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Introduction

The STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2012 Report 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. Part B of 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 2009 and 2010.

The section entitled “Background” (page 2) 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. “STOP Program 2009 and 2010: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar years 2009 and 2010—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 87) 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/survivors served on a state-by-state basis.

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

---

1 The STOP report previous to this one, called the STOP Program 2010 Report, was based on 2007 STOP Program data, which is reported annually, and was submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2010; this 2012 report is based on 2008, 2009, and 2010 data and is submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2012. Part A of this report is based on 2008 data only. Part B of the report is based on 2009 and 2010 data, which will bring STOP Program reporting into timely conformance with the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) 2005 requirement for biennial reporting on the effectiveness of all grant programs, including the STOP Program. Previous STOP Program reports can be found at http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/ovwrptcongress.htm. The STOP Program 2014 Report, based on 2011 and 2012 data, will also be timely and in compliance with those reporting requirements.

2 During this time period, data have also been collected from grantees that received additional funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). This report does not include data from STOP grantees funded under ARRA. That data will be addressed at the completion of these awards.

3 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.
Background

Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program

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

By statute, STOP Program funds may be used for the following purposes:4

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

4 VAWA 2005 added three purpose areas to the STOP Program, which are included as the last three bullets in this list. STOP subgrantees began reporting that their activities addressed these new purpose areas for the first time during calendar year 2008; prior to that, the reporting form did not allow them to do so.
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 violence against women that are sensitive to the needs and safety of victims and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States carry out these strategies by forging lasting partnerships between the criminal justice system and victim-advocacy organizations and by encouraging communities to look beyond traditional resources to new partners, such as faith-

---

5 In most instances this report’s use of the term “victim” is also intended to include “survivor,” as in “victim-survivor.” Exceptions include certain statutory wording and other terms of art that refer only to “victim”; in those instances the original wording has not been changed. The word “victim” may also appear without “survivor” to avoid awkward wording or to simplify displays of data.
Based and community organizations, to respond more vigorously to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes.

For fiscal year 2009, states were encouraged to develop and support projects to:

- Implement culturally competent services and community-driven initiatives, utilizing faith-based and community organizations, to address the needs of underserved, cultural and linguistic populations as defined by VAWA, including people with disabilities and elder victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

- Address sexual assault and stalking through service expansion; development and implementation of protocols; training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to violence against women.

- Enhance or strengthen statewide collaboration efforts among law enforcement, prosecution, non-profit/non-governmental victim service providers, including faith-based and community organizations; and courts in addressing violence against women.

- Develop, strengthen or enhance statewide court initiatives that implement innovative court procedures and practices to address violence against women.

For fiscal year 2010, states were encouraged to develop and support projects that:

- Support core services for victims of sexual and domestic violence, particularly support for rape crisis centers and shelters.

- Expand the options available to battered women by increasing and expanding the utilization of civil legal services, particularly for battered women who are in danger of losing custody to perpetrators of sexual and domestic violence.

- Provide comprehensive culturally specific services beyond bilingual advocacy.

- Provide basic and advanced training to Tribal law enforcement and Tribal courts.

- Provide basic and advanced training to target elder abuse violence against women programs.

- Provide basic and advanced training and services that address the intersection of domestic violence and prisoner reentry, providing advocacy services to battered women convicted of crimes, victims of prison rape, and women whose batterers are returning from prison.
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, including the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia, are eligible to apply for STOP Program grants to address the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Funds are distributed to the states according to the following formula: a base award of $600,000 is made to each state, and

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

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

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

---

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

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

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.⁸ 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.

---

⁸ Beginning in fiscal year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting 3-year implementation plans and annual updates.
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 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.

Measuring the effectiveness of the STOP Program and other OVW-funded grant programs is a uniquely challenging task. Between 1998 and 2003, states receiving STOP Program funds were required to submit data in the Subgrant Award and Performance Report (SAPR) reflecting how they and their subgrantees were using these funds. However, OVW was interested in gathering information about all grant-funded activities in a more uniform and comprehensive manner.
In late 2001, the Muskie School and OVW began developing progress report forms for grantees to use to collect data and report on their activities and effectiveness. This process was informed by extensive consultation with OVW grantees, experts in the field, and OVW staff concerning the kinds of measures that would best reflect the goals of the OVW grant programs and whether those goals were being achieved. The report forms included measures identified in the collaborative process and outcome measures identified by OVW as indicators of the effectiveness of the funded programs for purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

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

Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the STOP administrator and subgrantee report forms for the STOP Program in early 2005 and worked with Muskie School staff on revisions to the forms to reflect VAWA 2005 changes. Throughout this period, the Muskie School has provided ongoing, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms. Administrators submit annual STOP 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. Currently, states are required to submit both reports to OVW by March 30 of each year.

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 recently released 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](http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulatrain.htm)
STOP Program 2009 and 2010: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,305 subgrantees in 2009 and 2,274 subgrantees in 2010 from all 50 states, all 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by the 56 STOP administrators about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar years 2009 and 2010. 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.10

How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program requires that each state distribute its funds according to a specific formula: at least 25 percent each for law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent for victim services, and 5 percent for state and local courts (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(c)(3)).11 Tables 1a and 1b show the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories in 2009 and 2010.

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation category</th>
<th>Number of awards to subgrantees</th>
<th>Total funding in category ($)</th>
<th>Percentage of total dollars awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5,440,858</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>29,485,969</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>29,748,897</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim services</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>42,395,776</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,099,498</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

11 STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim-witness specialists in those agencies.
Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation category</th>
<th>Number of awards to subgrantees</th>
<th>Total funding in category ($)</th>
<th>Percentage of total dollars awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary(^{12})</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6,992,597</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>121,163,595</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 1b. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation category</th>
<th>Number of awards to subgrantees</th>
<th>Total funding in category ($)</th>
<th>Percentage of total dollars awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7,327,841</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>36,592,875</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>34,993,756</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim services</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>51,371,186</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,844,065</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary(^{13})</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>7,952,147</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>149,081,870</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

\(^{12}\) Examples of awards reported in this category include training and technical assistance to law enforcement, sexual assault nurse examiners (SANEs), and government agency staff; SANE programs; batterer intervention programs (BIPs); data collection systems; supervised visitation and exchange; and coordinated community response (CCR).

\(^{13}\) Examples of awards reported in this category include training to law enforcement, medical personnel, and SANEs; fatality review; technology projects such as database and communication systems for criminal justice subgrantees; CCR; and BIPs.
In 2009, 52 states made 271 awards totaling $9,610,196 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 22.7 percent of funds awarded for victim services. In 2010, 53 states made 279 awards totaling $10,634,157 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 22.2 percent of funds awarded for victim services.  

How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

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/survivors. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims/survivors represent 55 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs. By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 10 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. An annual average of 67 percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims/survivors, 43 percent used funds to provide training, 33.2 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 13 percent for law enforcement activities, 13 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

In 2009 and 2010, 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 453,000 victims/survivors received services supported by STOP Program funds each year (of 459,000 victims/survivors who sought services). Although the majority were white (55 percent), female (91 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (67 percent), subgrantees reported that 23 percent of the victims/survivors they served were black or African-American.
and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.\textsuperscript{18} Twenty-six percent of the victims/survivors served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims/survivors used victim advocacy (210,800), crisis intervention (202,300), and criminal justice advocacy (148,800) in greater numbers than any other services.\textsuperscript{19} In addition, a total\textsuperscript{20} of more than 679,000 hotline calls were received from primary victims/survivors during 2009 and 2010.

\textbf{Training.} From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about violence against women. The fact that 30 percent of all people trained with STOP Program funds (a total of more than 148,600 individuals) during this 2-year period were law enforcement officers 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 51,600 trained. A total of more than 490,400 professionals or volunteers acting in the role of a professional were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2-year period.

\textbf{Officers.} Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 150,000 calls for assistance, to investigate more than 152,600 incidents of violence, and to serve nearly 39,000 protection orders during the 2-year period. STOP Program-funded officers arrested nearly 60,000 offenders and made only 2,350 dual arrests.

\textbf{Prosecutors.} STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of a total of nearly 208,000 cases during calendar years 2009 and 2010, with an overall conviction rate of 68 percent.\textsuperscript{21} Approximately 127,500 of those were domestic violence misdemeanor cases, 66 percent of which were disposed of through convictions.

\section*{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 2009 and 2010. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services projects.

\textsuperscript{18} These percentages are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom race/ethnicity was known. This may represent an undercounting of the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for nearly 10 percent of victims/survivors was reported as unknown for these reporting periods. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this race/ethnicity information, as it could prevent victims/survivors from seeking further help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims/survivors presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim/survivor’s safety, service providers are advised not to collect it.

\textsuperscript{19} Victims/survivors were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year; these numbers are approximate averages.

\textsuperscript{20} Throughout this report, unless otherwise indicated, “total” represents 2009 and 2010 data added together.

\textsuperscript{21} This rate includes deferred adjudications.
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose area</th>
<th>Average Subgrantees (N = 2,290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies, protocols, orders, and services</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized units (law enforcement, judges, court personnel, prosecutors)</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of statewide coordinated community responses</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to victims in immigration matters</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking initiatives</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of data collection and communication systems</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to assist older and disabled victims</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the needs and circumstances of American Indian tribes</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the placement of special victim assistants</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, victim services, and protocols addressing domestic violence committed by law enforcement</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim services projects</td>
<td>1,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Each subgrantee was able to select all relevant purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar years 2009 and 2010. Thus, the total number of purpose areas is greater than the total number of subgrantees.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

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

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of agency</th>
<th>2009 Subgrantees (N=2,305)</th>
<th>2010 Subgrantees (N=2,274)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual (domestic violence/sexual assault) program</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence program</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault program</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based organization</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of local government</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault state coalition</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence state coalition</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation, parole, or other correctional agency</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual state coalition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal coalition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Of the organizations listed above, an average of 55 reported that they were faith-based and 129 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, dating violence decreased from 33 percent in 2008 to 31 percent in 2009 and decreased further to 29 percent in 2010. The percentage addressing domestic
violence, dating violence and either sexual assault or stalking rose from 55 percent in 2008 to 57 percent in 2009 and to 59 percent in 2010 (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 12 percent.

### Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of victimization</th>
<th>2009 Subgrantees (N =2,305)</th>
<th>2010 Subgrantees (N =2,274)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence only</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault only</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence and sexual assault</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence and stalking</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault and stalking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 87.)

Coordinated Community Response

Developing and/or participating in a coordinated community response (CCR) to address violence against women is an essential and fundamental component of the STOP Program and all other OVW-funded programs. A CCR brings together criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, social services program staff, and others to create a multidisciplinary, integrated response that holds offenders accountable for violent crimes against women and develops and strengthens services to the victims/survivors of these crimes. Research shows that efforts to respond to violence against women are most effective when integrated as part of a CCR (DePrince, Belknap, Labus, Buckingham, & Gover, 2012; Shepard & Pence, 1999; Shepard, 1999).

CCRs initially focused on reform of the criminal legal system. In many communities, representatives of women’s centers met with representatives of the legal system to discuss reforms in the operating protocols of each sector to enhance safety for victims and accountability for perpetrators. Policies and practices were modified, practitioners received training on the revisions in practice, and systems were developed to evaluate adherence to the reforms.

These reform efforts did not necessarily foster meaningful collaboration, however. Participants learned that more was needed, including a more unified vision of the goals of reform, fundamental principles of intervention, the roles of each sector, the merits of collaboration, and the need for public accountability. CCRs moved to cross-disciplinary collaborations that addressed the shortcomings of previous reform efforts.

An example of such cross-disciplinary collaboration is the “safety audit” process, which develops policies and implementation protocols, practice guidelines, and forms. The focus of an audit is the gap between institutional practices and the needs and experiences of both victims/survivors and perpetrators. The process engages all

22 Renamed “Best Practice Assessment of Community Response to Domestic Violence,” tools for Audits/Assessments in criminal justice and other government systems can be found at http://www.praxisinternational.org/praxis_safety_audits_resources.aspx.
sectors of the criminal legal system and victim services agencies in local, cross-disciplinary teams to examine current policies, protocols, guidelines, forms, and work routines and then evaluate whether they strengthen or impede safety for victims/survivors of domestic violence. The audits are then used to produce recommendations for systemic change (Praxis International, 2010).  

