

Following are the reasons most frequently reported by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees for not serving or partially serving victims:

- ▶ Program reached capacity
- ▶ Did not meet statutory requirements
- ▶ Program unable to provide service due to limited resources/priority-setting
- ▶ Services not appropriate for victim
- ▶ Conflict of interest

Demographics of Victims Served

Of the average **91,112** victims served from 2009 through 2012 for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (48 percent), female (91 percent), and ages 25 to 59 (66 percent).

Table 6. Demographic characteristics of victims served by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012 (annual averages)

Characteristics	Victims receiving services 2009–2012	
	Average number	Percent
Race/ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,980	2.5
Asian	1,320	1.6
Black or African-American	17,793	22.0
Hispanic or Latino	15,851	19.6
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	514	0.6
White	43,942	54.4
Unknown	10,401	NA

Table 6. Demographic characteristics of victims served by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012 (annual averages)

Characteristics	Victims receiving services 2009–2012	
	Average number	Percent
Gender		
Female	78,981	90.6
Male	8,180	9.4
Unknown	3,951	NA
Age		
0–12	NA	NA
13–17	4,703	5.8
18–24	19,015	23.6
25–59	53,101	66.0
60+	3,684	4.6
Unknown	10,610	NA
Other demographics		
People with disabilities	4,817	5.3
People with limited English proficiency	8,926	9.8
People who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	6,196	6.8
People who live in rural areas	20,282	22.3

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims for whom the information was known. Because victims 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 served and the sum of percentages for race/ethnicity may be greater than 100. Percentages for age may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 7. Relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012 (annual averages)

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence/dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	51,775	73.3	2,316	23.2	757	47.4
Other family or household member	6,775	9.6	2,335	23.4	107	6.7
Dating relationship	11,082	15.7	1,116	11.2	316	19.8
Acquaintance	965	1.4	3,122	31.3	338	21.1
Stranger`	66	0.1	1,099	11.0	79	5.0

Table 7. Relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012 (annual averages)

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence/dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Unknown	8,793	NA	2,431	NA	289	NA
Total (excluding unknown)	70,662	100	9,987	100	1,596	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims 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 reported as served for that victimization. Percentages may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

Types of Services Provided to Victims

Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees provided an array of services to victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services included victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and resources, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (help navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Victim advocacy and crisis intervention were the services most frequently provided by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees. In addition to the services listed in Table 8, Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and information to victims as needed.

- ▶ Total number of services provided: **702,283**

Table 8. Victim services provided by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012

Type of service	Services provided	
	Number	Percent
Victim advocacy	190,875	27.2
Crisis intervention	154,868	22.1
Criminal justice advocacy/court accompaniment	109,386	15.6
Counseling services/support group	97,062	13.8
Civil legal advocacy/court accompaniment	91,429	13.0
Civil legal assistance	16,268	2.3
Transportation	15,511	2.2
Language services	14,575	2.1

Table 8. Victim services provided by Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, 2009–2012

Type of service	Services provided	
	Number	Percent
Hospital/clinic/other medical response	9,054	1.3
Other victim service	3,255	0.5
Total	702,283	100.0

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

Number receiving shelter services and number of bed nights, 2009–2012:

- ▶ An annual average of **4,797** victims and **4,129** family members (with a maximum of **11,205** victims and **9,652** family members in 2010) received a total of **765,434** emergency shelter bed nights.
- ▶ An annual average of **200** victims and **261** family members (with a maximum of **384** victims and **501** family members in 2010) received a total of **130,987** transitional housing bed nights.

Total number of hotline calls, 2009–2012:

- ▶ From all callers, including victims: **476,968**
- ▶ From victims: **243,410**

Total number of victim-witness notification/outreach activities: **191,303**

Recovery STOP Program funding has allowed us to retain a full-time advocate during the day shift (from 7:00 am until 3:30 pm). Without Recovery STOP funding, this position would have been cut. This would have resulted in a decrease in critical services. Court accompaniment by our legal advocate would have been impacted because she would have had to remain in the shelter to provide other direct services. Advocacy, such as housing and employment assistance, with other residents would have decreased as staff would have less time to spend with each resident. Furthermore, the time to clean a room and prepare for the intake of a new resident would increase with fewer staff. This could result in a delay in providing shelter services to women in need. Recovery STOP funding allowed us to maintain our quality service provision.

—*St. Martha’s Hall, Missouri*

As a result of having Recovery Act VAWA funding we were able to bring advocates back to full-time positions after losing funding from other sources. This allowed us to meet the needs of an increasing number of survivors coming to us for support and shelter. We were also able to maintain 24-hour coverage of our shelter and keep the doors open to families fleeing violence. This was a critical part of us being able to maintain during a very difficult financial time as well as a time when we were seeing an increase in the number of survivors coming for help.

—*Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse, Utah*

As a result of the VAWA ARRA funding, Child and Family Service (CFS) was able to pay for 46% of two full-time DV Specialists (DVS) salaries. They assisted victims of domestic abuse with their temporary restraining order (TRO) applications and provided Family Court Advocacy during TRO hearings. Additionally, they guided victims through a safety plan and often referred them to community resources for safe housing (Domestic Abuse Shelters), medical services, and possible legal support (i.e., Legal Aid Society). Both DVS staff also case-managed and facilitated a Women’s Support Group and Pattern Changing Program in Hilo and Kona for women who have been or were currently in an abusive relationship.

—*Child and Family Service—Alternatives to Violence, Hawaii*

Protection Orders

The Recovery Act STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims 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. Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims in the protection order process. From 2009 through 2012, Recovery Act STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims in obtaining 142,816 temporary and final protection orders.

Table 9. Protection orders granted with assistance of Recovery Act STOP Program-funded staff, 2009–2012

Provider	Total	2009–2012	
		Temporary	Final
All providers	136,449	79,726	56,723
Victim services staff	94,110	51,697	42,413
Law enforcement	22,614	14,321	8,293
Prosecution	19,725	13,708	6,017

Subgrantees using funds for training addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders from 2009 through 2012. 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. Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees also used funds for data collection and communication systems for tracking and sharing information about protection orders, which was the second most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

Recovery Grant funding was also used to hire a full-time court clerk to be located solely at the Second Judicial District Court's Satellite domestic violence division at the Family Advocacy Center. The goal of the clerk position is to provide enhanced access to the Domestic Violence Order of Protection process and ability to obtain a Domestic Violence Order of Protection. Prior to the Recovery Grant funding a clerk was at the satellite office when District court was able to provide the staffing. The clerk has processed 540 requests for temporary protection orders from May 2010 to December 2010.

—City of Albuquerque, New Mexico

Prior to this project, victims of domestic violence who went to the hospital for medical care would then need to go to court to obtain a restraining order. These funds have allowed us to build a bridge between pilot hospitals and the courts so that we can service victims from the hospital and provide them with immediate protection of the temporary restraining order. During the coming year (calendar year 2011), we will be branching out to include a link from pilot shelters to the courts for the same purpose of providing easy access in obtaining a restraining order.

—Administrative Office of the Courts, New Jersey

Criminal Justice

The Recovery Act 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 Recovery Act STOP Program funds.

Law Enforcement

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

Table 10 summarizes Recovery Act STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities from 2009 through 2012. The most frequently reported activities were investigations and calls for assistance.

Table 10. Law enforcement activities provided with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, 2009–2012¹⁰⁰

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Calls for assistance	3,503	38,777	678	42,958
Incident reports	2,636	37,247	688	40,571
Cases/incidents investigated	3,631	39,624	1,490	44,745
Forensic medical evidence (cases in which rape kits were processed)	2,560	NA	NA	2,560
Arrests	1,116	16,352	348	17,816
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	132	8,191	480	8,803
Arrests for violation of bail bond	20	578	14	612
Enforcement of warrants	203	5,161	102	5,466
Arrests for violation of protection order	11	1,808	44	1,863
Protection orders issued	50	1,648	198	1,896
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	1,605	19,146	541	21,292
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	0	14	2	16

NA = Not applicable

¹⁰⁰ Subgrantees may have received funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not have engaged in the other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received Recovery Act 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 also were supported by the Recovery Act STOP Program.

The STOP Recovery Act funds have continued to allow us to maintain three investigator positions which were at risk of being eliminated due to budgetary constraints. . . . Because of these constraints and the forecasted continued decline of the local economy and job market, police departments were considering removing investigators from specialty investigative positions in order to fill or maintain patrol and general investigative positions in their departments. However, because the Prosecutor's Office received the grant award specifically for investigator positions at the Special Victims Unit, we were able to maintain the number of investigators assigned to the Unit and dedicated solely to investigation of crimes of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. This is a significant benefit to law enforcement, prosecutors, and more importantly to victims of these crimes.

—St. Joseph County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana

The goal of this project was to reduce the backlog of recent and cold case sexual assaults by the examination of 130 cases by the two Recovery STOP-funded contractors. The backlog has dropped to 4 cases. A total of 209 sexual assault cases were examined by the contractors during 2010 and 2011, serving 216 victims. Furthermore, 294 DNA extractions were completed by the contractors, serving an additional 54 victims. In total, 270 victims were served by the contractors during 2010 and 2011.

—Kansas City, Missouri

The law enforcement activities funded under the extension of our STOP Recovery grant were limited to the Suffolk County Police Department's Domestic Violence & Elder Abuse Unit. The five officers in the unit conducted 115 home visits to victims of felony level criminal contempt cases. These home visits were made specifically because of the violation of an order of protection and the safety issues associated with said violations. . . . Police Officers spent time speaking with the victim to assess their safety, ascertain the whereabouts of the perpetrator, and make arrangements to have panic alarms installed in the home.

—Suffolk County Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Inc., New York

Prosecution

After police arrest a suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to prosecute the case. However, in some states and local jurisdictions, police officers both arrest and charge offenders. Generally, city and county prosecutors handle ordinance-level offenses in municipal courts, misdemeanors in district courts, and felony offenses in superior courts.

Table 11 presents data on Recovery Act STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases from 2009 through 2012.

Table 11. Disposition of cases by prosecutors funded by Recovery Act STOP Program, 2009–2012.

Type of case	2009–2012		
	Total disposed	Number convicted	Percent convicted ¹⁰¹
Domestic violence/ dating violence ordinance	10,514	6,184	58.8
Misdemeanor domestic violence/dating violence	40,028	27,783	69.4
Felony domestic violence/dating violence	8,239	6,521	79.1
Domestic violence/ dating violence homicide	38	38	100.0
Misdemeanor sexual assault	582	490	84.2
Felony sexual assault	1,579	1,262	79.9
Sexual assault homicide	6	6	100.0
Stalking ordinance	96	84	87.5
Misdemeanor stalking	463	343	74.1
Felony stalking	311	281	90.4
Stalking homicide	0	0	NA
Violation of bail	596	534	89.6
Violation of probation or parole	2,968	2,765	93.2
Violation of protection order	4,294	3,103	72.3
Violation of other court order	468	370	79.1
Other	432	234	54.2
Total	70,614	49,998	70.8%

¹⁰¹ These conviction rates include deferred adjudications, which represented 22.4 percent of all conviction outcomes.