For example, a Georgia study examined the impact of a CCR on community systems and attitudes. The study evaluated the criminal justice system’s response in two counties to determine whether the practices of CCR participants changed because of their collaboration. It also documented the effect of CCR intervention on the legal sanctions imposed on batterers. CCR activities included the following: participation on a community task force on family violence, education of task force members on the elements of the CCR, implementation of a batterer intervention program (BIP), extensive training of law enforcement agencies, and a public awareness campaign. Researchers found statistically significant changes in systemic responses in responses after implementation of the CCR, including increases in the number of arrests in both counties and a higher prosecution rate in one county. In the county that increased its prosecution rate of domestic violence offenders, researchers observed that more offenders were sentenced to probation and BIPs and fewer received fines. However, there was no difference in the numbers of convicted offenders sentenced to jail or in the amount of jail time to which they were sentenced. The amount of the fines did increase (Salazar, Emshoff, Baker, & Crowley, 2007).

A study of participants in 51 domestic violence collaboratives in the Midwest framed the success of CCRs in terms of the capacity of the legal system and victim services and the benefits not just for victims but for CCR participants as well. The study found that organizations participating in domestic violence collaboratives experienced three types of mutually reinforcing outcomes, including increased knowledge and awareness of who does what in the community system, expanded social capital that results in increased referrals and services for victims, and increased influence in important decision-making processes within legal system sectors (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2011).

An evaluation of Illinois’ statewide network of family violence coordinating councils, one of the major mechanisms for coordinating interagency intervention to address domestic violence, found that the councils facilitated stronger relationships and enhanced knowledge among stakeholders. This evaluation also found a positive relationship between the formation and development of the councils and the rate of emergency protection orders that became final orders (Allen et al., 2009).

A re-examination of data from 10 CCR projects funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified several factors associated with higher rates of

---

23 In St. Paul, MN, a safety audit was the starting place for the development of the “Blueprint for Safety: An Interagency Response to Domestic Violence Crimes” (Pence & Eng, 2010).
victim/survivor contact with intimate partner violence (IPV)\textsuperscript{24} services. Those factors included developing goals and selecting priorities based on community needs, coordinating services, and disseminating information on the prevalence of IPV in the community (Klevens, Baker, Shelley, & Ingram, 2008).

Traditionally, CCR has referred to the criminal justice system and organizations serving victims/survivors, but the concept of “community” may be expanded to include employers, churches, community groups, families, social groups, and neighbors. In particular, including employers in the coordinated response could impact a survivor’s financial security and—because employers are in a position to affect domestic violence-related policies and procedures in the workplace—they could contribute to changing social attitudes about IPV (Pennington-Zoellner, 2009).

The following is an example of a STOP Program-funded victim services agency that has reached out to community partners in three small towns, fostering relationships and creating a safety net for victims/survivors:

\textbf{SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE}

STOP funding allows us to dedicate advocate time to our outreach offices in Milo, Greenville, and Dexter [Maine]. This availability contributes to victims’ perception and reality of a community-based safety net which, in turn, fosters more community partnerships. For instance, our donated office space in Dexter is located next to the general assistance workers’ office, the community clothing closet, and food cupboard. Victims of domestic and dating violence are referred to other necessary services and vice versa. The environment fostered in this community space creates a safety net around victims who are then more likely to reach out and refer others for services.

\textit{—Womencare/Aegis Association, Maine}

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. 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.

The requirement that STOP Program-funded agencies communicate and collaborate with criminal justice system and community partners leads to the creation and

\textsuperscript{24} “Intimate partner violence” and “domestic violence” are used interchangeably to mean violence that is committed by intimate partners.
implementation of protocols, an increase in cross-referrals, and a more comprehensive response to the needs of victims/survivors:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

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

—STOP administrator, Pennsylvania

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

The emphasis by the grant provider to coordinate our actions with those of other agencies that have joined in the fight against domestic violence convinced us of the need to pursue collaborative efforts on behalf of the victims. Instead of simply doing our part without further thought to other resources available to the victims, we became aware of other organizations and their ability to fill the needs of the victims that could not be met by the prosecutor’s office. As a result, we are able to pursue criminal prosecution of these cases while, at the same time, directing the victims to the appropriate agencies that may assist them with counseling, shelter, emergency funds, and substance abuse issues.

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

CCR efforts at the community level often include sexual assault response teams (SARTs) and domestic abuse or domestic violence response teams (DARTs or DVRTs). SARTs, often organized around sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, coordinate the efforts of medical providers, counselors, advocates, and criminal justice agencies to improve the response to sexual assault victims/survivors. Some SARTs have case-specific discussions, while others study systemic responses. SART programs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care for women who have been sexually assaulted, improve the quality of forensic evidence, improve law enforcement’s ability to collect information and to file charges, and increase the likelihood of successful prosecution (Campbell, Bybee, Ford, & Patterson, 2008; Campbell, Patterson, & Lichty, 2005; Crandall & Helitzer, 2003).

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

STOP Program funding allowed us the opportunity to provide the energized leadership and coordination required to sustain a fully participatory and effective sexual assault response team (SART). In our county, the grant has paid for the organization and leadership of the SART, as well as ensuring effective victim advocacy participation at all times. The SART grant provided the staffing resources to take Tulare County from a place that had lost one hospital-based forensic program and was about to lose another, was unable to examine children, and did not have effective or well-attended multidisciplinary meetings to a county that has a solid and financially secure SANE program, has a permanent hospital-related exam site that is victim-centered and fully meets all confidentiality concerns. . . has regular SART meetings attended by up to 30 individuals including representatives of most of the 9 law enforcement agencies in the county, 2 to 3 ADA’s [assistant district attorneys], probation, CWS [child welfare services], forensic nurses, and advocates. [The county also] has procedures for interagency problem solving, provides professional cross-training in order to strengthen appropriate and comprehensive victim support as well as successful arrest and prosecution, [and] has SART volunteers and backup volunteers on call for all nights and weekends. While we are a rural and relatively small community, we are forward-thinking. Our SART recognizes the need to not only maintain our comprehensive, coordinated services but also to reach out to a broader support constituency comprised of medical providers, the faith community, business, social services agencies, and other community-based programs.

—Family Services of Tulare County, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has been instrumental in the partnership development between the Coordinated Community Response Team/Sexual Assault Response Team and the law enforcement agencies, advocates, and prosecution. The funding has also provided much needed training for law enforcement, advocates, prosecution, mental health professionals, and social workers. This has provided the development of a communication pipeline for all disciplines, enhancing the services to the victim/survivor and ensuring the case has many checks and balances to lessen the chance of the case getting lost in the system.

—District Attorney District 27, Oklahoma
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 902, or 39 percent, of all subgrantees), domestic violence organizations (854, or 37 percent), courts (690, or 30 percent), and prosecutors (560, or 25 percent). 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 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.

---

25 More complete data on CCR activities can be found in Tables 12a and 12b.
The following subgrantee narrative describes the frequent interactions that can occur in STOP Program-funded CCRs:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The coordinated community response activities that are funded/supported by the STOP Program subgrant have been extremely beneficial in the prosecution of domestic violence in Marshall County. The domestic violence prosecutor attends weekly meetings with the Domestic Abuse Response Team, comprised of a detective from the police department, an advocate from the shelter, and a corrections officer. These meetings are used to exchange information about cases, get and give information regarding victim’s services, and share ideas and suggestions.

—Marshall County Attorney’s Office, Iowa

In addition to collaborating with other organizations in response to specific victims/survivors 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 decisionmakers, able to direct the implementation of protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration.

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

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The sexual assault resource team (SART) in Grafton County is comprised of law enforcement, sexual assault nurse examiners, counseling services, domestic violence crisis center advocates, and prosecutors. The SART team meets monthly and holds regular training for law enforcement in an effort to keep them apprised of best practices. Over the last year, a focus on strangulation (as new laws apply), domestic violence in an intimate partner environment, and a focus on sexual assaults perpetrated against victims through the use of alcohol have been a primary focus of the team. Through the team’s collaboration, we have been able to move several cases that were stymied in the investigative component of the criminal process and move them forward toward adjudication through case review and discussion, while honoring the needs, desires and concerns of the various victims we served.

—Plymouth State University Police Department, New Hampshire

The data in Table 5 reflect the specific community agencies and organizations with which STOP subgrantees met on a weekly or monthly basis to address issues in 2009 and 2010.
Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/organization</th>
<th>Average Subgrantees (N = 2,285)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence organization</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor’s office</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service organization</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault organization</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/mental health organization</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/survivors, 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

Funds for training may be distributed to organizations on the state or local level. In the following example, STOP Program funds were used to provide multidisciplinary training to rural agencies in Colorado:
A statewide legal immigration organization in Alaska used STOP Program funds to provide much-needed training to a range of professionals in remote areas throughout the state who were responding to the needs of immigrant victims/survivors:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

The EVAW [Ending Violence Against Women] Program has provided multidisciplinary training and technical assistance to rural communities that had limited access to these resources. Most of the rural agencies have very limited funds for training but they want someone with experience and credibility to come to their community to support their efforts. The STOP Program funding allows the EVAW Project to provide them with quality training in their community that is accessible and affordable. The project has helped agencies to address the needs that have been identified as barriers to safety and accountability. Professionals from each discipline learn how to strengthen their skills and collaborate with the other agencies in their community. The project’s team of 35 expert trainers, and a continually updated curriculum, coordinated by two staff members, is a valuable resource to professionals that has a lasting impact. This would not be possible without the STOP Program funding.

—Colorado District Attorneys’ Council

STOP Program funding has been critical to the provision of services to immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault victims. As the only agency in Alaska dedicated to providing comprehensive immigration legal services and the only agency with the expertise to provide legal services to immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors/victims, our staff address the complex intersection of violence, limited English proficiency, and immigration status. Training of law enforcement, health care professionals, domestic violence and sexual assault program staff and judges is essential in order to provide protection and safety to domestic violence and sexual assault victims. STOP funding has allowed AIJP [Alaska Immigration Justice Project] staff to travel to remote communities in Alaska with large immigrant communities to train professionals working in these communities. Training has been instrumental in increasing outreach to immigrants residing in these communities. During this reporting period, AUP’s STOP-funded staff traveled to Petersburg, Cordova, Fairbanks, and Juneau, communities that are only accessible by plane or ferry, [and] where there are large numbers of immigrants working in canneries, hotels and restaurants.

—Alaska Immigration Justice Project

STOP Program funds in Wisconsin were used to send judges and county commissioners to national training on domestic violence and to provide in-state training to judicial officers and other court staff on domestic violence and sexual assault:
As first responders, law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping the victim/survivor safe and ensuring offender accountability. Ongoing training for law enforcement is essential, because of high rates of attrition, emerging knowledge about violence against women, and the fact that best practices develop and change over time.

An example of emerging knowledge is the finding that attempted strangulation is prevalent in domestic violence assaults. In a study of 300 attempted strangulation cases in San Diego, researchers found that most strangulation produces minor or no visible injuries, but many victims suffer internal injuries and experience trauma symptoms; that strangulation is gender-based (299 of 300 perpetrators were men), that most offenders do not use strangulation to kill but to demonstrate that they can kill, and that victims of prior attempted strangulations are at seven times greater risk of homicide than victims with no history of strangulation. For these reasons, training about strangulation is critical for police and prosecutors (Strack & Gwinn, 2011).

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

---

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Because of STOP Program funding, we were able to send judges and a court commissioner to highly regarded and developed national trainings on domestic violence. These trainings provide curriculum unique to the court system and create an environment for judges and court commissioners to feel comfortable learning about and working through problem-solving strategies related to DV [domestic violence]. As a result of these national trainings, we have also been able to create judicial leadership related to these issues on a local level. We bring many of these training topics back to our state, and judges have been implementing many of the new ideas they learn at these workshops into their practices. The STOP funds have allowed our office to develop a formal “scholarship program” to send judges to training and hold them accountable for implementing training ideas upon their return. Without STOP funds, we would have not been able to offer the in-state training to judges, reserve judges, court commissioners, clerks of court, and their staff on domestic violence and sexual assault issues. In 2010, more than 330 Wisconsin court personnel benefited from this training thanks to STOP money.

—Wisconsin Director of State Courts Office
enforcement response to domestic violence (and former police officer) recommends that police officers receive training on defensive wounds. According to O’Dell, training to identify defensive wounds (such as bite wounds to the chest or arms) may result in a decrease in the number of victims/survivors who are illegally arrested (O’Dell, 2008).

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

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

The STOP Program funding has enabled the St. Louis County Police Department to increase the quantity and quality of investigations. The result from this increased funding is improved training for all officers and detectives, which has not only increased the department’s ability to protect victims, but it has also assisted in the swift, successful issuance of warrants against perpetrators. The training of patrol officers has also improved the quality of initial reports that lead to warrants issued and the victim being protected.

—St. Louis County, Missouri

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

STOP funds allowed Spokane County Sheriff’s Office personnel to attend the most recent and up-to-date training available. It is extremely valuable to have officers trained in the latest techniques so they are able to apply that knowledge to investigations. STOP funds allowed four crisis negotiators to attend an annual statewide training that included two case studies involving DV [domestic violence] situations that progressed into hostage situations and a case study that involved a prison scene with a female guard taken hostage and sexually assaulted. The DV team training allowed law enforcement to more effectively work side by side on the same floor with prosecutors and advocates and discuss cases face-to-face. The team setting allows law enforcement to tailor its response based on facts as they are made available to the various team members. The team training has led to a familiar working relationship among the team members, which has led to better outcomes for victims.