Receiving funds through the Recovery Act Violence Against Women grant program has provided us with the opportunity to have an additional Assistant Prosecuting Attorney and an Investigator dedicated to domestic violence in Boone County. Having these two positions has truly enhanced our ability to serve domestic violence victims in Boone County. Prior to the Recovery Act funding we had only two assistant prosecuting attorneys to handle over 1000 victims of domestic violence each year.

—Boone County, Missouri

In addition to felony trials and misdemeanor appeals in Superior Court, prosecutors funded by this [ARRA stimulus] grant handle bail hearings, probation violation hearings, motions to set and reduce bail as well as arguing against motions to vacate no contact orders while cases are pending. By handling cases from arraignment to trial, victims are reassured and can build a modicum of trust with the assigned prosecutor over time, and prosecution of the case also is positively affected because prosecutors know all the case details and its travel through the system.

—Office of the Attorney General, Rhode Island

The Recovery Act VAWA STOP funds allowed for the retention of two part-time prosecutor positions in Palmer and one part-time prosecutor position in Kenai on the sexual assault and domestic violence caseloads in the offices as well as the surrounding rural communities covered by those offices. The highly experienced and skilled prosecutors prosecuted assigned sexual assault and domestic violence cases from beginning to end, resulting in higher rate of convictions and better services to victims. The victims were able to work with the same prosecutors from the time charges were filed through the sentencing of the offender. This approach maintained continuity and enabled the prosecutors to better handle the many challenges presented by these cases. The early interaction with victims helped build stronger cases and provided critical support services and case coordination.

—State of Alaska Department of Law—Criminal Division

Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking—administrative and judicial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for overseeing court dockets, activities, and services and for ensuring that court houses are accessible, safe, and user friendly for all who have business in the courts. In their judicial role, judges are responsible for presiding over court hearings and ensuring that due process is accorded to victims and defendants in criminal proceedings and to all parties in civil litigation. They have broad powers to hold offenders accountable and improve the safety of victims through rejecting or approving negotiated pleas, convicting or acquitting defendants

in criminal cases after hearing, and rendering decisions in civil matters. They exercise significant discretion in sentencing, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Courts may monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with conditions of both civil (e.g., protection from abuse) and criminal (e.g., probation) court orders.

An annual average of **937** offenders were monitored from 2009 through 2012, with a maximum of **2,013** offenders reviewed at court hearings in 2010.

- ▶ A total of **8,219** individual judicial review hearings were held from 2009 through 2012.

The data in Table 12 reflect the consequences imposed by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded courts for violations of probation and other court orders.

Table 12. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Recovery Act Program-funded courts, 2009–2012

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 (<i>N</i> = 281)	160	56.9	63	22.4	1	0.4	0	-	57	20.3
New criminal behavior (<i>N</i> = 467)	36	7.7	249	53.3	174	37.3	1	0.2	7	1.5
Failure to attend BIP (<i>N</i> = 384)	224	58.3	72	18.8	86	22.4	1	0.3	1	0.3
Failure to attend mandated offender treatment (<i>N</i> = 41)	25	61.0	5	12.2	9	22.0	1	2.4	1	2.4
Other conditions (<i>N</i> = 590)	293	49.7	149	25.3	146	24.7	1	0.2	1	0.2

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 equal 100 percent because of rounding.

In 2009, the court obtained STOP program recovery funding for a domestic assault court coordinator (DACC). One of the DACC's most important functions is monitoring the attendance and participation of defendants in Men Exploring Non-violent Directions (MEND). This has resulted in defendants enrolling in MEND faster, beginning class faster, and being held accountable faster if issues arise. The DACC also works to resolve issues within domestic violence cases and coordinate with probation officers to ensure that information is promptly and accurately communicated.

—Boone County, Missouri

The RA STOP funds have allowed for a domestic violence trained bond supervision officer to supervise a case load of defendants assigned to bond supervision for release on domestic violence charges. This officer is able to refer both the victims and the offenders to specific services related to domestic violence. Generally most domestic violence cases are misdemeanors and most likely will be able to post bond. Releasing to a supervised pretrial supervision program provides additional supervision as well as allows the offender to maintain employment and support of the family.

—10th Judicial District Court, Johnson County, Kansas

In 2010 the courts have used ARRA funds to support work in three areas: improving access to justice; data collection and data system development, and training for judges and court staff. The ARRA funds were used: 67% for per diem judges, 14% for the data project, 6% for training and 10% for indirect costs. With this particular grant program, the New Hampshire District and Family Court was able to make 75 per diem judge days available in six of our busiest courts. The judges were assigned to hear dedicated domestic violence dockets. State funding for these judge days was eliminated in June of 2010 as a result of cuts to the judicial branch budget.

—New Hampshire District and Family Court

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 imposed, a short period of incarceration (i.e., partial probation revocation), or full 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 annual average number of offenders supervised by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff from 2009 through 2012 was **1,614**, (with a maximum of **3,527** supervised in 2010); of those, **1,439** were being supervised for domestic violence or dating violence offenses, **167** for sexual assault offenses, and **9** for stalking offenses. These offenders received a total of **46,755** contacts, as shown in Table 13. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. An annual average of **345** victims (with a maximum of **785** victims in 2010) received a total of **3,444** contacts from probation officers funded under the Recovery Act STOP Program during the four reporting periods.

Table 13. Offender monitoring by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff 2009–2012, by type and number of contacts

Type of contact	2009–2012	
	Average number of offenders	Total number of contacts
Face-to-face	1,302	25,777
Telephone	851	16,122
Unscheduled surveillance	317	4,856
Total	1,614	46,755

- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation without violations: **231** (70 percent of those completing probation), with a maximum of **507** in 2010
- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation with violations: **100** (30 percent), with a maximum of **256** in 2010

The data in Table 14 reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff from 2009 through 2012. Offenders received partial or full revocation when protection orders were violated (26 percent of protection order violation dispositions), when they failed to attend batterer intervention programs (30.4 percent), or when they engaged in new criminal behavior (32.8 percent).

Table 14. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by Recovery Act STOP Program-funded probation staff, 2009–2012

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 = 160)	11	6.9	42	26.3	1	0.6	85	53.1	21	13.1
New criminal behavior (N 519)	73	14.1	170	32.8	30	5.8	50	9.6	196	37.8
Failure to attend BIP (N = 1,024)	328	32.0	311	30.4	6	0.6	247	24.1	132	12.9
Failure to attend MOT (N = 235)	81	34.5	45	19.1	6	2.6	23	9.8	80	34.0
Other conditions (N = 1,322)	419	31.7	468	35.4	69	5.2	215	16.3	151	11.4

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

The STOP Program [ARRA] funding restored 2 full-time equivalent Deputy Probation Officer positions to the Sacramento County Probation Department’s existing Sex Offender Unit. Without funding from the STOP Program, the unit’s remaining officers would have suffered the burden of supervising nearly 700 sex offender cases. The two (2) positions restored under the STOP Program funding not only reduced the existing officers’ caseloads, but also allowed for intensive supervision of a select group of high-risk sexual assault probationers.

—*Sacramento County, California*

In response to the loss of a community-based source for behavior modification and with the funding from the STOP [ARRA] Program, Macon County has been able to develop and implement its own Duluth protocol batterers intervention programs within its Probation Department. Program materials had to be created as there were no materials available for purchase. Two probation officers were put in place to monitor offenders and facilitate the intervention programs. Additional contractual personnel were engaged to co-facilitate the intervention sessions. The Violence Against Women group assisted in creating the program protocol, and enlisted the participation of local judiciary in developing meaningful consequences for offender violations within the program (including overnight incarceration for missed sessions).

—*Macon County, Illinois*

STOP program [ARRA] funding allowed our office to continue the supervision of Misdemeanor Domestic Violence offenders in our community. The ongoing budgetary issues within Oregon and elsewhere would have required this office to lay-off a PO assigned to this job. This lay-off would greatly impact our ability to supervise the Misdemeanor Domestic Violence population in our community. If we had not received STOP funding this office would have been forced to stop serving this population and only supervise Felony offenders which represent 40% or less of current caseload assignment.

—*Klamath County Community Corrections, Oregon*

Batterer Intervention Program

- ▶ Average annual number of offenders in BIP: **424**
- ▶ Average number of continuing offenders from last reporting period: **173**
- ▶ Average number of offenders entering during current reporting period: **251**

Prior to receiving this [STOP ARRA] funding, there was not a single Batterer Intervention Program west of North Platte in the State of Nebraska. In other words, the entire panhandle was without a Duluth Model-based group treatment program to address and rehabilitate domestic violence offenders, and as such, domestic violence was being perpetuated in rapidly increasing numbers and by repeat offenders. The New L.E.A.F. BIP has received many referrals from the aforementioned area, and continuation of this service is paramount to ending domestic violence in the panhandle of Nebraska.

—*Sandhills Crisis Intervention Program, Nebraska*

[STOP ARRA funding has] allowed Avalon's AIM program to receive certification from the Tennessee Domestic Violence State Coordinating Council. Being able to add two additional part-time AIM facilitators has had two positive effects: we have been able to reduce class size while being able to accommodate a larger number of attendees. Additionally, we have been able to implement a sliding scale for BIP attendees so that we can assure judicial and district attorney personnel that we are making the program more accessible for more referrals.

—*Avalon Center: Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Program, Tennessee*

Conclusion

The data provided by state administrators and subgrantees funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Recovery Act STOP Program, highlight the efforts made to reduce violence against women and administer justice for, and strengthen services to, all victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2012, the Recovery Act STOP Program funded 55 states and more than 1,600 subgrantees to further these goals. These subgrantees used their funds to provide well over **700,000** services to victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, to investigate **45,000** incidents of these crimes, and to convict **50,000** offenders. They also used funds to train **180,000** professionals, of whom **58,000** were law enforcement officers, to improve their responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

This report reflects 3 years of collective efforts by states and their subgrantees to respond to a serious economic crisis. Programs and projects funded under the Recovery Act STOP Program, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, worked to maintain staff positions in an attempt to continue to meet the critical needs of victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking and to hold offenders accountable for their crimes.