—Spokane County Sheriff’s Office, Washington

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

Training health care providers in screening for and identifying domestic violence among their patients is a critical step in improving safety for victims/survivors. One study found that only 6 percent of physicians asked their patients about possible domestic violence, even though 88 percent of them knew that they had female patients who had experienced abuse (Elliott, Nerney, Jones, & Friedmann, 2002). Another study measuring the attitudes and values of 752 health providers before and after a 3-hour domestic violence training program found the following: after the training (including at the 6-month point), the providers reported feeling that they were better able to identify and assist victims/survivors, they were more comfortable making referrals, and they saw a greater role for themselves and the health care system in stopping domestic violence (Hamberger et al., 2004). This suggests that even a limited investment in training can yield significant results:

**Subgrantee Perspective**

Project Shield has increased awareness and knowledge about the issue of sexual assault against persons with intellectual disabilities/developmental disabilities (ID/DD) among a wide variety of professionals. Police, prosecutors, social service workers, and medical professionals are critical to supporting a victim with ID/DD who discloses sexual assault. Project Shield places a concentrated effort on providing outreach and education to these professionals to identify signs of sexual abuse in persons with ID/DD, best practice techniques including communication tips for working with people with ID/DD and other issues related to consent to the forensic exam and guardianship.

—Kings County District Attorney’s Office —Project Shield, New York

—Westmoreland County Commissioners, Pennsylvania

Payne and Triplett (2009) found that although social workers, particularly benefits workers, are in a position to respond to the needs of victims of domestic violence,
few are trained to do so. The same study also found that benefits workers are less likely than other social workers to attend training on domestic violence and are less likely to screen clients for domestic violence. Although domestic violence occurs at all socioeconomic levels, some research suggests that the prevalence rates are higher among those who live in poverty (Tolman & Raphael, 2000). Thus, many women seeking some form of public benefits also may be victims of domestic violence. Benefits workers, then, are especially well positioned to identify domestic violence victims and provide them with appropriate assistance and referrals to services.

Policies mandating training for benefits workers and screening of benefits clients would help ensure that the social welfare system does not overlook these victims. The connection between training and policy is important. Research suggests that human services agencies with policies mandating training have a higher rate of participation in training compared with agencies with no such policy (Payne, Carmody, Plichta, & Vandecar-Burdin, 2007). As these researchers suggest, “Developing policies that encourage participation in domestic violence training programs sends a message that these cases are important to agencies as well as public officials.”

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

With STOP funding, community education and outreach . . . is provided to agencies that come in direct contact with victims (i.e., law enforcement agencies, Department of Social Services/Child Protective Services, mental health centers, etc.). This collaboration and training with other agencies has been beneficial by encouraging more referrals to our program, increasing knowledge and understanding of domestic violence, lowering the incidence of re-victimization, and empowering victims to make informed decisions regarding their own safety.

—Lewis County Opportunities, Inc., New York

Given what is known about the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse, it is also important that child protective services (CPS) workers be trained on domestic violence. In a study examining the domestic violence training needs of CPS workers and strategies for delivering the training, Button and Payne (2009) identified the following specific areas of need: communicating warning signs about the potential for an abuser to become lethal, intervening with offenders, keeping CPS workers safe, understanding the needs of elder abuse victims, dealing with critical mental health issues, and managing the frustrations that arise when working on cases involving domestic violence (Button & Payne, 2009).
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010—selected professional positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>People trained 2009 (N =254,860)</th>
<th>People trained 2010 (N =235,593)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officers</td>
<td>78,987</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim advocates(governmental and nongovernmental)</td>
<td>29,798</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/mental health professionals</td>
<td>22,758</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service organization staff</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>10,039</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court personnel</td>
<td>9,241</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys/law students/legal services staff</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization staff</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections personnel</td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency staff</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

After victim services, training is the most frequent STOP Program-funded activity engaged in by subgrantees; an average of 977 subgrantees (43 percent) used their STOP Program funds to provide training in each reporting period. A total of 490,453 professionals were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2 years covered by this report. Nearly a third (30 percent) of those trained were law enforcement officers. Victim advocates (governmental and nongovernmental) made up the second largest category with 11 percent of those trained, and health/mental health professionals was the third largest category of professionals trained in 2009 and 2010.

26 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/survivors.
Victim Services

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

Providing services to victims/survivors and families is a major method for creating safety and security. Victims/survivors and families struggle with the physical, emotional, and financial implications of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and child sexual abuse. To address the complex needs of victims/survivors 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/survivor 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. In the U.S. alone, there are an estimated 1,900 domestic violence programs providing these types of services; most victims/survivors initially engage with support groups, support services, counseling, legal advocacy, and shelters (Lyon, Bradshaw, & Menard, 2011).

Macy, Nurius, Kernic, and Holt (2005) found that more than a third (38 percent) of women in their study sought assistance from community-based domestic violence and sexual assault agencies within one month of a partner assault. A more recent study on nonresidential services by Lyon et al. (2011) found that of 1,401 respondents, 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.

Victims/survivors need help finding services needed to support survival and end the abuse (Postmus, Severson, Berry, & Yoo, 2009). The types of services sought may evolve over time as the needs of victims change (Coker, Derrick, Lumpkin, Aldrich, & Oldendick, 2000). For example, services to assist victims with financial challenges are a critical component of victim assistance and advocacy. Access to money (e.g., income, spousal support, Temporary Aid to Needy Families [TANF], and other
government benefits) and economic self-sufficiency are critical to victim/survivor independence from perpetrators (Allstate Foundation, 2006).

Studies also reveal that victims who receive comprehensive advocacy and services are better able to meet their needs and achieve goals of safety, autonomy, healing, and economic security than women not receiving such support and services (Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004). More than 90 percent of the respondents in the Lyon et al. (2011) 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).

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

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of 452,893 victims/survivors during each reporting period. Of those, 85.4 percent were victims of domestic violence, 12.3 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.3 percent were victims of stalking.27 These victims/survivors received a wide range of services, including victim/survivor advocacy (assistance with obtaining services or resources, including material goods and services, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. Subgrantees providing these services also routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

27 The overall number of victims/survivors served represents an unduplicated count; this means that each victim/survivor is counted only once by each subgrantee, regardless of the number of times that victim/survivor received services during each calendar year. Because victims/survivors can only be counted once, they must be reported under only one primary victimization. It is not uncommon for victims/survivors to experience more than one type of victimization (e.g., domestic violence and stalking, or domestic violence and sexual assault), but that fact is not reflected in the reported percentages of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking victims/survivors served.
### Table 7. Victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>2009 Victims/survivors served</th>
<th>2010 Victims/survivors served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim advocacy</td>
<td>215,088</td>
<td>206,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>211,182</td>
<td>193,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice advocacy</td>
<td>158,060</td>
<td>139,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil legal advocacy</td>
<td>130,056</td>
<td>113,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/support group</td>
<td>115,725</td>
<td>106,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil legal assistance</td>
<td>25,273</td>
<td>24,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

There is a significant correlation between the presence of a domestic violence court advocate and positive outcomes of the protection from abuse process for victims of domestic violence, in that the presence of a legal advocate increases the likelihood of conditions being granted to protect the victim from further abuse. Project P.O.S.S.E. [Protection Order Support Services Evaluation] encourages advocate contact with plaintiffs prior to court hearings, in order to provide information about all legal options. Every victim with whom FVP [the Family Violence Project] interacts, whether court or self-referred, or contacted by us through information on the preliminary order, receives an explanation of court and protection order procedures, family court information and assistance, and someone to sit with and answer questions during court.

---

*Family Violence Project, Maine*

---

28 This number represents advocacy provided to victims/survivors 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. See page 2.

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

30 “Civil legal assistance” is the provision of civil legal services by an attorney and/or paralegal.
**Subgrantee Perspective**

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

—American Friends Service Committee, New Jersey

**Subgrantee Perspective**

STOP Program funding has allowed us to provide coordination of the domestic violence specialists (DVS) who are co-located at child protection offices to offer support to battered women and their children. DVSs provide consultation to the Child Protection Service workers (CPSW) on domestic violence-specific issues that can impact families. Battered women are offered ongoing support throughout the life of the child protection case. DVSs are also trained in batterer accountability and are able to support CPSWs in holding batterers accountable during the child protection process.

—New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence

**Subgrantee perspective**

The STOP Program funding has enabled the office of the sheriff to provide a DV [domestic violence] intake specialist to victims of domestic violence who present [themselves] outside of regular business hours. Domestic violence incidents are not restricted to Monday–Friday business hours and neither should services available to victims. The DV intake specialist has provided a significant amount of support to victims that has resulted in a more positive experience with the criminal justice system for victims as well as exceptional multiagency collaboration. The DV intake specialist has been able to fill a gap in service to victims that had previously been recognized in the Lexington-Fayette County community. Victims receive exceptional one-on-one contact with grant-funded staff which enables our staff to provide continued communication with victims. Grant-funded staff have been able to assist victims with the process of the criminal justice system, with necessary transportation to/from court as needed, and with proper referrals for resources that are necessary to the victim. By working so closely with victims, our grant-funded staff are able to provide direct information to victims as offenders are served with emergency protection orders, which directly increases the safety of the victim and her family.

—Office of the Fayette County Sheriff, Kentucky
Other agencies concentrate on providing confidential services to victims/survivors who have substance abuse issues:

**Subgrantee Perspective**

STOP Program funding has enabled Safe Horizon to provide specialized crisis intervention, counseling and advocacy to victims of domestic violence representing underserved populations, particularly victims who are immigrants and victims with limited English proficiency. Language and cultural differences can be barriers to service and make it difficult for the victim to convey the extent of the violence and its impact. With STOP Program funding, case managers have helped victims to navigate complex systems and communicate their needs. Staff has provided culturally sensitive services to victims from countries as diverse as Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Honduras, China, Korea, the Philippines, and Nigeria. The family court case manager drafted a total of 155 family offense petitions on behalf of victims, clearly delineating the past violence and present threat, including high risk indicators and aggravating circumstances. These petitions have resulted in strong and effective court orders. In addition, the case manager provided 34 victims with immediate practical support such as transportation, clothing, and emergency financial assistance.

—Safe Horizon, Inc., New York

**Subgrantee Perspective**

The Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Program continues to provide a vital network of support and resources for women with co-occurring domestic violence and substance abuse. The AOD specialist has cultivated valuable relationships with substance abuse prevention and treatment providers, especially in Holyoke and Springfield [Massachusetts]. The presence of the AOD specialist and the strict attention to confidentiality have increased the number of disclosures about past and present AOD issues. This enables the AOD specialist and the victim to develop more effective safety plans and identify resources before use or relapse occurs.

—Womenshelter/Companeras, Massachusetts

**Underserved Populations**

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

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

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

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

Every effort is made to address the needs of underserved populations; recognition for the need has been established for years. Our projects are carried out with language and cultural sensitivities in mind. Guam’s multiethnic population is represented by the diverse staff composition in each of Guam’s STOP project service providers. In addition to specific staffing diversity, our outreach awareness and service information brochures are printed in various languages: Chamorro, Filipino, Palauan, Chuukese, and English. Radio and television awareness ads, public service announcements, and information campaigns are also conducted with diverse/underserved representatives speaking their own native languages.

—STOP administrator, Guam

---

31 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.”

32 42 U.S.C. 3796gg-1(c)(3)(B)
Of all subgrantees providing services in calendar years 2009 and 2010, 99 percent provided services to victims/survivors in at least one of the underserved categories. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to an annual average of 9,169 victims/survivors who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; 94,274 victims/survivors who were black or African-American; 75,897 victims/survivors who were Hispanic or Latino; 6,304 victims/survivors who were Asian; 15,807 victims/survivors who were 60 years of age or older; 24,818 victims/survivors with disabilities; 38,975 victims/survivors with

---

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

---
limited English proficiency; 21,477 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and 118,878 victims/survivors living in rural areas.34

In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (such as brochures, manuals, training curriculums, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims/survivors. Training was provided to a total of 7,736 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 724 subgrantees—74 percent of subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, an average of 257 subgrantees—57 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/survivors in underserved populations and to improve responses to the needs of these victims.

American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indian and Alaska Native women report higher rates of victimization than women from any other ethnic or racial background (Black et al., 2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) revealed that rates of domestic violence varied significantly by race; rates among American Indian women are much higher (45.9 percent) than rates among African-American (40.9 percent), Hispanic (35.2 percent) and white women (31.7 percent) (Black et al., 2011). However, accurate lifetime prevalence rates in American Indian groups do not currently exist (Chester, Robin, Koss, Lopez, & Goldman, 1994; Evans-Campbell, Lindhorst, Huang, & Walters, 2006; Jones, 2007).35

In a study conducted of 1,368 American Indian women from 6 tribal nations, nearly half reported physical assault and 80 percent of those said the assault had been committed by an intimate partner (Yuan, Koss, Polacca, & Goldman, 2006). A survey of American Indian women between the ages of 18 and 77 found that 65 percent

34 For more detailed demographic information on victims/survivors served by all states, see Table 22; for demographic information on victims/survivors served by individual states see Tables B3a, B3b, B4a and B4b in Appendix B.

35 In an effort to address this gap, VAWA 2005 called for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct "a national baseline study to examine violence against Indian women in Indian country.” In consultation with OVW, NIJ is implementing a new research program that will collect information on violence against Indian women in Indian country and in Alaska Native communities focusing on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and murder. For more information regarding the status of this research, see the 2012 Biennial Report, section on American Indians and Alaska Natives.
had experienced some form of interpersonal violence, with 40 percent reporting a history of domestic violence (Evans-Campbell et al., 2006). A survey mirroring the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey, administered to Athabaskan women in Alaska, found that nearly two-thirds had experienced domestic violence at some point in their adult life (Wood & Magen, 2009).

As startling as the rates of domestic violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women are, the rates of sexual abuse are even more startling and are reported to be the highest in the nation (Luna-Firebaugh, 2006). According to data from the NISVS, more than a quarter of women who self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native reported being raped at some point in their lives (Black et al., 2011). The NVAW Survey found that 65 percent of American Indian women reported experiencing rape or physical violence, a rate 2 times that of African-Americans, 2.5 times that of whites, and 4.5 times that of Asian Americans. American Indian and Alaska Native women are also more likely to suffer physical injuries in addition to the sexual assault (50 percent) when compared with non-Native women (30 percent) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). Revictimization rates are also considerably higher among American Indian and Alaska Native women when compared with non-Native women (Saylors & Daliparthy, 2006; Ullman, Najdowski, & Filipas, 2009).

Complicating efforts to protect these victims/survivors is the fact that many live in isolated communities and may not have access to telephones, transportation, or emergency services. Also, criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in those communities.

STOP Program funds have been used to train tribal law enforcement and tribal prosecution staffs, for outreach to Native victims/survivors and families, and to provide court advocacy for Native victims, as described in the following examples:

**Administrator Perspective**

Law enforcement dollars will provide training for village public safety and village police officers in rural communities and some of prosecution’s funding is designated specifically for training rural paralegal/witness coordinators and rural prosecutors. Additionally, the Council funded the tribal government of St. Paul Island to assist in providing services to Aleut Tribal member victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. St. Paul Island is an isolated, rural community located in the middle of the Bering Sea, 300 miles from the Alaska mainland and 600 miles from Anchorage, the closest urban hub.

—STOP administrator, Alaska
An average of 15 subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding in 2009 and 2010 identified themselves as tribal sexual assault and/or domestic violence programs, tribal coalitions or tribal governments. An average of 59 subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited nearly 211 unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals comprised 2.2 percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010, with 18,337 victims/survivors receiving services. Training on issues specific to American Indian/Alaska Native victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking was provided by

---

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

The STOP Program funding has made it possible to meet the continuously growing need for domestic violence services for Native American victims and their children. This [staff] position has allowed us to educate and bring awareness about domestic violence in the Native American cultures through presentations, publications, and increased advocacy, specifically to Native American victims and their families. Additionally, tribal and district court processes for victims are not as intimidating now that an advocate is readily available to help the victim from the initial filing of documents through the final hearings. As a result of court advocacy, a primary Native American cultural barrier (keeping family issues in the family) is showing an extraordinary stride towards accountability and justice for abusers. The events mentioned above are improving community and agency responses to Native American victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

—Okmulgee County Family Resource Center, Inc, Oklahoma

---

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

The Fremont County Alliance [Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault] provides services to all victims who access our services, and this includes services to residents who reside on the Wind River Reservation, which covers a significant portion of Fremont County. The program provides our Native American clients with assistance in filing for protection orders through the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court, as well as the Riverton and Lander Circuit courts (if they live off the reservation), enabling clients to be provided with the protection that best fits their needs. The program staff have developed an excellent working relationship with the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court judges and clerks, and work closely with the court in facilitating services for victims residing on the reservation. Two of our staff members are currently taking the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court Advocacy training, which will enable them to represent clients in Tribal Court on matters such as divorce and child custody when they pass the court advocate test.

—Fremont County Alliance Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Wyoming

---

36 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.
an average of 137 subgrantees, and 684 tribal government and tribal agency staff were trained with STOP funds during 2009 and 2010.

Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Older Victims/survivors

Over 306 million Americans live with a wide array of physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2011). Of these, between 2 and 4 people in 1,000 are functionally D/deaf, with about 1 person in 1,000 becoming deaf before he or she is 18 years old. Some people who are D/deaf or hard of hearing do not consider themselves a “person with a disability or limitation” but rather identify as a member of a cultural or linguistic group (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2009).

The violence and abuse of women with disabilities and D/deaf women may be more severe, of longer duration, inflicted by multiple perpetrators, and occur in settings unlike those of other victims/survivors (e.g., group homes, hospitals, and institutions). Also, women with disabilities and D/deaf women frequently have greater challenges accessing the legal system, advocacy, services, and community support than other victims/survivors (Nosek & Hughes, 2006).

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey of 356,112 men and women revealed that, compared with all other populations, women with disabilities were nearly 3 times more likely to be threatened by violence, 2.5 times more likely to be physically abused, and more than 12 times more likely to experience unwanted sex (D. L. Smith, 2008). According to the Committee on Law and Justice (2001), studies show prevalence rates from 39 to 85 percent of women with disabilities who experience some type of physical or emotional abuse at the hands of an intimate partner or caregiver. A study of 5,326 women revealed that the 26 percent of women who reported having some type of disability were more than 4 times more likely to have been sexually assaulted within the past year than women without disabilities (Martin et al., 2006).

Victims with disabilities may also be subject to types of abuse that are less likely to be issues for nondisabled women, such as the denying or delaying medications; withholding food, heat, or assistance; and preventing the use of necessary assistive devices (Radford, Harne, & Trotter, 2006). Significant economic consequences also have been noted in the research. For example, in a study of 200 disabled women, 30 percent said the interpersonal violence interfered with their ability to maintain employment, and slightly more than 60 percent reported that the violence kept them from living independently (Powers et al., 2002).

---

37 Disability is defined as something that occurs outside of the person based on the interaction of the person, his or her functional abilities, and the environment. There are specific categories of functional disabilities: balance, cognitive functions, dimensional extremes, mental health, movement and mobility, respiratory functions, sensory functions, voice/speech and language, stamina, and fatigue. VERA’s Accessing Safety Project. “Understanding Disability: http://www.accessingsafety.org/index.php/.
Women with disabilities face additional barriers that may seriously interfere with their ability to leave a violent relationship. These barriers include being dependent on their perpetrator for caregiver assistance, an inability to exit the house, loss of caregiver service, the replacement cost of assistive structures/devices that are not portable, inadequate transportation, limited sign language skills of criminal justice personnel or lack of instructions in Braille for pro se litigants, inaccessible emergency shelters or court buildings, the risk of retaliatory or involuntary institutionalization by their abuser, and the loss of resources provided by the abusive partner or other family members (Copel, 2006; Curry et al., 2009).

In the following example, a woman with disabilities was assisted by a skilled advocate in a criminal case that resulted in a positive outcome for the victim/survivor:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
Our advocate has been able to spend time with victims and address their needs. She has the time to do in-depth personal assessments of victims and can help them prepare for testimony. She is also able to discuss her assessment with the prosecutor. In our case with the homeless victim who had learning problems our victim advocate correctly assessed that she had problems communicating and remembering the events in sequential order. This is common with learning disabilities and also with PTSD [post-traumatic stress disorder] sufferers. This assessment and communication with the prosecutor allowed the prosecutor to introduce evidence of her problems and present to the jury the valid reasons why her testimony was inconsistent. With this knowledge, the jury had no problems convicting him [the defendant] of all counts.

—Sacramento County District Attorney’s Office, California

A New Mexico subgrantee reported using STOP funds to provide interpreter services for victims/survivors who are D/deaf and hard of hearing:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The provision of interpreter services for D/deaf and hard-of-hearing survivors creates access to domestic and sexual violence services where previously there may have been none. It is also true that after receiving training, a number of DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] providers report that they were sought for services by someone from the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing community. Providers also reported feeling that they felt more adequately prepared to effectively serve D/deaf and hard-of-hearing survivors

—Rape Crisis Center of Central New Mexico

Older women also experience intimate partner violence. In their study conducted for the National Center on Elder Abuse, Otto and Quinn (2007) found that 20 percent of the reports of abuse against victims older than 60 were the result of
domestic violence. It is estimated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging (2007), that approximately a half-million older adults experience some form of domestic violence.

Only a handful of studies have been conducted examining the experience of older women with intimate partner violence. This is because older victims do not typically receive services through the same service system as younger victims. The two main systems responding to older victims of intimate partner violence are adult protective services (APS) and domestic violence agencies (Kilbane & Spira, 2010; Lundy & Grossman, 2009). Each system operates from different sets of assumptions and models of service delivery. Workers in each system are trained differently in terms of theoretical and conceptual understandings and best practices for service, which results in fundamental differences in planning for safety and protection and in reporting incidents (Kilbane & Spira, 2010). Often women in later life are encouraged to seek and/or are referred to obtain assistance from APS (Paranjape, Tucker, Mckenzie-Mack, Thompson, & Kaslow, 2007). However, once a woman is within the APS system, it is highly unlikely that she will be referred to domestic violence programs for appropriate services or that the incidents will be reported to law enforcement (Otto & Quinn, 2007). Perhaps more problematic is the possibility that the APS investigative process—including unannounced home visits, and contact with family members complicit in abuse by a caretaker or partner—could trigger additional acts of violence, because of APS workers’ lack of training in the risks of intimate partner violence (Kilbane & Spira, 2010).

An additional complication is that, historically, many domestic violence and sexual assault agencies have overlooked older women. It is often assumed that sexual assault happens only to “younger women.” Doctors, caretakers, friends, and family members may overlook sexual assault and fail to appropriately screen for it (I. Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Providers may not recognize the signs of violence in an older relationship as quickly as they might in a younger couple (Beaulaurier, Seff, Newman, & Dunlop, 2007). In one study, only 3 percent of older women indicated having ever been asked about physical or sexual violence by their health care provider (Bonomi et al., 2007).

Older women often have distinct and special needs: few are employed and most are receiving public assistance or Social Security benefits or are dependent on family members for their care (Lundy & Grossman, 2009). For many, the length of their relationships can be a complicating factor. Women who have been married for 25 or more years may feel their options are more limited (Leisy, 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 situations of older victims/survivors and that these agencies work with community justice and social services agencies to improve their communities’ overall response to victims/survivors who are older. The following are examples, both in Pennsylvania, of how subgrantees used STOP Program funding to benefit older victims/survivors:
Because of the unique challenges and barriers faced by victims/survivors with disabilities and victims/survivors who are older, it is critical to direct funding to programs that will focus 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/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault. Overall, STOP subgrantees reported providing victim services to an average of 24,818 victims/survivors with disabilities and 15,807 victims/survivors over the age of 60—5.5 percent and 3.8 percent, respectively, of all victims served. STOP Program subgrantees provided training and developed or implemented policies designed to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of the criminal justice system’s response and the provision of services to older and disabled victims/survivors. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by an average of 402 subgrantees to other professionals; subgrantees also provided

---

38 Because data are collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims/survivors were both disabled and 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 ages 25–59.
training to 6,066 staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims/survivors who are elderly or who have disabilities were developed or implemented by an average of 160 subgrantees in each reporting year.

**Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees**

Language barriers, isolation, immigration status, and traditional values increase the vulnerability of immigrant women and intensify their need to rely significantly on their abusers (Bhuyan, Mell, Senturia, Sullivan, & Shiu-Thornton, 2005). Lack of education and job skills necessary for working in the United States may deepen that isolation and dependency. Tactics used by batterers to isolate victims/survivors can include not allowing them to learn English, go to school, gain employment, or communicate with friends and family (Erez, Adelman, & Gregory, 2008). Language barriers, cultural values, religious convictions, economic dependence, lack of education, and a lack of knowledge of the legal system are among the major obstacles these women may confront when seeking justice and trying to escape the violence in their intimate relationships (Vidales, 2010).