Appendix A 2009–2012

Table A1: Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009–2012

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Alabama	49	23	11	11	1	3	\$700,008	\$572,711	\$716,312	\$111,043	\$111,043	\$2,211,117	\$313,474
Alaska	18	12	2	2	1	1	\$180,224	\$64,380	\$37,293	\$0	\$0	\$281,897	\$35,226
American Samoa	6	3	1	1	1	0	\$217,929	\$155,665	\$155,665	\$31,133	\$0	\$560,392	\$62,266
Arizona	38	20	7	5	5	1	\$1,111,300	\$618,670	\$606,124	\$127,508	\$113,427	\$2,577,029	\$151,313
Arkansas	31	12	8	8	2	1	\$596,622	\$416,218	\$284,961	\$71,548	\$0	\$1,369,349	\$64,170
California	253	154	17	81	1	0	\$5,278,173	\$3,505,803	\$3,279,844	\$598,446	\$0	\$12,662,266	\$1,329,880
Colorado	35	20	7	4	1	3	\$773,338	\$524,493	\$520,130	\$103,798	\$164,945	\$2,086,704	\$461,322
Connecticut	15	11	1	2	1	0	\$710,100	\$372,500	\$818,690	\$105,000	\$0	\$2,006,290	\$124,912
Delaware	12	5	4	1	2	0	\$386,430	\$214,685	\$214,685	\$41,460	\$0	\$857,260	\$45,196
District of Columbia	14	3	6	1	1	3	\$217,634	\$232,182	\$181,362	\$36,272	\$127,918	\$795,368	\$110,355
Florida	47	14	13	16	4	0	\$3,325,169	\$1,569,747	\$1,569,747	\$328,949	\$0	\$6,793,612	\$74,140
Georgia	98	42	24	24	8	0	\$1,600,491	\$1,278,067	\$942,854	\$321,463	\$0	\$4,142,875	\$488,932
Guam	9	5	1	1	1	1	\$178,608	\$148,840	\$148,840	\$29,768	\$89,304	\$595,360	\$66,151
Hawaii	19	6	4	7	2	0	\$362,927	\$233,298	\$305,381	\$47,354	\$0	\$948,960	\$144,509
Idaho	18	6	4	3	2	3	\$303,755	\$253,129	\$253,129	\$50,626	\$151,878	\$1,012,517	\$137,112
Illinois	15	5	5	3	0	2	\$1,368,933	\$1,146,221	\$1,146,139	\$229,246	\$687,740	\$4,578,279	\$463,541
Indiana	41	21	4	14	2	0	\$1,165,885	\$634,936	\$816,393	\$126,987	\$0	\$2,744,201	\$282,194
Iowa	78	31	39	6	2	0	\$682,366	\$683,740	\$64,709	\$74,040	\$0	\$1,504,855	\$332,613
Kansas	11	4	3	2	2	0	\$446,766	\$378,907	\$353,173	\$259,581	\$0	\$1,438,427	\$82,699
Kentucky	30	12	4	7	2	5	\$623,400	\$482,098	\$519,484	\$170,001	\$341,543	\$2,136,526	\$0
Louisiana	55	20	16	12	4	3	\$651,835	\$570,547	\$605,692	\$119,390	\$0	\$1,947,464	\$213,219
Maine	18	11	4	2	1	0	\$455,000	\$273,499	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$1,028,499	\$62,447

Table A1: Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009–2012													
State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Maryland	87	38	19	16	4	10	\$752,319	\$575,267	\$541,221	\$115,270	\$266,478	\$2,250,555	\$173,181
Massachusetts	67	2	53	10	1	1	\$1,162,000	\$658,771	\$662,292	\$128,000	\$10,000	\$2,621,063	\$247,620
Michigan	173	44	43	44	42	0	\$1,858,450	\$1,022,983	\$1,025,991	\$148,991	\$0	\$4,056,415	\$0
Minnesota	34	14	7	10	3	0	\$994,861	\$540,736	\$543,677	\$113,797	\$0	\$2,193,071	\$212,562
Mississippi	39	16	11	9	2	1	\$542,789	\$382,887	\$371,457	\$73,073	\$157,951	\$1,528,157	\$79,749
Missouri	43	23	9	6	4	1	\$1,071,316	\$666,124	\$747,313	\$227,885	\$23,726	\$2,736,364	\$287,172
Montana	13	5	3	2	1	2	\$250,693	\$202,908	\$206,000	\$41,574	\$124,085	\$825,260	\$91,695
Nebraska	34	8	8	6	2	10	\$295,765	\$277,835	\$273,866	\$54,773	\$214,318	\$1,116,557	\$80,238
Nevada	52	24	14	9	2	3	\$530,072	\$590,405	\$620,796	\$67,324	\$32,491	\$1,841,088	\$200,045
New Hampshire	27	9	8	7	3	0	\$408,908	\$313,285	\$324,333	\$96,069	\$0	\$1,142,595	\$58,641
New Jersey	98	40	30	27	1	0	\$1,198,477	\$1,164,518	\$918,656	\$172,174	\$0	\$3,453,825	\$181,235
New Mexico	18	7	4	3	1	3	\$383,092	\$339,195	\$278,312	\$55,662	\$56,988	\$1,113,249	\$104,773
New York	70	31	19	17	2	1	\$1,991,227	\$1,659,355	\$1,659,356	\$331,872	\$995,613	\$6,637,423	\$150,000
North Carolina	24	9	7	3	1	4	\$1,186,771	\$893,651	\$803,985	\$170,289	\$423,398	\$3,478,094	\$377,075
North Dakota	87	26	26	13	4	18	\$219,282	\$182,736	\$182,737	\$36,547	\$109,641	\$730,943	\$81,216
Ohio	99	39	20	19	7	14	\$1,409,684	\$1,368,230	\$1,042,040	\$286,810	\$612,168	\$4,718,932	\$0
Oklahoma	28	11	5	4	3	5	\$478,743	\$262,704	\$386,436	\$79,792	\$375,632	\$1,583,307	\$310,426
Oregon	37	22	6	6	3	0	\$772,158	\$428,973	\$428,973	\$105,827	\$0	\$1,735,931	\$192,952
Pennsylvania	64	18	19	18	9	0	\$1,713,803	\$1,252,091	\$1,253,541	\$228,452	\$0	\$4,447,887	\$89,072
Puerto Rico	146	137	2	2	3	2	\$460,321	\$330,869	\$438,762	\$76,660	\$266,108	\$1,572,720	\$196,902
Rhode Island	19	6	11	1	1	0	\$416,907	\$180,650	\$217,140	\$42,428	\$0	\$857,125	\$95,444
South Carolina	108	55	24	19	4	6	\$902,447	\$596,089	\$624,989	\$115,787	\$93,047	\$2,332,359	\$211,484
South Dakota	46	33	2	6	3	2	\$257,390	\$214,492	\$214,492	\$42,900	\$93,674	\$822,948	\$0

State	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	ADMIN
Tennessee	47	21	9	12	5	0	\$1,224,987	\$676,764	\$767,701	\$149,020	\$0	\$2,818,472	\$128,477
Texas	156	62	47	31	9	7	\$2,899,425	\$2,621,977	\$2,576,951	\$522,607	\$1,147,892	\$9,768,852	\$348,631
Utah	34	13	6	9	1	5	\$442,053	\$404,856	\$470,450	\$69,484	\$219,295	\$1,606,138	\$155,207
Vermont	45	22	12	7	4	0	\$290,843	\$271,542	\$210,249	\$61,222	\$0	\$833,856	\$99,480
Virgin Island	8	5	1	1	1	0	\$267,166	\$148,426	\$148,426	\$29,685	\$0	\$593,703	\$128,687
Virginia	51	20	11	12	4	4	\$1,091,845	\$871,031	\$765,816	\$166,883	\$305,477	\$3,201,052	\$330,580
Washington	35	16	8	9	1	1	\$962,796	\$641,728	\$702,004	\$128,346	\$132,038	\$2,566,912	\$213,617
West Virginia	49	14	12	15	2	6	\$443,742	\$371,745	\$421,895	\$77,018	\$123,279	\$1,437,679	\$1,354
Wisconsin	44	12	10	14	7	1	\$848,313	\$564,687	\$673,294	\$271,459	\$15,718	\$2,373,471	\$254,686
Wyoming	59	23	6	4	23	3	\$189,940	\$175,745	\$175,477	\$35,160	\$123,279	\$699,601	\$1,354
TOTAL	2,851	1,265	657	584	209	136	\$49,255,478	\$35,183,591	\$34,469,235	\$7,356,453	\$7,710,094	\$133,974,851	\$10,129,226

Table A2. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state: 2009–2012

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Alabama	\$700,008	\$106,276	15.2
Alaska	\$180,224	\$39,177	21.7
American Samoa	\$217,929	\$217,928	100.0
Arizona	\$1,111,300	\$134,500	12.1
Arkansas	\$596,622	\$151,500	25.4
California	\$5,278,173	\$1,135,621	21.5
Colorado	\$773,338	\$413,857	53.5
Connecticut	\$710,100	\$0	0.0
Delaware	\$386,430	\$34,840	9.0
District of Columbia	\$217,634	\$146,291	67.2
Florida	\$3,325,169	\$150,969	4.5
Georgia	\$1,600,491	\$480,678	30.0
Guam	\$178,608	\$178,608	100.0
Hawaii	\$362,927	\$155,867	42.9
Idaho	\$303,755	\$30,376	10.0
Illinois	\$1,368,933	\$500,000	36.5
Indiana	\$1,165,885	\$318,426	27.3
Iowa	\$682,366	\$56,700	8.3
Kansas	\$446,766	\$42,381	9.5
Kentucky	\$623,400	\$272,560	43.7
Louisiana	\$651,835	\$73,892	11.3
Maine	\$455,000	\$144,500	31.8
Maryland	\$752,319	\$210,315	28.0
Massachusetts	\$1,162,000	\$125,807	10.8
Michigan	\$1,858,450	\$204,758	11.0
Minnesota	\$994,861	\$198,766	20.0
Mississippi	\$542,789	\$190,392	35.1
Missouri	\$1,071,316	\$172,344	16.1
Montana	\$250,693	\$73,193	29.2
Nebraska	\$295,765	\$32,864	11.1
Nevada	\$530,072	\$104,272	19.7
New Hampshire	\$408,908	\$40,000	9.8

Table A2. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBOs) by state: 2009–2012

State	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
New Jersey	\$1,198,477	\$173,665	14.5
New Mexico	\$383,092	\$46,333	12.1
New York	\$1,991,227	\$624,000	31.3
North Carolina	\$1,186,771	\$107,764	9.1
North Dakota	\$219,282	\$21,971	10.0
Ohio	\$1,409,684	\$271,511	19.3
Oklahoma	\$478,743	\$47,875	10.0
Oregon	\$772,158	\$194,032	25.1
Pennsylvania	\$1,713,803	\$493,787	28.8
Puerto Rico	\$460,321	\$116,232	25.3
Rhode Island	\$416,907	\$26,056	6.2
South Carolina	\$902,447	\$119,874	13.3
South Dakota	\$257,390	\$28,360	11.0
Tennessee	\$1,224,987	\$114,220	9.3
Texas	\$2,899,425	\$516,131	17.8
Utah	\$442,053	\$220,852	50.0
Vermont	\$290,843	\$32,490	11.2
Virgin Island	\$267,166	\$267,166	100.0
Virginia	\$1,091,845	\$90,090	8.3
Washington	\$962,796	\$77,007	8.0
West Virginia	\$443,742	\$45,792	10.3
Wisconsin	\$848,313	\$208,586	24.6
Wyoming	\$189,940	\$0	0.0
TOTAL	\$49,255,478	\$9,981,452	20.3

Appendix B 2009

Table B1a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009

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	19	3	1	3	2	0	0	13	2	1	0	0	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	12	7	1	0	0	1	2	10	0	1	0	0	0
Arkansas	12	2	0	1	0	6	1	11	2	1	0	0	0
California	174	52	15	62	17	18	12	116	5	7	0	4	0
Colorado	29	10	5	2	4	3	3	21	0	1	0	0	0
Connecticut	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Delaware	7	1	2	0	2	2	0	4	0	1	1	0	0
District of Columbia	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	1	0	0	0
Florida	36	7	8	4	5	16	3	20	8	8	0	0	0
Georgia	49	7	8	3	2	10	7	34	2	9	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	12	4	2	0	2	2	0	10	0	1	0	0	0
Indiana	21	5	7	3	3	4	3	13	1	2	0	0	0
Iowa	29	11	5	1	7	4	3	22	2	0	0	0	0
Kansas	9	2	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0
Maine	8	3	3	2	3	3	1	5	1	1	0	0	0
Maryland	38	7	8	4	5	10	3	31	2	3	0	0	1
Michigan	45	7	11	4	8	2	4	39	0	2	0	0	0
Minnesota	20	8	6	4	2	1	4	14	1	1	0	0	1
Missouri	28	5	2	2	0	5	1	22	2	2	0	0	1
Montana	12	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	1	0	2	0
Nevada	15	0	1	1	1	4	0	13	0	0	0	1	0
New Hampshire	11	5	6	3	3	2	5	8	0	1	0	0	0
New Mexico	16	3	1	5	1	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	0

Table B1a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
New York	8	3	0	1	3	1	2	3	0	1	0	0	0
North Carolina	18	3	3	3	2	4	4	13	4	2	0	0	0
North Dakota	17	5	2	1	9	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	69	9	13	8	4	15	6	53	5	6	2	0	0
Oklahoma	17	3	1	1	1	4	2	12	1	2	0	0	0
Oregon	27	6	3	0	1	2	2	23	1	1	0	1	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	5	2	2	3	1	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	24	10	3	6	3	6	0	14	3	4	2	0	1
Tennessee	36	6	2	5	11	11	2	20	5	3	0	0	2
Utah	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0
Vermont	11	3	2	1	0	4	1	9	3	1	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	42	15	8	11	3	12	4	24	1	8	0	0	0
Washington	26	1	2	1	1	3	0	18	2	4	1	0	0
West Virginia	16	5	5	2	1	3	0	11	4	4	0	0	0
Wisconsin	13	7	4	3	1	1	2	9	1	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	29	8	3	4	1	1	3	29	0	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	980	242	147	154	111	167	84	694	59	85	7	9	6

Table B2a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	19	13	3,118	3,113	5	-	3,118	3,000	106	12
American Samoa	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	14	10	332	321	-	11	321	261	58	2
Arkansas	13	11	885	878	1	6	879	826	53	-
California	201	116	11,395	11,102	269	24	11,371	7,299	4,046	26
Colorado	31	21	1,100	880	12	208	892	826	60	6
Connecticut	2	1	13	13	-	-	13	13	-	-
Delaware	7	4	313	216	18	79	234	178	56	-
District of Columbia	9	6	405	176	-	229	176	176	-	-
Florida	38	20	4,717	4,525	122	70	4,647	4,579	52	16
Georgia	59	34	2,297	2,177	40	80	2,217	1,798	402	17
Guam	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Idaho	15	10	303	303	-	-	303	276	23	4
Indiana	29	13	603	582	19	2	601	524	56	21
Iowa	43	22	717	689	8	20	697	573	122	2
Kansas	9	4	313	295	18	-	313	245	64	4
Maine	10	5	135	117	18	-	135	101	31	3
Maryland	39	31	4,008	3,814	100	94	3,914	3,272	638	4
Michigan	47	39	2,521	2,427	6	88	2,433	2,083	298	52
Minnesota	20	14	1,885	1,775	32	78	1,807	1,233	565	9
Missouri	28	22	3,186	2,095	25	1,066	2,120	2,040	61	19
Montana	13	7	1,204	1,197	3	4	1,200	963	163	74
Nevada	18	13	2,617	2,546	59	12	2,605	2,549	30	26
New Hampshire	11	8	993	953	29	11	982	775	159	48
New Mexico	18	6	373	367	4	2	371	333	20	18
New York	9	3	215	215	-	-	215	26	189	-

Table B2a. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
North Carolina	19	13	660	636	23	1	659	543	109	7
North Dakota	26	15	839	669	2	168	671	547	119	5
Ohio	82	53	7,220	6,696	451	73	7,147	6,011	637	499
Oklahoma	20	12	898	866	19	13	885	758	68	59
Oregon	27	23	1,591	1,252	339	-	1,591	1,377	176	38
Puerto Rico	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	5	4	4,054	3,493	61	500	3,554	3,483	63	8
South Carolina	24	14	4,871	4,769	27	75	4,796	4,307	426	63
Tennessee	37	20	1,395	1,370	24	1	1,394	1,335	29	30
Utah	12	6	302	301	-	1	301	256	42	3
Vermont	14	9	449	447	2	-	449	413	27	9
Virgin Islands	1	1	50	50	-	-	50	50	-	-
Virginia	45	24	1,879	1,811	14	54	1,825	1,648	168	9
Washington	27	18	1,705	1,705	-	-	1,705	1,536	131	38
West Virginia	18	11	529	508	18	3	526	481	37	8
Wisconsin	16	9	1,626	1,502	78	46	1,580	340	1,228	12
Wyoming	29	29	782	780	2	-	782	598	70	114
TOTAL	1120	694	72,498	67,631	1,848	3,019	69,479	57,632	10,582	1,265

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Alabama	3,118	39	-	1,066	52	3	1,269	692	2,384	111	623	34	678	1,677	57	672
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Arizona	321	36	2	5	118	2	166	7	286	30	5	7	90	196	17	11
Arkansas	879	5	-	199	44	-	624	9	782	96	1	63	250	502	57	7
California	11,371	167	432	1,222	4,040	212	3,441	1,914	9,571	1,249	551	1,404	2,222	5,614	363	1768
Colorado	892	6	4	17	422	1	249	194	689	15	188	11	119	555	10	197
Connecticut	13	-	-	7	3	-	2	1	11	2	-	-	6	2	5	0
Delaware	234	-	3	48	43	-	128	12	226	8	-	22	45	149	0	18
District of Columbia	176	-	18	117	34	1	4	2	173	3	-	2	64	110	0	0
Florida	4,647	4	14	756	775	24	2,839	242	4,103	533	11	128	948	2,523	189	859
Georgia	2,217	1	65	749	362	16	765	259	2,059	116	42	404	330	1,182	58	243
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Idaho	303	8	5	3	73	-	214	-	287	16	-	2	83	170	48	0
Indiana	601	3	1	21	63	1	347	165	542	33	26	24	124	309	20	124
Iowa	697	16	34	54	230	3	342	25	655	42	-	68	120	445	30	34
Kansas	313	8	-	50	79	-	157	19	290	22	1	50	87	151	14	11
Maine	135	2	6	10	4	-	107	6	126	9	-	19	36	76	3	1
Maryland	3,914	8	30	2,327	353	4	1,119	102	3,335	550	29	103	825	2,088	818	80
Michigan	2,433	42	19	902	150	6	1,245	78	2,349	80	4	141	595	1,557	63	77
Minnesota	1,807	190	27	234	36	1	478	841	1,033	68	706	197	366	492	14	738
Missouri	2,120	6	16	551	106	2	1,014	426	2,056	62	2	47	470	1,134	31	438
Montana	1,200	145	2	8	21	-	999	27	1,143	57	-	51	404	734	8	3

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Nevada	2,605	59	55	177	496	14	1,320	484	2,259	232	114	56	419	1,553	69	508
New Hampshire	982	5	13	48	106	-	589	224	898	84	-	79	151	473	27	252
New Mexico	371	4	1	13	213	-	126	14	346	25	-	16	107	241	7	0
New York	215	5	2	50	22	-	121	15	201	14	-	58	47	62	5	43
North Carolina	659	1	8	148	131	-	364	7	577	82	-	28	116	439	15	61
North Dakota	671	142	2	46	40	-	419	22	627	43	1	14	193	448	9	7
Ohio	7,147	7	32	985	193	4	4,877	1,074	6,208	600	339	390	1,381	3,444	1121	811
Oklahoma	885	87	5	81	43	2	639	34	759	108	18	41	233	514	40	57
Oregon	1,591	23	28	173	193	8	849	321	1,458	127	6	21	276	1,178	38	78
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Rhode Island	3,554	19	54	429	591	-	2,196	265	2,802	692	60	247	1,815	1,349	124	19
South Carolina	4,796	26	20	2,091	151	-	2,465	43	4,444	350	2	115	1,051	3,335	231	64
Tennessee	1,394	-	8	232	101	1	664	388	888	138	368	16	205	727	27	419
Utah	301	5	2	3	189	2	82	18	249	52	-	19	40	218	12	12
Vermont	449	8	6	16	10	3	337	78	431	18	-	12	78	261	24	74
Virgin Islands	50	-	-	48	-	-	1	1	31	19	-	26	9	14	1	0
Virginia	1,825	1	22	270	257	-	1,247	31	1,735	70	20	29	264	1,464	46	22
Washington	1,705	44	32	97	217	9	1,239	67	1,483	208	14	72	335	1,228	68	2
West Virginia	526	1	3	23	2	-	463	34	489	33	4	12	113	360	15	26
Wisconsin	1,580	88	101	217	178	-	940	56	1,482	94	4	346	304	850	34	46
Wyoming	782	25	8	15	71	5	630	30	685	84	13	18	152	521	53	38
TOTAL	69,479	1,236	1,080	13,508	10,212	324	35,077	8,227	60,152	6,175	3,152	4,392	15,151	38,345	3,771	7,820