Women refugees arrive from home countries where they may have been victims of war, genocide, gang rape by military personnel or combatants, starvation, religious persecution, stalking, or intimate partner violence (Ganeshpanchan, 2005; Runner, Yoshihama, & Novick, 2009). The violence they suffer may be state sponsored or culturally condoned, and may occur in situations of armed conflict, refugee camps, or detention facilities (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2009). Victimization by intimate partners, racist and faith-intolerant neighbors, detention personnel, and others is not uncommon for refugee women. Few service providers and legal system personnel have the knowledge and skills to assist these victims/survivors (Runner et al., 2009).

Immigrant women, especially those who are undocumented, may be afraid to seek help after being victimized. They may not know their rights or the services that are available to them. Of those who are aware, many are fearful of the stigma that may be associated with accessing services. Literature suggests that immigrant victims may prefer to tell friends or family members about the interpersonal violence they have experienced (Ingram, 2007; Yoshihama, Bybee, Dabby, & Blazevski, 2010).

Research suggests that domestic violence may be more severe among immigrant women than among U.S. citizens (M. Anderson, 1993; Raj & Silverman, 2002). Homicide data from New York City revealed that immigrant women were disproportionately represented among female victims of intimate partner homicides (Frye, Hoselins, Waltermaurer, Blaney, & Wilt, 2005); Washington State data on homicides from 1997 through 2009 revealed that nearly 20 percent (61 of 309) of domestic violence homicide victims were immigrants and refugees, although people born outside the United States made up only 12 percent of the state’s population (Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2011).
Fear of deportation is a tremendous concern for some immigrant victims. Often, the batterer will exploit this fear and use threats of deportation to maintain control (Erez et al., 2008; Runner et al., 2009). Seventy-five percent of battered immigrant women interviewed in one study indicated that their abusers used their immigration status against them (Erez et al., 2008). Immigrant women are fearful not only of being deported themselves and losing their children, but worry about the potential for their husbands to be deported. The deportation of the battering husband often means the loss of economic resources, stability, and family ties. The woman may be left with feelings of guilt and suffer social and cultural stigmatization, increased isolation, economic instability, and loss of familial support if the abuser is deported.

Congress passed two measures of relief specifically for noncitizen victims: VAWA 2000 and VAWA 2005 improved on efforts made in VAWA 1994 to prevent an abusive citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse from using immigration law to keep an abused immigrant spouse from reporting the abuse or leaving the relationship; and VAWA 2000 established the U-visa for victims of certain serious crimes who lack lawful status in the United States and are willing to cooperate in the investigation or prosecution of those crimes. Among the crimes covered by the U-visa legislation are rape, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

The following is one subgrantee’s description of the many challenges faced by victims/survivors who are immigrants and how STOP funds were used to respond to the needs of one victim:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

This year we began the VAWA visa process for two [Hispanic] victims. Without this funding, our program would not have had the bilingual staff or the time to assist in the visa process. The Hispanic woman who has been with us for over a year is the perfect example of the need for this project. She came to us severely beaten. We gave her shelter and filed for a protective order. Her American husband filed for divorce and custody of their son and attempted to have her deported. We found her an attorney at a reduced rate for the divorce and linked her with the Tulsa University Immigrant Rights Project to file for a VAWA visa. In this year the victim has obtained her divorce with joint custody of her son, has obtained her immigration papers including her work permit, filed her taxes, obtained a driver’s license, and is now working in a bank. The Hispanic advocate was there every step of the way providing translation services, transportation, advocacy, and referrals.

—STOP administrator, Oklahoma

In the following examples, immigrant victims/survivors were assisted with culturally and linguistically appropriate counseling and legal advocacy:
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/survivors. Subgrantees reported serving an average of 21,577 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 5 percent of all victims/survivors served in 2009 and 2010. Training on issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by an average of 281 subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims/survivors face are complex and the consequences of reporting their victimization are often more serious than for other victims/survivors.

Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by an average of 129 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 636 unique products in 27 different languages in 2009 and 2010.39

Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas

Rural women are at elevated risk for domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. A recent study of battered women attending a family planning clinic in the Midwest

39 For a list of the languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 93, the Products section of “STOP Aggregate Accomplishments.”
revealed that women living in remote, isolated rural areas are at particular risk of domestic and sexual violence. In the year before the study, 61.5 percent of women living in remote rural areas were assaulted 4 or more times compared with 39.1 percent of women in urban areas, and the severity of abuse was 3 times greater for rural as compared with urban victims/survivors (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Separated and divorced rural women are raped/sexually assaulted at rates 1.6 times higher than separated suburban women and more than 3 times higher than their urban counterparts (Rennison, DeKeseredy, & Dragiewicz, 2012). Further, women in rural areas report higher levels of stalking and are more likely to be isolated from family or friends by their abusive partners (Logan, Evans, Stevenson, & Jordan, 2005). The percentage of homicides involving intimate partners is higher in rural areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006; Gallup-Black, 2005).

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey (2005) found that 26.7 percent of women and 15.5 percent of men living in rural areas reported experiencing physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime (Breiding, Ziembroski, & Black, 2009). A study of partner violence in rural health care clinics found that 13.3 percent of women reported they currently were experiencing IPV and 25.6 percent reported IPV in the past 5 years, with two-thirds revealing both assault and psychological battering (Coker et al., 2007).

Victims/survivors in rural communities often find that medical, legal, and social services are very limited or nonexistent (Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007; Grama, 2000; Logan, Walker, Cole, Ratliff, & Leukefeld, 2003). In addition, rural women must travel great distances to reach services: 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 program (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Given the reduced availability of services for victims/survivors, the opportunity for building support networks through discussion and sharing experiences with other victims/survivors is frequently nonexistent (Eastman et al., 2007).

Compounding the lack of services is the complex interweaving of systemic, cultural, physical, psychological, and emotional barriers that may prevent women in rural and frontier areas from seeking assistance. Cultural factors such as patriarchal male peer support (DeKeseredy, Schwartz, Fagen, & Hall, 2006), a lack of anonymity, the fear of familial disapproval, and an ethic of self-reliance may prevent women from seeking safety (Eastman et al., 2007; Grama, 2000; Hunnicutt, 2007; Lee & Stevenson, 2006). In some rural communities, women attempting to leave a relationship report that the men who sexually assault them received support and reinforcement for their behavior from peers, and that many of these “supportive” men also were abusing their own partners (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2008).

Rural areas are often characterized by high unemployment levels, high poverty rates, limited services, and a lack of appropriate housing or shelter, all of which create obstacles to help seeking by victims/survivors (Eastman et al., 2007). Rural women are less likely to be insured than urban and suburban residents (Mueller & MacKinney, 2006; P. Patterson, 2006), thus restricting their access to physical and
mental health care services (Basile & Black, 2011). Geographic isolation, combined with inadequate transportation and a lack of telephone service, makes leaving a batterer, particularly in the midst of a crisis, nearly impossible for rural victims/survivors (Grama, 2000; Krishnan, Hilbert, & VanLeeuwen, 2001).

STOP funding helped provide a comprehensive array of services to rural victims/survivors that would not have been otherwise available. Below are some examples:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The village of Granville is located in a rural corner of Washington County near the Vermont border. Victim services are located about 35 miles away. Public transportation is nonexistent so without STOP funds and the relationships that the police department has built through the multidiscipline and coordinated response contacts, victims would have much fewer resources available to them. Domestic Violence Intervention Unit officers provide transportation, advocacy, referral, intervention, medical and court accompaniment and other assistance to victims that would not be possible without STOP funding. Victims find themselves with a resource through the assigned Domestic Violence Unit Officer that breaks down barriers that might otherwise exist for them.

— *Granville Police Department, Vermont*

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
STOP funding has been, and remains, critical to our ability to truly provide victim-centered, empowerment-based advocacy and support services. The Shelter, Inc. primary service area includes five rural counties encompassing approximately 3,000 square miles. Without the direct service resources provided by STOP funding, victims/survivors would not have options for making choices for staying or leaving, obtaining PPO’s [protective orders], accessing counseling, court accompaniment and countless other services based on individual choice and need.

— *Shelter, Inc., Michigan*

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The STOP program allows us to provide supervised visits and exchanges to women and their children affected by domestic violence or the threat of domestic violence. Our program is very important as it is the only program [that] provides visitation and exchange services in our county and in our surrounding counties in rural Appalachian Ohio. The ability to have a supervised exchange is very comforting to women who must provide their children for court-ordered visitation with their (the woman’s) abuser.

— *Supervised Visitation Center, Ohio*
STOP Program funds were used to provide services to an average of 118,878 victims/survivors 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/survivors served. Training in issues specific to victims/survivors who live in rural areas was provided by an average of 405 subgrantees (41 percent of those using funds for training).

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 532 STOP subgrantees (23 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 557 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 239 subgrantees (10 percent).

Law Enforcement

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

Specialized Units
The availability of physical evidence is often crucial to the successful disposition of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases. Specialized police domestic violence units have been shown to collect valuable evidence in a much higher percentage of cases than traditional patrol units (Friday et al., 2006). The evidence collected by specialized units also is more likely to be useful for prosecution (Townsend, Hunt, Kuck, & Baxter, 2005) and lead to higher rates of prosecution, conviction, and sentencing (Jolin, Feyerherm, Fountain, & Friedman, 1998). Victims/survivors assisted by specialist domestic violence officers are more likely to engage in help-seeking and self-protection strategies than those not receiving specialized police intervention (Amendola, Slipka, Hamilton, & Whitman, 2010).

Specialized law enforcement units may consist of just one dedicated staff person, but still can have a significant impact on victim safety and offender accountability.

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**
The STOP grant funding has allowed our community to have the benefit of a full time DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] investigator. Before this funding, victims were bounced from one officer to another when trying to obtain information about their case. With the DV/SA investigator, the victim can call one person and they will get the information needed about the case. This enables victims to feel they are more in control of the situation and makes them feel as if they can trust law enforcement again and will call again if needed. Without this funding we will have no choice but to return to the way it was with victims "chasing" their case through the system.

—Jefferson County Commissioners, Ohio
Police/Advocate Response

Law enforcement responses that involve both officers and victim advocates often provide the best outcomes for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking. These teams respond to incidents together, providing support to victims at the scene and follow-up after an incident. A study in New Haven, CT, compared the outcomes of a police/advocate team response to the standard law enforcement response to domestic violence (a single visit from police officers at the time of the incident). Researchers found that in the 12 months following an initial domestic violence call, only 20 percent of the victims who received a follow-up visit from a police officer and an advocate needed repeat police intervention for further
domestic violence, compared with more than 40 percent of the victims who received the standard law enforcement response (Casey et al., 2007). In a subsequent study, victims/survivors who had police/advocate team intervention reported a higher rate of satisfaction with the police, and were more likely to report feeling respected and safe (Stover, Berkman, Desai, & Marans, 2010).

Law enforcement partnerships with domestic violence agencies enhance victim safety. The Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) is a collaborative partnership among law enforcement, domestic violence programs, the state domestic violence coalition, and researchers. First instituted in Maryland, LAP-associated police departments use a research-based lethality assessment tool with victims/survivors of domestic violence during 911-call responses. Officer-advocate teams follow up with home visits with victims/survivors who are assessed to be at high risk for continuing, escalated violence. The team encourages high-risk victims to pursue legal advocacy, counseling, emergency housing, healthcare, and other services offered by the local domestic violence program. In 2008, in those jurisdictions utilizing LAP, 56 percent of the victims sought the services of domestic violence programs, while in non-LAP districts only 28 percent of the victims contacted domestic violence services after a police response to a 911 call. Maryland’s intimate partner homicides declined by 41 percent in the first 4 years (2007—2010) of LAP (Reckdenwald & Parker, 2010). LAP was initiated with OVW funds and has been replicated in 11 other states to date.

The following subgrantee narrative describes the interactions and communications between the victim/survivor, advocate, and dedicated domestic violence/sexual assault detective and the benefits to the victim:
Spectrum of Law Enforcement Responsibilities

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

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding allows for one detective to be dedicated to serving only domestic/sexual assault victims in conjunction with victim advocates. Without this funding, victims would be served on a rotation basis by law enforcement with no coordination with support service. The coordination of law enforcement and support services, that are typically provided by victim advocates, increases the likelihood of the victim following through with the prosecution of the perpetrator. Once a victim is provided with his/her basic needs, without the perpetrator, and has the emotional support of an advocate while going through the judicial process, [that victim] is empower[ed] to provide for his/her own safety. By having one full-time detective assigned to the domestic/sexual violence unit, he is able to obtain additional information from the advocate as it becomes available and is able to provide the victim with a continuous update on his/her case. This can include when the perpetrator was arrested, if he is out on bail, if he has been served with the restraining order, etc. This information provides the victim with a sense of safety as he/she knows where the perpetrator is and if the restraining order is in fact in effect (the perpetrator has been served). Should the victim need the assistance of law enforcement due to the perpetrator violating the restraining order, he/she can contact the detective and provide additional information.