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/ asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	79	21	5	572
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	39	78	70	88
Arkansas	68	13	6	140
California	651	1,492	661	1,947
Colorado	38	246	217	300
Connecticut	1	1	3	-
Delaware	2	34	7	56
District of Columbia	2	50	58	-
Florida	151	576	496	866
Georgia	63	353	331	411
Guam	-	-	-	-
Idaho	14	45	20	204
Indiana	17	60	55	343
Iowa	33	216	221	383
Kansas	13	54	3	21
Maine	18	4	3	106
Maryland	201	412	266	529
Michigan	150	58	52	557
Minnesota	138	20	38	205
Missouri	143	70	63	486
Montana	102	-	1	36
Nevada	119	182	93	825
New Hampshire	104	67	60	117
New Mexico	8	69	58	94
New York	5	14	13	-
North Carolina	13	101	83	174
North Dakota	64	14	10	99
Ohio	311	109	36	2,220
Oklahoma	58	10	2	446
Oregon	73	179	77	404
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	16	255	8	3
South Carolina	253	132	60	1,923
Tennessee	61	109	64	319
Utah	13	160	173	46
Vermont	52	3	6	338
Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-
Virginia	140	227	177	1,103
Washington	181	7	-	459
West Virginia	32	7	2	302
Wisconsin	257	132	58	358
Wyoming	35	20	6	346
TOTAL	3,718	5,600	3,562	16,826

Table B5a. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2009

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Alabama	1,745	97	399	19	7	851
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	223	60	20	24	6	7
Arkansas	642	133	66	13	4	41
California	5,118	1,384	807	1,124	476	2,739
Colorado	574	42	66	10	9	193
Connecticut	3	1	2	-	-	7
Delaware	178	20	1	18	-	17
District of Columbia	116	4	56	-	-	-
Florida	3,832	481	259	28	17	43
Georgia	1,375	307	192	168	22	194
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-
Idaho	216	19	48	16	4	-
Indiana	428	53	45	37	7	36
Iowa	498	54	61	41	6	46
Kansas	46	9	34	11	1	212
Maine	76	18	27	12	2	-
Maryland	3,309	52	82	145	81	317
Michigan	1,835	146	207	104	45	114
Minnesota	332	94	274	114	8	1,002
Missouri	1,840	76	155	40	3	25
Montana	903	105	2	103	22	93
Nevada	1,513	253	351	17	3	469
New Hampshire	585	81	99	48	13	183
New Mexico	213	96	41	4	1	16
New York	46	30	-	84	32	23
North Carolina	250	115	204	34	5	61
North Dakota	531	28	68	41	15	22
Ohio	4,852	621	818	293	68	553
Oklahoma	410	141	171	86	17	60
Oregon	727	163	93	68	18	539
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	93	55	80	17	2	3,393
South Carolina	3,835	339	419	123	63	58
Tennessee	761	178	168	34	8	254
Utah	167	32	1	2	6	93
Vermont	405	39	65	10	-	6
Virgin Islands	23	27	-	-	-	-
Virginia	1,516	139	79	55	16	30
Washington	1,206	183	214	82	17	3
West Virginia	363	56	108	9	8	34
Wisconsin	386	553	153	475	128	80
Wyoming	488	50	117	71	13	81
TOTAL	41,659	6,334	6,052	3,580	1,153	11,895

Appendix B 2010

Table B1b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010

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	18	6	2	3	0	2	0	12	3	1	0	0	0
Alaska	12	1	0	1	0	2	2	10	1	1	0	0	0
American Samoa	6	8	5	0	7	1	8	3	2	1	0	0	0
Arizona	14	13	3	7	1	1	1	12	1	1	0	0	0
Arkansas	11	2	1	1	0	6	0	10	2	1	0	0	0
California	58	21	10	15	9	19	2	40	8	6	0	5	0
Colorado	33	13	6	6	2	5	3	23	1	1	0	0	0
Connecticut	8	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
Delaware	8	2	2	1	1	4	1	5	1	1	1	0	0
District of Columbia	9	2	2	1	0	1	0	6	0	1	0	0	0
Florida	38	14	11	7	3	21	3	20	12	11	0	0	0
Georgia	56	18	9	7	2	10	8	35	3	7	1	1	1
Guam	6	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Hawaii	9	1	1	0	0	3	0	5	2	2	0	0	0
Idaho	12	5	3	5	2	1	2	9	0	1	0	0	0
Illinois	15	6	2	5	1	4	1	8	0	2	0	3	0
Indiana	25	9	10	7	6	4	3	19	2	2	0	0	0
Iowa	46	13	5	2	12	4	4	36	1	2	0	0	0
Kansas	9	3	1	2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0	1	0
Kentucky	19	10	5	5	4	1	6	13	0	1	0	0	0
Louisiana	37	10	7	5	10	11	3	25	3	5	1	0	0
Maine	13	3	3	1	3	3	0	8	1	2	0	0	0
Maryland	44	12	7	6	5	10	3	35	2	3	0	0	2
Massachusetts	57	20	6	8	5	14	4	43	8	5	0	0	0
Michigan	45	17	14	7	6	1	4	39	0	1	0	0	0
Minnesota	22	11	6	7	5	3	4	17	0	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	21	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	5	3	0	0	0
Missouri	35	7	5	3	1	8	2	23	5	3	2	0	3
Montana	12	8	3	3	4	1	3	6	0	1	0	2	0
Nebraska	11	7	1	5	1	2	1	6	1	1	0	0	1

Table B1b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Nevada	18	4	2	2	3	6	0	14	0	2	0	1	0
New Hampshire	16	10	10	4	6	4	3	10	2	2	1	0	0
New Jersey	72	35	12	24	4	2	1	68	1	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	17	7	3	7	1	4	1	10	2	1	1	0	0
New York	61	24	14	13	12	19	6	43	5	12	0	1	1
North Carolina	25	2	4	1	2	7	2	17	4	2	0	0	0
North Dakota	20	10	4	3	5	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	1
Ohio	63	18	12	8	1	13	5	48	8	8	0	0	0
Oklahoma	24	13	3	2	3	7	1	12	4	3	0	1	0
Oregon	33	10	1	7	2	5	3	28	1	1	0	1	0
Pennsylvania	23	19	8	13	3	9	6	15	7	6	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	7	2	1	3	3	2	1	5	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	11	7	3	7	3	2	1	8	2	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	10	3	2	3	2	1	2	8	0	2	0	0	0
Tennessee	37	8	3	7	7	11	3	22	5	3	0	0	2
Texas	95	34	20	6	29	22	14	58	8	9	0	1	0
Utah	22	8	7	6	4	6	1	16	2	1	0	0	0
Vermont	11	5	4	0	0	4	1	9	3	4	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
Virginia	47	25	14	16	6	8	4	27	7	6	0	1	0
Washington	35	1	1	1	1	7	0	20	8	4	0	0	0
West Virginia	18	6	8	5	1	4	0	13	7	6	0	0	0
Wisconsin	25	19	14	11	9	5	10	10	3	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	29	7	2	2	2	1	1	29	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,446	530	282	275	201	296	141	1,009	143	145	7	18	11

Table B2b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	18	12	2,391	2,329	12	50	2,341	1,993	339	9
Alaska	13	10	1,500	1,500	0	0	1,500	1,185	293	22
American Samoa	8	3	423	416	7	0	423	395	28	0
Arizona	15	12	1,873	1,860	8	5	1,868	1,615	243	10
Arkansas	12	10	3,277	3,272	3	2	3,275	3,094	176	5
California	73	40	4,697	4,514	165	18	4,679	3,454	1,173	52
Colorado	33	23	3,833	3,700	26	107	3,726	3,397	278	51
Connecticut	10	1	179	179	0	0	179	179	0	0
Delaware	8	5	622	621	1	0	622	530	79	13
District of Columbia	9	6	800	502	4	294	506	495	8	3
Florida	40	20	10,701	10,110	548	43	10,658	10,433	191	34
Georgia	60	35	5,858	5,671	167	20	5,838	5,085	722	31
Guam	8	2	86	84	0	2	84	81	3	0
Hawaii	12	5	347	346	0	1	346	291	55	0
Idaho	13	9	1,155	1,138	0	17	1,138	854	217	67
Illinois	15	8	4,130	3,940	123	67	4,063	2,603	1,450	10
Indiana	28	19	4,277	4,275	1	1	4,276	3,776	368	132
Iowa	52	36	2,785	2,632	33	120	2,665	2,198	442	25
Kansas	9	5	583	526	49	8	575	417	145	13
Kentucky	22	13	2,832	2,804	1	27	2,805	2,731	55	19
Louisiana	42	25	4,406	4,313	68	25	4,381	3,614	691	76
Maine	14	8	720	711	9	0	720	662	56	2
Maryland	44	35	6,381	6,184	116	81	6,300	5,334	950	16
Massachusetts	57	43	5,200	5,023	147	30	5,170	3,988	1,147	35
Michigan	45	39	5,109	4,471	621	17	5,092	4,343	649	100
Minnesota	22	17	7,027	6,706	38	283	6,744	4,833	1,856	55
Mississippi	21	11	1,641	1,604	28	9	1,632	1,402	147	83
Missouri	36	23	6,116	4,369	18	1729	4,387	4,102	180	105
Montana	13	6	1,081	984	94	3	1,078	850	205	23
Nebraska	12	6	2,204	2,182	22	0	2,204	1,776	249	179
Nevada	20	14	5,569	5,528	40	1	5,568	5,442	82	44

Table B2b. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Hampshire	16	10	1,461	1,408	44	9	1,452	1,200	179	73
New Jersey	76	68	15,911	15,765	99	47	15,864	13,126	2,660	78
New Mexico	18	10	1,658	1,644	14	0	1,658	1,035	575	48
New York	62	43	10,405	10,033	319	53	10,352	9,899	429	24
North Carolina	26	17	7,260	6,735	355	170	7,090	6,720	306	64
North Dakota	23	17	1,360	1,340	9	11	1,349	1,091	227	31
Ohio	66	48	12,320	11,086	831	403	11,917	10,493	928	496
Oklahoma	25	12	1,812	1,624	152	36	1,776	1,606	116	54
Oregon	34	28	3,643	3,392	248	3	3,640	3,042	446	152
Pennsylvania	25	15	10,777	10,682	59	36	10,741	9,086	1,471	184
Puerto Rico	14	11	576	546	15	15	561	559	2	0
Rhode Island	8	5	2,230	1,813	286	131	2,099	1,925	156	18
South Carolina	12	8	747	743	0	4	743	555	148	40
South Dakota	11	8	626	610	16	0	626	549	48	29
Tennessee	39	22	5,010	4,980	13	17	4,993	4,830	139	24
Texas	137	58	12,205	11,460	482	263	11,942	10,370	1,400	172
Utah	24	16	2,954	2,728	205	21	2,933	2,628	245	60
Vermont	12	9	897	887	5	5	892	662	202	28
Virgin Islands	6	4	809	668	141	0	809	757	42	10
Virginia	47	27	4,853	4,363	152	338	4,515	3,933	557	25
Washington	35	20	3,247	3,247	0	0	3,247	2,818	350	79
West Virginia	20	13	2,020	1,976	28	16	2,004	1,893	84	27
Wisconsin	31	10	1,776	1,610	67	99	1,677	975	661	41
Wyoming	29	29	1,850	1,828	20	2	1,848	1,477	105	266
TOTAL	1,580	1,009	2,391	2,329	5,909	4,639	19,9571	17,2381	23,953	3,237

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Alabama	2,341	3	9	825	46	2	1,162	322	1,922	147	272	55	262	993	122	909
Alaska	1,500	694	18	24	69	19	534	142	1,333	102	65	68	258	1,001	73	100
American Samoa	423	-	-	-	-	423	-	-	420	3	-	45	117	223	38	-
Arizona	1,868	157	18	92	556	16	872	162	1,614	132	122	147	316	1,144	123	138
Arkansas	3,275	13	14	1,186	208	4	1,814	36	2,692	575	8	365	651	2,113	107	39
California	4,679	31	270	352	1,895	28	1,406	837	3,443	701	535	525	989	1,982	100	1,083
Colorado	3,726	119	19	383	1,097	9	1,345	840	2,671	253	802	61	308	1,571	35	1,751
Connecticut	179	1	-	69	47	-	61	1	178	1	-	-	53	126	-	-
Delaware	622	4	6	135	122	-	340	15	583	39	-	19	163	397	35	8
District of Columbia	506	-	20	377	93	1	8	7	496	10	-	11	221	261	11	2
Florida	10,658	8	61	2,514	2,293	39	5,047	704	9,279	1,154	225	285	2,717	6,577	308	771
Georgia	5,838	2	103	2,252	559	6	2,432	484	5,515	312	11	515	1,244	3,432	116	531
Guam	84	-	15	1	-	67	1	-	72	12	-	-	14	69	-	1
Hawaii	346	5	89	2	18	118	92	30	340	6	-	19	52	251	6	18
Idaho	1,138	41	6	14	379	4	679	29	1,064	74	-	75	324	707	23	9
Illinois	4,063	30	87	1,135	1,079	10	1,678	184	3,653	366	44	551	845	2,248	95	324
Indiana	4,276	4	13	426	655	5	2,357	816	3,909	360	7	208	894	2,819	93	262
Iowa	2,665	103	69	209	531	3	1,666	107	2,496	168	1	174	534	1,690	97	170
Kansas	575	3	1	87	155	-	243	86	531	44	-	34	101	370	12	58
Kentucky	2,805	9	20	437	192	5	2,033	109	2,698	107	-	17	648	1,911	149	80
Louisiana	4,381	48	13	1,798	157	-	2,318	53	3,950	428	3	418	949	2,848	86	80
Maine	720	3	8	25	15	-	547	122	672	46	2	25	193	365	15	122
Maryland	6,300	4	135	2,633	596	7	2,110	824	5,848	452	-	200	1,494	3,721	189	696
Massachusetts	5,170	5	75	554	902	1	2,941	703	4,638	512	20	190	933	3,574	98	375
Michigan	5,092	75	32	1,616	376	8	2,716	270	4,866	216	10	266	1,161	3,385	126	154
Minnesota	6,744	947	94	864	139	2	1,750	2,948	3,968	217	2,559	656	1,746	1,400	94	2,848
Mississippi	1,632	48	2	812	72	-	562	136	1,468	149	15	38	524	868	32	170
Missouri	4,387	13	39	1,587	221	5	2,397	139	4,077	295	15	37	1,047	3,007	101	195
Montana	1,078	177	8	13	16	2	954	44	1,020	58	-	90	192	727	37	32
Nebraska	2,204	52	20	112	407	-	1,604	9	1,915	289	-	311	480	1,359	46	8

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Nevada	5,568	186	118	756	1,134	38	2,807	531	4,796	634	138	164	1,008	3,726	181	489
New Hampshire	1,452	9	14	37	157	3	900	332	1,326	117	9	55	251	692	29	425
New Jersey	15,864	65	328	3,218	2,511	39	8,054	1,653	13,212	1,795	857	470	2,963	8,480	442	3,509
New Mexico	1,658	87	14	42	1,063	-	446	75	1,546	105	7	109	330	1,144	45	30
New York	10,352	14	225	2,547	2,187	3	4,314	1,097	8,762	590	1,000	322	1,645	6,737	244	1,404
North Carolina	7,090	74	14	449	1,342	1	1,236	3,974	2,764	351	3,975	119	756	1,927	116	4,172
North Dakota	1,349	277	9	86	73	-	886	22	1,196	153	-	57	414	707	76	95
Ohio	11,917	39	45	2,381	339	10	7,250	1,865	10,252	1,186	479	462	2,315	5,894	1,706	1,540
Oklahoma	1,776	228	13	178	210	-	1,075	79	1,512	218	46	81	383	1,195	65	52
Oregon	3,640	46	79	180	533	21	2,293	504	3,225	378	37	83	766	2,455	126	210
Pennsylvania	10,741	9	156	2,377	858	33	5,522	1,786	9,947	793	1	478	1,283	6,514	909	1,557
Puerto Rico	561	-	-	-	555	-	4	2	561	-	-	11	77	299	149	25
Rhode Island	2,099	58	17	459	382	1	1,043	139	1,804	248	47	110	889	973	76	51
South Carolina	743	-	1	264	34	-	443	1	657	86	-	30	147	550	16	-
South Dakota	626	283	-	5	17	1	325	3	584	42	-	40	133	420	24	9
Tennessee	4,993	2	30	2,420	244	2	2,291	7	4,139	854	-	156	1,177	3,429	152	79
Texas	11,942	73	109	1,473	5,876	95	3,696	1,135	11,103	815	24	699	2,362	8,180	213	488
Utah	2,933	77	40	70	870	27	1,604	252	2,587	200	146	51	683	1,681	302	216
Vermont	892	10	10	35	19	-	660	169	851	38	3	46	155	561	23	107
Virgin Islands	809	2	1	483	183	1	50	89	606	196	7	239	128	420	16	6
Virginia	4,515	6	129	763	595	8	2,538	478	4,223	289	3	96	773	3,060	116	470
Washington	3,247	71	76	167	552	31	2,350	-	2,884	363	-	199	586	2,291	171	-
West Virginia	2,004	3	2	101	4	1	956	939	1,878	126	-	20	341	1,141	49	453
Wisconsin	1,677	47	246	229	169	2	884	107	1,569	105	3	223	321	1,010	61	62
Wyoming	1,848	88	11	39	281	3	1,384	55	1,650	198	-	22	286	1,028	144	368
TOTAL	199,571	4,353	2,951	39,293	33,083	1,104	94,680	25,453	170,965	17,108	11,498	9,747	39,602	115,653	7,818	26,751

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	64	22	9	137
Alaska	95	75	16	1,316
American Samoa	18	77	66	74
Arizona	119	252	94	435
Arkansas	194	193	167	420
California	234	865	89	352
Colorado	109	667	486	926
Connecticut	15	0	0	0
Delaware	33	104	99	192
District of Columbia	10	99	108	0
Florida	282	608	686	1,415
Georgia	374	479	425	1,364
Guam	0	0	0	59
Hawaii	29	27	61	125
Idaho	104	248	195	531
Illinois	115	524	214	34
Indiana	55	568	574	1,347
Iowa	144	418	414	1,182
Kansas	32	57	16	57
Kentucky	701	178	218	1,621
Louisiana	385	126	92	2,895
Maine	45	19	16	643
Maryland	541	813	595	1,464
Massachusetts	228	674	634	336
Michigan	386	170	130	1,062
Minnesota	504	71	84	864
Mississippi	50	28	30	459
Missouri	340	169	163	1,036
Montana	90	8	6	352
Nebraska	163	333	312	1,333
Nevada	187	312	152	1,482
New Hampshire	175	44	74	223
New Jersey	667	1,238	616	880
New Mexico	57	371	371	354
New York	768	1,644	1,275	773
North Carolina	75	1,014	875	1,061
North Dakota	113	16	9	274
Ohio	560	174	96	3,500
Oklahoma	158	183	7	700
Oregon	227	297	124	1,107
Pennsylvania	324	376	302	888
Puerto Rico	10	38	13	208
Rhode Island	40	212	41	8
South Carolina	24	29	8	141
South Dakota	33	7	4	519
Tennessee	131	189	172	1,842
Texas	705	3,035	2,373	2,098
Utah	170	528	339	619
Vermont	110	14	18	432
Virgin Islands	9	143	46	178
Virginia	166	480	514	1,244
Washington	428	306	230	1,251
West Virginia	82	12	2	614
Wisconsin	401	156	114	602
Wyoming	119	49	24	1,046
TOTAL	1,1198	18,739	13,798	44,075

Table B5b. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2010

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Alabama	1,107	88	174	132	35	905
Alaska	859	267	28	192	38	116
American Samoa	92	81	42	73	4	131
Arizona	1,360	210	151	73	32	120
Arkansas	2,295	268	574	104	24	17
California	1,987	301	645	369	250	1,566
Colorado	1,538	142	349	48	18	1,731
Connecticut	179	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	362	63	154	23	19	9
District of Columbia	267	11	218	6	2	2
Florida	7,470	1,152	1,392	48	18	588
Georgia	4,391	686	294	249	36	226
Guam	84	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	297	6	5	12	3	29
Idaho	742	120	170	78	8	31
Illinois	1,312	650	858	392	161	849
Indiana	2,928	346	652	202	38	183
Iowa	1,748	164	272	192	34	264
Kansas	169	39	178	45	17	127
Kentucky	2,399	133	207	17	14	35
Louisiana	2,951	560	702	204	62	120
Maine	624	15	61	29	4	-
Maryland	4,197	159	657	203	144	1,846
Massachusetts	2,323	556	1,363	346	95	684
Michigan	3,957	257	573	164	78	221
Minnesota	1,764	409	698	627	86	3,262
Mississippi	1,078	143	242	88	13	68
Missouri	2,815	463	967	117	32	167
Montana	646	69	72	69	27	195
Nebraska	947	664	443	134	11	5
Nevada	3,512	607	929	78	5	457
New Hampshire	945	211	94	93	13	98
New Jersey	7,295	1,596	3,501	752	204	2,568
New Mexico	895	183	133	122	23	380
New York	6,277	1,136	1,543	170	53	1,228
North Carolina	2,021	382	494	177	20	4,027
North Dakota	866	182	83	168	21	41
Ohio	7,566	1,470	1,268	568	122	977
Oklahoma	1,101	204	286	73	16	107
Oregon	2,464	313	438	196	39	214
Pennsylvania	8,309	638	867	337	129	627
Puerto Rico	618	1	7	1	3	4
Rhode Island	463	199	404	68	22	1,181
South Carolina	478	82	142	45	24	2
South Dakota	500	66	67	21	8	20
Tennessee	2,143	1,020	1,405	108	20	303
Texas	8,393	1,562	1,754	901	186	761
Utah	2,817	274	243	52	10	331
Vermont	684	55	126	71	8	63
Virgin Islands	493	215	45	51	4	1
Virginia	3,391	564	292	279	28	51
Washington	2,112	505	458	222	34	21
West Virginia	1,587	174	182	27	11	33
Wisconsin	1,030	386	189	196	23	112
Wyoming	1,042	186	341	186	23	88
TOTAL	119,890	20,233	27,432	9,198	2,352	27,192