—City of Homestead, Florida
SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE
This program allowed detectives to focus on handling the needs of the victims, beyond just the arrest of the batterer. Additional time was concentrated on assisting victims in obtaining protective orders, conducting threat assessments, referrals to Safe Harbor, and the explanation of the process of how their case will be handled in the courts. Repeat offenders were specifically targeted in an effort to stop abuse. Cases that represented an increased probability of continued or escalating violence were closely scrutinized. In these cases, criminal “stay away orders” and bond revocations were pursued to limit the offender’s ability to continue their actions. Follow-up contacts were conducted with victims after a period of time from the original incident, to ensure that there were no additional acts of violence and their needs were being met. Several victims commented that they felt empowered to know that there were people in the system that truly cared for their well-being.

—St. Tammany Parish Sheriff’s Office, Louisiana

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE
The STOP funding has continued to allow the Pearl River County Sheriff’s Department to respond to and handle cases of domestic violence in a tremendous way. It provides a single Investigator solely dedicated to investigating each and every case and seeing that each is handled on a one-on-one basis. It allows for follow-ups on all calls and cases and also allows for victim notification on each case as it processes through the criminal justice system. Each victim has the opportunity to meet with the investigator on [his/her] case from the arrest to the prosecution. Without the continuation of the STOP funding, cases of domestic violence would not get the investigation needed for prosecution.

—Pearl River County Sheriff’s Office, Mississippi

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

—Lexington County Sheriff’s Office, South Carolina
During calendar years 2009 and 2010, an average of 296 subgrantees (13 percent of all subgrantees reporting) used STOP Program funds for activities carried out by law enforcement personnel, with an average of 262 FTEs\textsuperscript{40} per reporting period. Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2009 and 2010 responded to and prepared incident reports for a total of 155,698 cases, investigated 152,666 cases, made 59,642 arrests and 2,349 dual arrests, and referred 70,498 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than 38,900 protection/restraining orders, made 8,199 arrests for violations of bail and protection orders, and enforced 17,113 warrants over the 2-year period covered by this report.\textsuperscript{41}

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 288 used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; 624 provided training on law enforcement response; 306 addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 112 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor; and 83 developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

**Prosecution**

Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking presents numerous challenges. Prosecution of violent crimes committed against women often fails without thorough police investigation and detailed reports,

\textsuperscript{40} For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see Tables 26a and 26b.

\textsuperscript{41} 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.
expertise on violence against women, investigators to supplement information from law enforcement, advocates to support victims throughout the criminal legal process, reasonable caseloads, technology to enhance investigation and presentation of evidence, and resources to employ experts for evidence analysis and expert testimony.

Prosecutors without knowledge of violence against women may fail to identify stalking and intimate partner sexual assault and may not devise specialized policies to guide prosecution of these crimes. Prosecutors without resources often charge offenders with misdemeanors, because felony trials are labor and cost intensive (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without enough staff to prosecute violations of sentencing conditions, either in judicial monitoring or probation revocation proceedings, prosecutors do not vigorously seek serious sanctions (Friday et al., 2006). Funding from OVW over the past 17 years has been instrumental in enhancing both the expertise and resources targeted to prosecution of violent crimes against women across the country.

Outreach to victims, coupled with the proper charging of abusers and rigorous prosecution, safeguards victims/survivors and their children from further abuse and reduces recidivism by criminal abusers (Wooldredge & Thistlethwaite, 2005). A recent study confirms the importance of outreach to victims: researchers found that “victim contact” with prosecutors’ offices, especially direct personal communication with staff, may protect against future intimate partner violence. Repeat IPV police incidents were reduced 30 percent when victims had direct communication with prosecutors (Rhodes, Cerulli, Kothari, Dichter, & Marcus, 2011). Researchers suggest that victims may be more inclined to participate in the criminal process if prosecutors mitigate the “negative consequences for victims, including loss of privacy, feelings of confusion, and disillusionment fueled by frustration” through improved protocol and practices (Rhodes et al., 2011).

Practitioners report that when police have carefully developed evidence, prosecutors often are able to prevail during plea deliberations or at trial without victim testimony or cooperation (Gwinn, 2010; Pence & Eng, 2010). The impact of concerted efforts in evidence collection is reflected in the Blueprint for Safety collaboration in St. Paul, MN, which originated from a safety audit funded by OVW (Pence & Eng, 2010).

When police are able to produce substantial evidence, including witnesses, video or audio recordings, signs of struggle, multiple victims, and DNA evidence, prosecutors are much more likely to file charges for sex crimes (Spohn & Tellis, 2012). In general, prosecutors are hesitant to file charges when the victim/survivor’s credibility is in question (Holleran, Beichner, & Spohn, 2010). Extra-legal information becomes important in assessing “convictability” when evidence is limited (Rosay, Wood, Rivera, Postle, & TePas, 2011). A study of prosecutorial decision-making in Philadelphia and Kansas City showed that prosecutors are less likely to file charges in sexual assault cases involving intimate partner or acquaintance rape and more likely to take action in stranger cases (Holleran et al., 2010). In a study in Los Angeles of specialized assistant district attorneys, partner or acquaintance sexual violence
was more carefully scrutinized by police and less often prosecuted than “identified stranger” sexual violence cases (Spohn & Tellis, 2012). These practices produce less than satisfactory outcomes for victims/survivors of crimes of sexual assault.

Specialized Prosecution

Specialized domestic violence prosecution units may improve prosecution of domestic violence cases. The specialized prosecution unit in Cook County, IL (Chicago) obtained a conviction rate of 71 percent compared with 50 percent for the rest of the office for domestic violence cases (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003). In Milwaukee, the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit increased felony convictions five-fold (Harrell, Schaffer, DeStefano, & Castro, 2006). Although victims/survivors most commonly cites fear of retaliation as a barrier to their participation in prosecution, a three-state study found that the fear was reduced in sites with specialized prosecution, increased victim advocacy, and specialized domestic violence courts (Harrell, Castro, Newmark, & Visher, 2007).

Subgrantees in Missouri and Texas discuss how having specialized prosecutors has improved outcomes in terms of victim safety and well-being and offender accountability:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Before we received STOP Program funding, the Sex Crimes and Child Abuse Unit had five attorneys handling all child sexual/physical abuse cases and all adult sex crimes cases in Jackson County. The attorneys in the unit were extremely overworked because of the massive caseloads and the burnout was high. STOP Program funding has allowed us to acquire three additional prosecutors dedicated solely to the review and prosecution of adult sex crimes cases. This shift has actualized a monumental change in this unit. It allows for the faster review of cases submitted for filing, better preparation of cases for trial, earlier and better plea dispositions due to early case preparation and specialization in working with adult victims of sexual abuse. The end result is more effective prosecution of perpetrators of adult sex crimes, with less re-victimization of the women we are trying to help.

—Jackson County Prosecutor’s Office, Missouri
Vertical Prosecution

Vertical prosecution provides the victim/survivor and the prosecutor the opportunity to work together throughout the life of the case. Cook County, IL (Chicago) victims/survivors reported higher rates of satisfaction with the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit, which featured specially trained prosecutors, vertical prosecution, and its own victim advocates, compared with prosecutors who handled domestic violence cases outside the unit. Victims/survivors who were helped by these units also were more likely to appear in court: 75 percent of victims appeared, compared with just 25 percent in domestic violence cases not handled by the unit.

Vertical prosecution has been instituted in numerous STOP Program-funded prosecution offices. As the following subgrantee relates, it has led to more convictions in domestic violence and sexual assault cases in an Ohio jurisdiction:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Prior to receiving STOP funds, our office was not able to take the needed time to adequately service victims due to lack of manpower and time restraints. Having our specialized Domestic/Family Violence Prosecution Unit has allowed us to better access each individual case so that we can be more successful in servicing our victims. This leads to more cooperation from our victims allowing us to have better outcomes in case dispositions, thus leading to holding the offender accountable for [his/her] actions. It also has allowed us to better access the needs of each individual victim/survivor so that we can address safety needs in a timely manner.

—Mahoning Valley Justice Unit, Ohio

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received a total of 312,963 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence and stalking and accepted 235,229 (75 percent) of those cases for prosecution during the two reporting periods. STOP
Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 32 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors.  

During calendar years 2009 and 2010, an average of 294 subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with an average of 267 FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by an average of 295 subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve the prosecution response: an average of 356 provided training on prosecution response; 96 developed and/or implemented policies on victim-witness notification; and 74 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
There are more than 130 specialized domestic violence courts in 27 states in the United States (Labriola, Bradley, O’ Sullivan, Rempel, & Moore, 2009). The majority of the specialized or integrated domestic violence courts are in New York, California, Florida, Michigan, and North Carolina. There are also courts with specialized domestic violence dockets in criminal and civil protection order cases in most states (Klein, 2009). Successful and effective prosecution of domestic violence is augmented where courts have consolidated domestic violence calendars and increased pretrial and post-conviction monitored supervision of defendants (Harrell et al., 2006). Domestic violence courts appear to process cases more efficiently (Peterson & Dixon, 2005) and may increase both offender compliance with court-ordered conditions and enhanced penalties for non-compliance (Klein, 2009; Harrell et al., 2006; Newmark, Rempel, Diffily, & Kane, 2001).

Although there is great diversity in domestic violence court models and practices, several studies in jurisdictions across the country have identified key areas of processing and services for domestic violence cases that are essential to managing specialized courts effectively. One study of 106 jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence courts found that 70 percent shared the following key practices and processes essential to effective management of specialized courts: 1) effective management of domestic violence cases, coordinating the cases involving the relevant parties, and integrating information for the court; 2) specialized intake and court staffing for domestic violence cases; 3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims/survivors by court staff, often aided by related, specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; 4) court processes to ensure victims/survivors’ safety, from metal detectors and separate waiting rooms to special orders and victim referrals; 5) increased court monitoring and

---

---

42 This percentage is based on the number of dismissals compared with all other dispositions. Subgrantees were instructed to report only on the disposition of the original case (which is characterized by the most serious offense), not on the dispositions of lesser charges or counts pled to by the offender. For more information on the dispositions of cases, see Table 27.
enforcement of batterer compliance with court orders, often supervised by related specialized probation units; 6) consideration of children involved in domestic violence; and 7) enhanced domestic violence training for judges (Keilitz, 2004).

Other studies have examined the importance and effectiveness of elements similar to those identified in the Keilitz study, such as expedited processing of domestic violence cases, including accessible, efficient, and timely systems for disposition of civil and criminal cases (Klein, 2009; Logan, 2006); enhanced access to information from diverse court dockets and court databases (Hulse, 2010); clerical assistance for litigants, readily available translator services, court accompaniment by advocates, childcare for children of victims, access to law libraries, expedited proceedings, respectful judges and court personnel (Bell, Perez, Goodman, & Dutton, 2011; Ptacek, 1999); court and judicial resources to monitor batterer compliance with court orders, and enforcing those orders with victim input to promote victim safety (Gondolf, 2002); certification and education of guardians ad litem and custody evaluators on domestic violence issues (Dalton, Drozd, & Wong, 2006); judges’ sensitivity to the needs of domestic violence victims; and an understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence (Bell et al., 2011; Klein, 2009; Labriola et al., 2009; Ptacek, 1999).

A study of the OVW-funded Milwaukee Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative (JODI) domestic violence court found that domestic violence probationers involved in the initiative were half as likely to recidivate as domestic violence offenders on probation before the initiative. Rearrest for violence dropped from 8 percent to 4.2 percent. The average number of new arrests for all crimes also dropped significantly. JODI employed pretrial court monitoring of domestic violence offenders; those violating bail conditions were jailed for short terms. Pretrial incarceration for non-compliance was associated with an increase in post-conviction compliance (Harrell et al., 2006). Similar reductions in recidivism rates occurred at a JODI domestic violence court in Dorchester, MA (Harrell et al., 2007).

Rates of conviction are higher and dismissals are lower in many specialized domestic violence courts (Davis, Smith, & Rabbit, 2001; Harrell et al., 2006; Klein, 2009; Newmark et al., 2001). In Cook County, IL (Chicago), for example, the conviction rate in four misdemeanor domestic violence courts was 73 percent, compared with 22.9 percent in general criminal courts. Victim participation in the criminal process in the misdemeanor domestic violence courts was 73 percent, compared with 40 percent in general courts. Specialized courts also were more likely to incarcerate high risk abusers: 43 31.3 percent in the specialized courts compared with 6.7 percent in general criminal courts (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003).