Appendix B 2011

Table B1c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011

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	9	3	3	2	0	3	2	3	2	2	0	0	0
Alaska	11	0	0	1	0	2	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
Arizona	22	14	8	9	1	7	0	13	3	6	0	0	0
California	15	11	3	11	2	6	3	5	5	0	0	1	0
Colorado	33	10	7	6	4	4	4	24	1	1	0	0	0
Connecticut	32	6	4	6	2	0	2	28	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	5	2	1	0	2	3	0	3	0	1	1	0	0
District of Columbia	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	31	8	3	6	3	16	2	20	5	10	0	0	0
Georgia	6	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Guam	6	0	0	2	2	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
Hawaii	13	3	1	0	0	3	0	8	2	2	0	0	0
Idaho	12	3	0	1	1	1	2	8	0	1	0	0	0
Illinois	47	16	2	6	1	3	2	38	1	2	0	3	0
Indiana	23	10	8	2	6	4	2	18	2	2	0	0	0
Iowa	13	4	4	1	2	2	0	7	0	2	0	0	0
Kansas	9	3	1	2	0	1	2	5	0	1	0	1	0
Kentucky	20	7	4	8	5	4	10	15	0	1	0	0	0
Louisiana	11	4	3	1	4	3	1	7	1	2	0	0	0
Maine	5	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	1
Maryland	12	1	0	0	2	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	1
Massachusetts	28	3	4	3	39	16	2	14	10	6	0	0	0
Michigan	40	10	9	4	6	1	4	35	1	1	0	0	0
Minnesota	22	10	6	4	3	3	3	17	0	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	8	2	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0
Missouri	26	4	5	3	1	9	4	15	5	3	2	0	2
Montana	12	5	4	0	1	2	1	7	0	1	0	2	0
Nebraska	6	5	0	3	2	3	2	2	0	1	0	0	0
Nevada	10	5	3	4	1	3	2	8	0	1	0	0	0
New Hampshire	6	4	4	2	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0

Table B1c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2011

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
New Jersey	34	17	5	8	1	2	0	32	1	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	9	3	1	5	1	4	0	5	2	1	1	0	0
New York	36	15	11	7	7	11	2	23	3	5	0	1	1
North Carolina	19	2	3	4	1	8	2	13	5	2	0	0	0
North Dakota	14	6	3	0	1	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	28	6	4	6	3	9	2	18	8	3	0	0	0
Oklahoma	17	6	2	2	1	4	1	9	2	2	0	1	0
Oregon	28	6	2	3	4	2	2	23	0	1	0	1	0
Pennsylvania	23	18	8	16	1	9	4	15	7	6	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	15	3	2	1	1	2	0	12	0	1	0	0	0
Rhode Island	7	2	2	1	1	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	20	9	4	7	3	7	1	14	3	3	1	0	1
South Dakota	11	2	1	2	2	1	1	9	0	1	0	0	0
Tennessee	33	7	0	9	5	8	3	21	4	1	0	0	2
Texas	93	58	16	20	50	24	14	60	9	9	0	1	0
Utah	21	7	5	5	4	5	2	12	2	1	0	0	0
Vermont	10	4	3	2	0	2	1	9	2	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	5	1	1	2	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	0	0
West Virginia	17	7	5	4	1	2	0	9	7	5	0	0	0
Wisconsin	28	17	9	6	7	8	6	10	2	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	966	356	179	199	189	217	97	652	100	96	7	11	8

Table B2c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	9	3	196	196	0	0	196	192	4	0
Alaska	11	9	771	771	0	0	771	643	121	7
Arizona	23	13	831	823	8	0	831	728	89	14
California	17	5	166	166	0	0	166	-	166	0
Colorado	34	24	667	652	7	8	659	569	82	8
Connecticut	33	28	1,335	1,335	0	0	1,335	661	674	0
Delaware	5	3	293	293	0	0	293	284	7	2
District of Columbia	1	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0
Florida	33	20	3,930	3,763	163	4	3,926	3,857	62	7
Georgia	7	2	150	128	22	0	150	150	0	0
Guam	6	4	309	309	0	0	309	219	82	8
Hawaii	14	8	670	670	0	0	670	642	28	0
Idaho	12	8	796	789	3	4	792	581	143	68
Illinois	47	38	8,568	8,170	327	71	8,497	6,148	2,288	61
Indiana	27	18	1,720	1,712	8	0	1,720	1,400	164	156
Iowa	14	7	206	198	8	0	206	175	27	4
Kansas	9	5	230	214	8	8	222	140	74	8
Kentucky	21	15	3,308	3,300	1	7	3,301	3,193	98	10
Louisiana	12	7	1,057	1,007	13	37	1,020	938	79	3
Maine	6	3	235	230	5	0	235	226	2	7
Maryland	13	11	523	515	6	2	521	508	10	3
Massachusetts	62	14	2,455	2,445	10	0	2,455	2,413	36	6
Michigan	40	35	2,178	1,882	239	57	2,121	1,856	254	11
Minnesota	23	17	1,934	1,841	35	58	1,876	865	1,005	6
Mississippi	8	4	597	570	27	0	597	561	23	13
Missouri	28	15	1,564	1,300	18	246	1,318	1,272	23	23
Montana	13	7	253	248	3	2	251	184	59	8
Nebraska	7	2	182	182	0	0	182	53	129	0
Nevada	10	8	2,428	2,390	24	14	2,414	2,368	19	27
New Hampshire	6	2	66	66	0	0	66	57	1	8
New Jersey	34	32	5,272	5,259	0	13	5,259	5,111	129	19

Recovery Act S•T•O•P Program

Table B2c. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2011

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Mexico	11	5	105	103	2	0	105	91	13	1
New York	37	23	3,353	3,342	9	2	3,351	3,194	157	0
North Carolina	19	13	3,399	3,279	26	94	3,305	2,859	293	153
North Dakota	14	11	626	626	0	0	626	541	71	14
Ohio	29	18	1,924	1,847	49	28	1,896	1,528	224	144
Oklahoma	18	9	192	157	35	0	192	131	53	8
Oregon	28	23	1,276	1,134	141	1	1,275	1,107	108	60
Pennsylvania	24	15	4,152	4,084	28	40	4,112	3,220	796	96
Puerto Rico	16	12	1,305	1,291	11	3	1,302	1,300	1	1
Rhode Island	8	4	5,666	4,274	1,014	378	5,288	5,225	63	0
South Carolina	21	14	1,087	1,037	43	7	1,080	584	459	37
South Dakota	12	9	1,313	1,285	28	0	1,313	1,181	99	33
Tennessee	35	21	2,592	2,575	4	13	2,579	2,485	47	47
Texas	139	60	11,292	10,789	447	56	11,236	9,963	1,148	125
Utah	23	12	2,779	2,583	183	13	2,766	2,467	204	95
Vermont	13	9	246	227	16	3	243	148	83	12
Virgin Islands	5	4	622	545	77	0	622	548	54	20
Virginia	5	4	859	856	3	0	859	768	91	0
West Virginia	19	9	1,776	1,741	24	11	1,765	1,663	63	39
Wisconsin	33	10	889	864	18	7	882	270	603	9
TOTAL	1,094	652	88,343	84,063	3,093	1,187	87,156	75,267	10,508	1,381

Table B3c. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Alabama	196	-	-	46	2	-	77	71	192	4	-	-	4	35	-	157
Alaska	771	338	17	16	72	13	244	77	674	41	56	16	147	518	32	58
Arizona	831	47	9	31	265	3	351	130	736	60	35	26	127	426	78	174
California	166	-	8	18	86	-	52	2	148	18	-	98	36	31	1	-
Colorado	659	10	1	11	257	-	253	127	635	24	-	26	94	379	26	134
Connecticut	1,335	2	14	332	348	5	563	71	1,223	111	1	150	250	839	42	54
Delaware	293	-	-	85	30	-	172	6	274	18	1	3	114	161	10	5
District of Columbia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	3,926	11	20	863	606	2	2,494	185	3,371	535	20	118	775	2,796	147	90
Georgia	150	-	-	117	3	-	23	7	146	4	-	8	5	134	1	2
Guam	309	-	50	5	-	238	14	2	280	28	1	67	58	181	2	1
Hawaii	670	11	86	15	33	253	197	75	638	32	-	12	98	482	20	58
Idaho	792	5	2	5	316	6	453	5	761	31	-	32	182	557	21	-
Illinois	8,497	44	103	2,630	2,340	11	3,293	231	7,553	899	45	819	1,702	5,351	260	365
Indiana	1,720	8	6	163	135	-	1,383	25	1,550	170	-	114	332	1,090	72	112
Iowa	206	-	-	13	6	-	165	22	177	25	4	21	47	110	3	25
Kansas	222	5	-	23	78	-	83	36	177	37	8	13	42	134	9	24
Kentucky	3,301	7	22	409	141	11	2,475	238	3,203	98	-	46	865	2,234	98	58
Louisiana	1,020	2	7	472	63	3	454	19	833	180	7	30	258	692	22	18
Maine	235	12	5	10	11	-	135	62	219	11	5	3	71	125	2	34
Maryland	521	1	6	190	80	4	237	13	450	71	-	14	121	371	15	-
Massachusetts	2,455	-	23	279	395	-	1,557	217	2,136	314	5	65	465	1,800	76	49
Michigan	2,121	32	13	568	149	2	1,115	242	1,991	129	1	134	501	1,327	21	138
Minnesota	1,876	347	63	356	71	2	854	183	1,683	98	95	450	656	619	29	122
Mississippi	597	6	7	217	12	1	299	55	548	12	37	27	122	362	7	79
Missouri	1,318	10	3	346	71	1	658	239	1,261	57	-	14	276	760	24	244
Montana	251	42	1	1	45	-	141	21	231	20	-	30	54	138	25	4
Nebraska	182	2	1	15	15	-	149	-	174	8	-	4	47	129	2	-
Nevada	2,414	98	44	438	512	8	1,089	225	1,943	422	49	84	549	1,568	93	120
New Hampshire	66	1	-	1	2	1	61	-	51	15	-	2	11	25	1	27