In a study of the Domestic Violence Intake Center (DVIC) in Washington, DC, victims said the court experience was empowering and the criminal court process increased their quality of life and reduced depression and fear (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010). A

---

43 “High-risk” abusers in this study were those with a history of domestic violence, including the following: injury inflicted to the victim/survivor, use of weapons with threats, and/or domestic battery accompanied by threats.
positive court experience also appears to increase the numbers of victims who say they would use the criminal justice system in the future should they again be battered (Belknap & Sullivan, 2002; Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; Zweig & Burt, 2003). Another study found that 75 percent of victims said they would be more likely to report future violence if a domestic violence court was available (B. Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2001).

STOP funding for an additional case manager enabled a Louisiana district court to keep victims/survivors safer:

**Subgrantee Perspective**
STOP funding has allowed the Orleans Parish Criminal Court to employ an additional case manager to handle the volume of domestic violence-related arrests that are referred to Domestic Violence Monitoring Court. The court would have been overwhelmed without the employment of this additional case manager and would have been unable to properly provide the protective services needed by victims of domestic violence. This also enabled the court to expand its outreach efforts into the community to make the public aware of the services offered by the Domestic Violence Monitoring Court.

—Orleans Parish Criminal District Court, Louisiana

In the following examples, STOP Program-funded probation officers were critical to the success of domestic violence courts in monitoring offenders’ compliance with court orders:

**Subgrantee Perspective**
Prior to receiving this funding, we were not able to form the Domestic Violence Court because of the need for a probation officer. Without these funds, our budget would not allow for the hiring or retention of the probation officers. The probation officers are essential to the Domestic Violence Court because of the mandatory reporting policies. The probation officers ensure that the offenders are complying with court orders by attending court-ordered services. If the offender does not comply, then the probation officers send 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.

—Custer County Domestic Violence Court, Oklahoma
Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, and stalking by an average of 15 STOP subgrantees in 2009 and 2010; 9 of these subgrantees used funds for judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.8 hearings per offender for an average of 3,276 offenders in 2009 and 2010. These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders.

As illustrated in Table 8, 43 percent of all violations disposed of by STOP Program-funded courts in 2009 resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2010, 63 percent had this result.

### Table 8. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disposition</th>
<th>2009 (N = 2,124)</th>
<th>2010 (N = 1,254)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/written warning</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial/full revocation of probation</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions added</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action taken</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

A study of Rhode Island’s Department of Corrections/Probation and Parole found that a specialized probation supervision unit for those convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of reabuse and rearrest among low-risk offenders, and increased victim satisfaction when compared with nonspecialized supervision (Klein et al., 2005). Findings of a study that examined probation outcomes in three probation agencies in Oklahoma, Iowa, and Colorado suggested that reducing probation officer caseloads, when combined with the application of evidence-based practice, can reduce criminal recidivism. Specialized officers with reduced caseloads are better able to manage cases, thereby improving probation outcomes (Kuck Jalbert et al., 2011).

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

Although sex offenders constitute a large and increasing number of prison inmates, most are eventually released into the community. Intensive community supervision for this population may offer an effective way to reduce the threat of future victimization. A study of 917 convicted male sex offenders on probation in 17 states...
subject to community supervision found that although the overall recidivism rate was 16 percent, only 4.5 percent of offenders committed a new sex crime during probation (Meloy, 2005).

In Hawaii, a probation deterrence program that imposes swift, certain, and proportionate consequences on probationers who violate the terms of their probation has achieved significant success. After 1 year in the deterrence program, probationers (when compared with probationers in a control group) were 55 percent less likely to be arrested for new crimes, 72 percent less likely to use drugs, 61 percent less likely to skip an appointment with a supervising officer, and 53 percent less likely to have their probation revoked (McEvoy, 2012).

Some subgrantees in California have used STOP funds for specialized probation officers. These officers have smaller caseloads and more frequent contact with offenders, maintain regular contact with victims/survivors and refer them to services, respond swiftly when offenders are out of compliance, and are able to develop relationships with other criminal justice system and community partners:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

This grant has enabled two deputy probation officers to conduct intensive supervision of domestic violence offenders throughout Contra Costa County [California], and establish collaborative efforts with local law enforcement agencies. Because the officers' caseloads are smaller than normal caseloads, the grant has enabled them to contact a greater number of victims of domestic violence and refer them to community-based organizations, and further support the victims' efforts to enforce protective orders and ensure victim safety. It has allowed the probation officers to provide offenders an opportunity to seek treatment to address substance abuse issues and an opportunity for offenders to modify their violent behavior.

—Contra Costa County Probation Department, California

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Regular, intensive supervision was not possible prior to this program being implemented. This particular caseload is very labor-intensive and requires considerable follow-up. Offenders must be quickly held accountable when violations of probation are noted. As well, it has provided victims of these crimes the ability to communicate directly with the probation officer assigned to the program and advise when and if they are being further victimized.

—Glenn County Probation Department, California
As described by the STOP administrator, the following subgrantee used STOP funds for intense supervision of offenders by a court officer who communicates with the STOP Program-funded prosecutor when offenders are not in compliance:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

STOP funding pays for a full-time prosecutor in the DA’s [district attorney’s] office and pays for a court services officer who monitors offenders for the DV [domestic violence] Court. The court services officer attends every domestic violence docket at the Cleveland County Courthouse—misdemeanor and felony. She consults with and makes reports to the DA about offender accountability and makes sure that the DA is aware of all offenders who are not completing the conditions of their probation as ordered by the court. [The] judge who oversees the DV Court in Cleveland County, counts on the information she receives from both the court services officer and the DA to make her rulings when it comes to the DV Court. The two STOP-funded people are also active participants in their coordinated community response team. They have made so much progress in their community that they plan and present DV training to all the new recruits at the Norman Police Academy.

—STOP administrator, Oklahoma

An average of 24 subgrantees funded probation activities during each of the reporting periods covered by this report; these subgrantees hired an average of 27 probation officers. STOP subgrantees reported training 11,172 professionals in the category of corrections officers, which includes probation and parole officers.
As illustrated in Table 9, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 66 percent of the total dispositions of their violations in 2009 and 46 percent in 2010.  

### Table 9. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disposition</th>
<th>Total Violations</th>
<th>2009 (N = 1,590)</th>
<th>2010 (N = 1,596)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal/written warning</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial/full revocation of probation</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions added</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action taken</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 2009 and 2010, STOP Program-funded probation officers supervised an annual average of 3,921 offenders and made a total of 108,743 contacts with those offenders. The majority of the contacts (51 percent) were face to face, 32 percent were by telephone, and 17 percent were unscheduled surveillance. STOP Program-funded agencies also had a total of 8,869 contacts with an average of 1,412 victims/survivors during 2009 and 2010.

### Sexual Assault

Sexual assault is any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. Falling under the definition of sexual assault are activities such as forced sexual intercourse, forcible sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2012). Sexual assault is perpetrated in a range of relationships, from strangers, acquaintances, and dating partners to intimate or married partners of the victims/survivors (White, McMullin, Swartout, & Gollehon, 2008).

The recently released National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), based on 16,507 interviews with men and women in the United States, found that
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44 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.
nearly one in five (18.3 percent) women has experienced rape\textsuperscript{45} at least once, 44.6 percent have experienced some other form of sexual violence, and approximately 1 in 10 women has been raped by an intimate partner. 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).

Women under age 25 are at increased risk for sexual crimes: More than three-quarters (79.6 percent) of women surveyed in the NISVS study who had been victims of a completed rape were first raped before their 25th birthday, with approximately 42 percent of these victims experiencing their first rape before the age of 18 (Black et al., 2011). The Campus Sexual Assault Study, which surveyed more than 6,800 undergraduate students in 2 large public universities, found that approximately 14 percent of the 5,466 women completing the survey had been victims of at least 1 completed sexual assault since entering college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007).

Studies of intimate partner sexual assault demonstrate significantly greater prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder, stress, and dissociation when compared with non-intimate partner sexual assault and women who were physically assaulted only (McFarlane et al., 2005; Temple, Weston, Rodriguez, & Marshall, 2007). A study of more than 3,000 women between the ages of 18 and 86 suggests a lifetime prevalence rate of sexual assault as high as 18 percent for the 112 million women living in the United States, with only 1 in 5 women reporting their victimization to the police. Of those reported, only 37 percent were prosecuted (Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & McCauley, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006).

The shame and fear experienced by survivors of sexual assault may prevent them from seeking assistance. In a study of 215 college students (55 percent of whom were female), the most crucial barriers reported were shame and guilt, concerns over confidentiality, fear of retaliation, and worry about not being believed (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). In a qualitative study of 29 victims/survivors who had not sought assistance, researchers found that these victims/survivors were trying to protect themselves, thinking the services would not help them, could not protect them, and might cause them greater psychological harm (D. Patterson, Greeson, & Campbell, 2009).

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. 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

\textsuperscript{45} In the NISVS study, rape is separated into three types—completed forced penetration, attempted forced penetration, and completed alcohol- or drug-facilitated penetration.
to better responses and improved services to victims/survivors of sexual assault and stalking.

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and evidence collected, but also to provide victims/survivors of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is vital to ensure that victims/survivors obtain competent medical care and follow-up services in a manner that supports their immediate needs and long-term healing. Training on the collection of forensic evidence during the examination is critical to holding offenders accountable in the criminal justice process. Historically, victims/survivors of sexual assault 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.

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

A North Dakota subgrantee describes the impact of having STOP-funded SANEs available 24 hours a day in the community:

**Subgrantee Perspective**

Our community now has professionally trained sexual assault nurse examiners dedicated to serving victims/survivors on call 24 hours a day. The victims of sexual violent crimes are now provided immediate, comprehensive exams by professionals trained to collect evidence. In addition, individuals are able to reach a SANE 24 hours a day by calling our crisis line to request an exam or to ask medical questions regarding sexual assault. We provide assistance to victims/survivors in obtaining support by providing referrals and health care services.

—Jamestown Sexual Assault Response Team, North Dakota

The following subgrantees used STOP funds to provide essential training on sexual assault:
Subgrantees used funds to expand access to critical counseling services for sexual assault victims/survivors:

**STOP Program**

Subgrantee Perspective

STOP Program funding allows the Olmsted County SAIC [Sexual Assault Inter-Agency Council] to develop and train various disciplines on a coordinated, victim-centered, sexual assault response protocol. Prior to the Olmsted County SAIC, there was no multidisciplinary protocol for sexual assault responders in our community. Since its inception, the Olmsted County SAIC has provided extensive training and ongoing monitoring of protocol compliance to various sexual assault responding agencies. This training and ongoing monitoring of protocol compliance ensures all core responding agencies are providing a victim-centered response.

—Dodge, Fillmore, Olmsted County Victim Services, Minnesota

**STOP Program**

Subgrantee Perspective

STOP funding is so vital to the anti-sexual violence movement and to the Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault. The funding from STOP supports the majority of the training that is provided through the coalition to professionals. The funding enables the coalition to have a law enforcement officer at the police academy to provide training to new recruits, detectives, and investigators. The funding enables us to work with the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council to provide training specific to prosecuting sex crimes to prosecutors. It supports the annual mock trial training that provides court [experience] for SANEs and gives advocates and other professionals an intimate look at the criminal justice process from both the defense and prosecution sides. The STOP grant enables the state to have a protocol on medical evidence collection to provide uniformity and consistency across Indiana for forensic nurse examiners. All of this training improves the response to victims and enhances the processes that will ultimately result in higher conviction rates and hopefully higher reporting rates.

—Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Indiana

**STOP Program**

Subgrantee Perspective

STOP Program funding continues to allow NYPTI [New York Prosecutor’s Training Institute] to enhance the level of expertise and professionalism among sexual assault prosecutors. It allows us to coordinate and support sexual assault prosecutors statewide by helping NYPTI provide training to prosecutors, investigators, sexual assault nurse examiners and forensic scientists.

—New York Prosecutor’s Training Institute, New York
**Subgrantee Perspective**

With this grant funding, the program was able to hire a licensed therapist to meet victims’ needs. This position offers no-cost professional counseling services at a safe place. This position is a great asset to the program and the victims/survivors we serve. Many individuals we see have been in counseling before and report [that] their counselors would tell them why they didn’t “deal with” sexual assault or abuse and they would have to talk with another counselor about those issues. Now victims see one therapist to learn coping skills for all areas they identify as the presenting problem. Clients have more faith that their needs are being met, someone cares, and their abuse matters and is worth processing. Prior to funding by this program, Carteret County Rape Crisis [Program] did not have sufficient funding to support such a position. This funding will hopefully influence the county, community, and board that having a trained and licensed therapist at this and all rape crisis programs is an asset not only to the primary and secondary victims they serve, but also to the community. Individuals coming to therapy are learning positive coping and to work through their abuse instead of turning to alternatives such as criminal behavior, substance abuse, and child abuse.

—Carteret County Rape Crisis Program, North Carolina

**Subgrantee Perspective**

The STOP funding has allowed our program to establish our sexual assault advocacy team. These advocates respond to an on-scene crisis call, and help the victim during their time of need. Our sexual assault/ domestic violence program is the only one in La Paz County, and has allowed law enforcement and other agencies to better utilize our services for their clients. We have opened a new door of opportunity for victims who need support and security during a crisis.