Recovery Act S•T•O•P Program

Table B3c. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
New Jersey	5,259	2	90	830	564	8	3,052	713	4,257	580	422	99	847	2,934	151	1,228
New Mexico	105	4	1	-	54	-	25	21	102	3	-	5	6	87	3	4
New York	3,351	2	63	851	352	1	1,943	195	3,216	134	1	95	548	2,470	76	162
North Carolina	3,305	265	5	387	1,435	2	1,041	181	2,785	483	37	190	773	1,928	132	282
North Dakota	626	72	2	12	10	-	491	39	591	35	-	14	165	437	9	1
Ohio	1,896	54	6	129	180	-	1,411	122	1,670	158	68	69	325	1,182	48	272
Oklahoma	192	27	1	7	57	-	97	3	170	22	-	8	30	145	4	5
Oregon	1,275	25	35	124	197	13	845	48	1,154	119	2	31	264	803	66	111
Pennsylvania	4,112	4	93	1,158	510	2	1,824	521	3,835	256	21	177	550	2,310	369	706
Puerto Rico	1,302	-	-	-	1,298	-	4	-	1,302	-	-	26	221	911	128	16
Rhode Island	5,288	28	39	455	711	-	2,573	1,482	4,399	781	108	89	2,104	1,799	219	1,077
South Carolina	1,080	2	4	489	46	1	492	46	913	135	32	118	232	615	19	96
South Dakota	1,313	600	9	19	34	8	539	104	1,106	204	3	87	214	708	21	283
Tennessee	2,579	1	15	1,233	142	-	1,113	75	2,122	436	21	66	694	1,618	117	84
Texas	11,236	74	101	1,447	6,140	12	3,396	729	10,121	1,102	13	358	3,126	6,855	120	777
Utah	2,766	77	38	38	500	13	2,029	71	2,656	109	1	62	720	1,876	72	36
Vermont	243	3	1	8	4	1	196	30	229	9	5	17	56	124	22	24
Virgin Islands	622	-	-	364	211	-	44	3	422	200	-	25	86	457	43	11
Virginia	859	-	12	209	35	-	597	6	829	30	-	2	63	791	3	-
West Virginia	1,765	1	9	145	21	-	1,011	580	1,444	292	29	46	322	930	97	370
Wisconsin	882	11	129	141	79	1	452	69	806	65	11	175	236	414	41	16
TOTAL	87,156	2,293	1,164	15,721	18,724	626	42,216	7,624	77,387	8,625	1,144	4,185	19,591	52,768	2,899	7,713

Table B4c. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	1	0	0	22
Alaska	61	72	78	659
Arizona	65	111	22	319
California	1	0	0	0
Colorado	42	148	138	266
Connecticut	172	111	28	18
Delaware	15	23	24	136
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	199	193	74	508
Georgia	5	3	3	65
Guam	2	4	0	64
Hawaii	26	39	19	247
Idaho	35	131	106	515
Illinois	287	1,130	363	266
Indiana	40	117	99	1,018
Iowa	6	3	0	71
Kansas	8	81	22	34
Kentucky	545	110	107	1745
Louisiana	14	62	58	486
Maine	19	16	16	235
Maryland	37	76	76	107
Massachusetts	62	133	81	151
Michigan	247	92	93	408
Minnesota	270	38	40	522
Mississippi	26	5	5	432
Missouri	109	70	64	374
Montana	21	1	0	158
Nebraska	6	10	12	20
Nevada	33	96	15	783
New Hampshire	3	1	0	0
New Jersey	135	229	132	193
New Mexico	3	22	23	25
New York	132	219	114	1,141
North Carolina	32	1,289	849	1,237
North Dakota	27	4	4	91
Ohio	121	46	3	412
Oklahoma	28	45	21	106

Recovery Act S•T•O•P Program

Table B4c. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2011

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Oregon	76	155	100	451
Pennsylvania	158	258	149	484
Puerto Rico	113	375	129	175
Rhode Island	27	200	24	0
South Carolina	25	27	14	203
South Dakota	109	20	14	280
Tennessee	49	98	83	413
Texas	371	4,375	3,778	1,779
Utah	131	216	49	363
Vermont	48	1	2	152
Virgin Islands	12	103	13	421
Virginia	44	22	43	675
West Virginia	79	15	0	524
Wisconsin	62	62	21	241
TOTAL	4,139	10,657	7,108	18,995

Table B5c. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2011

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Alabama	30	3	5	0	1	157
Alaska	451	149	14	63	17	79
Arizona	597	100	87	27	9	47
California	8	43	13	64	36	2
Colorado	389	45	72	20	11	122
Connecticut	588	231	72	244	63	137
Delaware	197	23	63	7	0	3
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	2,681	439	489	17	2	306
Georgia	150	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	221	58	1	27	2	1
Hawaii	559	72	16	5	1	17
Idaho	491	73	179	41	4	4
Illinois	3,435	1,653	2,223	571	400	677
Indiana	1,079	172	321	162	24	55
Iowa	138	22	29	16	1	0
Kansas	102	17	20	28	6	49
Kentucky	2,792	71	273	32	9	143
Louisiana	728	92	26	63	2	109
Maine	230	5	0	0	0	0
Maryland	489	18	21	1	0	0
Massachusetts	1,175	243	925	40	8	148
Michigan	1,587	105	249	98	29	105
Minnesota	909	191	107	403	58	330
Mississippi	425	98	58	2	2	35
Missouri	968	44	119	163	2	22
Montana	83	67	37	20	5	39
Nebraska	74	9	14	68	13	4
Nevada	1,038	315	771	61	13	222
New Hampshire	52	8	8	0	1	0
New Jersey	3,084	490	1,286	99	13	360
New Mexico	76	6	13	4	6	0
New York	2,461	228	344	35	14	274
North Carolina	1,767	406	806	135	25	239
North Dakota	436	57	69	39	22	4
Ohio	615	119	135	91	10	926

Recovery Act S•T•O•P Program

Table B5c. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2011

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Oklahoma	120	20	25	17	7	14
Oregon	943	112	128	60	5	47
Pennsylvania	2,845	375	385	234	56	283
Puerto Rico	1,167	1	130	2	1	13
Rhode Island	2,280	593	2,395	17	4	1
South Carolina	474	65	149	166	124	108
South Dakota	1,162	70	59	32	14	4
Tennessee	1,929	342	271	39	6	36
Texas	8,348	1306	1,165	674	138	812
Utah	2,157	150	160	59	8	236
Vermont	135	20	35	40	4	15
Virgin Islands	476	108	22	7	11	0
Virginia	686	67	30	70	1	5
West Virginia	768	267	446	160	16	178
Wisconsin	258	142	78	197	104	110
TOTAL	53,853	9,310	14,343	4,420	1,308	6,478

Appendix B 2012

Table B1d. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2012

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Arkansas	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	7	1	1	0	0	0
Illinois	11	4	0	0	0	3	0	7	0	2	0	3	0
Indiana	5	1	2	0	1	3	2	3	0	1	0	0	0
Iowa	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	5	1	3	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	0
Maine	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Missouri	5	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	0	1
Nebraska	4	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Nevada	3	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	7	1	1	2	0	2	0	5	0	2	0	0	0
Oregon	3	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Rhode Island	3	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	11	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	0
Wisconsin	17	8	1	3	1	5	2	2	0	2	3	0	0
TOTAL	113	37	15	10	14	27	10	54	12	16	5	3	1

Table B2d. Number of Recovery Act STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2012

State	Subgrants	Subgrants using funds for victim services	Victims seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially Served	Not Served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Arkansas	8	7	483	481	2	0	483	479	4	0
Illinois	11	7	3,698	3,553	118	27	3,671	2,946	643	82
Indiana	6	3	427	423	4	0	427	368	46	13
Iowa	17	16	300	297	3	0	300	255	41	4
Louisiana	6	3	1,549	1,314	235	0	1,549	1,484	8	57
Maine	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	3	1	68	68	0	0	68	68	0	0
Missouri	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	4	1	10	10	0	0	10	10	0	0
Nevada	3	2	388	388	0	0	388	381	0	7
Ohio	7	5	615	615	0	0	615	417	196	2
Oregon	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	4	2	104	104	0	0	104	89	14	1
Puerto Rico	4	1	160	160	0	0	160	160	0	0
Rhode Island	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	4	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
West Virginia	11	3	273	273	0	0	273	269	3	1
Wisconsin	20	2	191	191	0	0	191	0	191	0
TOTAL	120	54	8,267	7,878	362	27	8,240	6,927	1,146	167

Table B3d. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Total Served	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
		American Indian /Alaska Native	Asian	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	16-24	25-59	60+	Unknown
Arkansas	483	2	1	58	6	0	414	2	423	58	2	10	95	350	24	4
Illinois	3,671	7	54	1,085	978	3	1,469	88	3,270	393	8	273	671	2,611	116	0
Indiana	427	1	1	9	50	0	299	67	385	42	0	71	78	250	5	23
Iowa	300	18	7	32	7	0	227	10	280	20	0	22	93	178	5	2
Louisiana	1,549	0	7	1,053	57	0	428	4	1,415	134	0	10	356	1,134	34	15
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	68	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	14	54	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Nevada	388	2	12	98	80	0	194	2	289	99	0	20	88	258	20	2
Ohio	615	1	2	123	12	0	466	13	598	17	0	55	182	359	19	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	104	0	0	0	0	0	13	91	104	0	0	0	3	10	0	91
Puerto Rico	160	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	35	125	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
West Virginia	273	1	0	98	4	0	166	4	240	33	0	8	45	202	16	2
Wisconsin	191	4	1	26	31	0	109	20	175	16	0	17	54	95	8	17
TOTAL	8,240	36	85	2,650	1,386	3	3,795	301	7,418	812	10	486	1,714	5,636	248	156

Table B4d. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving Recovery Act STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2012

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Arkansas	20	4	0	114
Illinois	119	497	224	45
Indiana	5	49	17	225
Iowa	26	11	8	161
Louisiana	22	40	34	72
Maine	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	1	1	1
Nevada	0	19	6	106
Ohio	7	0	0	279
Oregon	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	6	11	4	13
Puerto Rico	0	0	15	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	1
West Virginia	4	60	6	162
Wisconsin	5	16	2	52
TOTAL	214	708	317	1,231

Table B5d. Victims' relationships to offender for victims served with Recovery Act STOP Program funds, by state: 2012

State	Current/ former spouse or intimate partner	Other family or household member	Dating	Acquaintance	Stranger	Relationship unknown
Arkansas	293	89	68	28	0	5
Illinois	1,693	592	925	246	100	195
Indiana	189	37	103	18	4	76
Iowa	205	49	26	20	5	12
Louisiana	653	0	845	24	2	28
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	14	0	54	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	10	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	108	84	149	20	0	27
Ohio	395	87	4	81	26	26
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	103	0	1	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	153	0	5	2	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	1	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	167	34	41	22	0	9
Wisconsin	3	18	2	37	24	107
TOTAL	3,986	991	2,223	498	161	485