—Colorado River Regional Crisis Shelter, Colorado

**Subgrantee Perspective**

STOP funding has allowed the St. Landry-Evangeline Sexual Assault Center the opportunity to provide counseling services to more clients throughout St. Landry and Evangeline parishes. The therapist has been able to be more visible in these parishes as well as being able to provide sessions to accommodate those with difficult schedules.

—St. Landry-Evangeline Sexual Assault Center, Louisiana
The following subgrantees used STOP funds to enhance training, protocol, and practice for the prosecution of sex crimes:

**Subgrantee Perspective**

Primarily, STOP funding assists in maintaining an office in Clarksville, Tennessee, where we see the victims funded by this grant. It allows us to provide theraupeutic services to a population that might otherwise be faced with the need to travel to Nashville to receive such specialized treatment. Certainly, without STOP funding, we would have to reduce the number of clients that we see in that area, thus leaving many victims of sexual assault without a specialized treatment facility in their area. STOP funding had enabled us to provide healing therapeutic services to many victims of sexual assault.

—**Sexual Assault Center, Tennessee**

STOP Program funding allowed the Center for Victims of Violence and Crime (CVVC) to focus on systems-wide training to a variety of professionals who are often the first contact with sexual violence victims. These audiences have primarily included law enforcement, prosecutors, and probation and parole. CVVC presents information on how to be an effective, victim-sensitive first responder. Training curriculum includes information on all victim’s rights and services and the traumatic impacts of sexual violence. Our overall goal is to ensure that systems professionals are equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to respond effectively, both in terms of sensitive treatment of the victim and best practice for successful prosecution of these cases. Current training is based on revised law enforcement protocols for responding to these types of crime.

—**Allegheny County District Attorney’s Office, Pennsylvania**

[We] established a multiagency collaborative board consisting of law enforcement, judges, prosecutors, probation officers, and social service agencies, to address [violence against women] issues and develop and implement response protocols. This has allowed us to more effectively share information and resources to better address [violence against women] cases, which has improved the consistency with which these cases are prosecuted. Funds have also allowed us to assign a prosecutor to prosecute adult sexual assault cases which has also improved the consistency with which these cases are prosecuted. This helped us to develop additional expertise through training and experience. [Funds have also allowed us to provide] training of law enforcement and sexual assault nurses in collection of physical evidence, testifying in court, and photographic evidence. This has helped provide better investigators and more evidence to help prosecute these difficult cases with positive outcomes.

—**Marion County Commissioners, Hawaii**
An average of 224 sexual assault organizations—180 local programs and 44 state sexual assault coalitions—received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims/survivors made up 12 percent of all victims/survivors served with program funds in 2009 and 2010. An average of 985 subgrantees provided services to sexual assault victims, 177 engaged in law enforcement activities that addressed sexual assault, and 162 prosecuted sexual assault cases. STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of 6,835 sexual assault cases during 2009 and 2010, and an overall average of 82 percent 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 14 percent (138) of subgrantees using funds for training reported that they used funds for SANE training, and a total of 7,105 SANEs received STOP Program-funded training during 2009 and 2010. STOP Program funds also were used by an average of 50 STOP subgrantees to support 45 FTE SANE staff positions per reporting period.

An average of 645 subgrantees—66 percent of those using funds for training—provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault: sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination.

### Stalking

The most recent national survey on stalking, NISVS, revealed that 16.2 percent of women in the United States or approximately 19.3 million adult women have been stalked, and 4.2 percent of women, or 5.2 million adult women were stalked in the 12 months before the survey. Two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the women stalked were targeted by current or former intimate partners. Women were overwhelmingly

---

46 Subgrantees also reported that an average of 500 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs, 9 tribal dual programs, and 24 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010.

47 This rate includes deferred adjudications. For purposes of comparison, the average conviction rate for domestic violence cases was 67 percent; for stalking cases, the rate was 71.4 percent.
stalked by men (82.5 percent). Unwanted telephone calls and voice or text-messaging were the most common (78.8 percent) stalking tactics employed against women. A majority of the female victims of stalking were first stalked before age 25, and 20 percent were first stalked between the ages of 11 and 17 (Black et al., 2011).

The danger of stalking is often underestimated. Stalking has been associated with a range of serious consequences for victims/survivors, including an increased risk of violence, injury, and homicide (Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Swanberg, 2007; Roberts, 2005). A study using a nonrandom sample of more than 1,000 North American stalkers found that nearly a third had assaulted their victims. (Mohandie, Meloy, McGowan, & Williams, 2006). A 10-city study of female abuse victims and female victims of homicide or attempted homicide committed by their intimate partners found a strong association between stalking and subsequent lethal or near-lethal attacks. It found that stalking, when combined with a history of physical assault by a former or estranged partner, places women at greater danger of becoming victims of homicide or attempted homicide by intimate partners. It also found that women who reported that they were being followed or spied on by a partner had more than a twofold increase in the risk of becoming a homicide victim (McFarlane, Abeita, & Watson, 2002).

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

While stalking traditionally takes the form of unwanted spatial contact, cyberstalking—unwanted contact or monitoring through electronic devices—is experienced by 26 percent of stalking victims, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009). The accelerated development and availability of communications technology, combined with underreporting of stalking crimes in general, means that the actual number of cyberstalking victims is likely much higher. Studies of cyberstalking rates among college students reveal that between 3 and 41 percent are subject to various forms of cyberstalking and suggest that college students are at greater risk of cyberstalking victimization than the general population (Alexy, Burgess, Baker, & Smoyak, 2005; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Kraft & Wang, 2010; Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2012). Cyberstalking shares the fundamentals of traditional stalking and leads to many of the same consequences for victims (Sheridan & Grant, 2007).

Stalking remains an area in need of attention from law enforcement agencies (Klein, Salomon, Huntington, Dubois, & Lang, 2009). An examination of more than 2,500 domestic violence reports in Rhode Island for 2001–2005 revealed that for every
incident identified as stalking by the police, nearly 21 other incidents that met the definition of stalking were not identified as such by law enforcement. These other cases often involved different charges, such as breaking and entering or violation of a protective order. The study also found that the police-identified stalking cases were much more likely to have witnesses, indicating that the absence of third-party corroborating witnesses is a barrier to proper identification of stalking cases. The failure of law enforcement to identify and charge stalking crimes is pervasive. In a study of 16 large urban counties, only 5 percent of domestic violence suspects were charged with stalking, while 78 percent were charged with simple assault and 12 percent with aggravated assault (E. L. Smith, Farole, Greipp, & Reichard, 2009). Yet NISVS estimates that 5.2 million women and 1.2 million men were stalked in the 12 months before the survey (Black et al., 2011).

Stalking presents unique challenges to the criminal justice system, even when cases are successfully prosecuted. One study found that when stalking increased in frequency, victims were likely to contact criminal justice system personnel, but stalking did not decrease significantly thereafter (Cattaneo, Cho, & Botuck, 2011). Stalkers often continue their crimes after having been charged, prosecuted, convicted, and released. Research indicates a recidivism rate of approximately 60 percent among stalkers (Mohandie et al., 2006).

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/survivor and others in collecting evidence necessary to prosecute the crime, and how to keep the stalking victim/survivor safe, as well as how to coordinate the response among criminal justice agencies and community partners.

An Allegheny County, PA, victim-services agency, part of a CCR that included the district attorney’s office, realized the need to begin conversations about stalking with its partners, particularly law enforcement, as a first step toward developing training for and implementing a uniform stalking protocol:
Subgrantees used STOP Program funds for a stalking advocate/coordinator to work with law enforcement and a paralegal in a state’s attorney’s office:

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Historically, through working with police officers and victims, it had come to the attention of Crisis Center North (CCN) advocates that knowledge and enforcement of the stalking law was either confused or rarely happening. With some research, it became clear that in Allegheny County there was no one uniform stalking protocol for regional police departments to follow. CCN recognized that this lack of formal direction through policy may lead to understanding why this criminal conduct was largely going unenforced or prosecuted. The development of the survey tool allowed for CCN advocates and regional police chiefs to begin conversations around stalking and how to write a protocol that could be utilized universally by departments in the county. By utilizing an interview setting to conduct the survey, police chiefs or supervising officers were given an open forum in which to cultivate ideas and address concerns. Responses from officers on this format and the survey tool show that they felt their thoughts were heard and would be considered by the CCN staff. Since completing the surveys in late summer 2010, advocates have seen their work returned through better and more open relationships with police officers and department heads. With the upcoming implementation of the stalking protocol and the training that will take place around it, CCN anticipates seeing an increased use of the stalking charge and its prosecution within the courts.

—Allegheny County District Attorney’s Office, Pennsylvania

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Funding allowed for the hiring of a victim advocate that was the stalking coordinator. Without the expertise and trust that had been developed between the victim and advocate, law enforcement would be an outsider looking in. Information was flowing freely between victim and both law enforcement and advocates. . . . The nighttime on-call victim advocates (nova) were trained in domestic violence/sexual assault/stalking and how to work with law enforcement and their guidelines. Money was also used to purchase digital recorders and to do stalking victim focus groups to see where our gaps are.

—City of La Crosse, Wisconsin
SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE
Funding has allowed our office to more thoroughly review cases for stalking charges. The paralegal funded through this grant reviews cases charged as harassment, telephone misuse, and other similar charges that may be part of an overall stalking pattern. After interviewing the victim, she is able to determine if stalking charges can be filed. In addition, she discusses a safety plan with victims and refers them to appropriate services to enhance safety.

—Harford County State’s Attorney’s Office, Maryland

Training law enforcement and prosecutors in the identification, investigation, and prosecution of stalking crimes, including stalking via technology, is critical and has been supported by the following STOP Program-funded agencies:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE
Program funding has allowed the Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office to implement the Stalking and Threat Assessment Team (STAT), a specialized vertical prosecution unit in which specially selected and trained deputy district attorneys handle stalking cases from initial filing through the ultimate disposition of the case in the criminal courts. Since 1998, funding has allowed the first centralized unit created within the district attorney’s office dedicated solely to the vertical prosecution and investigation of stalking and criminal threat cases. The STAT deputy district attorney receives specialized training to develop an expertise in the prosecution of stalking and criminal threat cases. In addition, STOP Program funding enables the STAT deputy district attorney to attend the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP) conference every year. By attending the ATAP conference, the STAT deputy district attorney is able to network with stalking and threat assessment experts throughout California and the remainder of the United States. Most importantly, the STOP-funded STAT deputy district attorney serves as an advisor and trainer for other law enforcement agencies, community-based service providers who work with domestic violence and stalking victims, and Victim Impact Program (VIP) deputies who are assigned throughout the Los Angeles County district attorney’s office.

—Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE
Training on the use of technology in intimate partner stalking provided FASTT [Family Abuse and Stalking Training Team] detectives with new skills necessary to investigate cases involving the use of telephones, computers, and the Internet. Knowledge gained in the grant-funded training was used to identify and locate suspects sending threatening phone or computer messages, and to provide technological safety planning for victims.

—City of Albuquerque/Albuquerque Police Department, New Mexico
STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, and strengthen programs that address stalking by an average of 286, or 12 percent, of subgrantees. Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported disposing of a total of 2,762 stalking cases in 2009 and 2010, which constituted 1.3 percent of all cases disposed of. The conviction rate for all stalking cases (including ordinance, misdemeanor, felony, and stalking homicide) was 71 percent. Training on stalking issues was provided by an average of 355 subgrantees or 36 percent of those using funds for training. Training topics included overview and dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

Remaining Areas of Need

STOP administrators are asked to report on the most significant areas of unmet need in their states, for victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and for offender accountability. In their reports for calendar year 2010, administrators regularly cited the following as remaining unmet needs:

- Maintaining/expanding core services to victims/survivors in an uncertain economic climate
- Offender accountability
- Training of law enforcement and the judiciary
- Services for underserved populations, especially immigrant and limited English proficiency victims/survivors
- Improving the economic stability of victims/survivors
- Improving coordinated community response among victim service providers and the criminal justice system, especially for sexual assault
- Providing services for victims in geographically isolated areas

**SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE**

Finally, the [STOP] program funding allows the Domestic Violence Deputy Prosecutor the opportunity to provide training sessions to local law enforcement officers focusing on: the unique and complex issues involved in prosecuting domestic violence cases; the resources available to aid the officers in assisting victims; new, pertinent legislation enacted; and most importantly, the specific types of evidence critical to ensuring a conviction. This type of training is vital in any domestic violence case, but especially in situations where the victim recants due to fear of retaliation from her abuser. The training sessions also educate law enforcement officers about the specific types of evidence needed to ensure a stalking conviction, such as how to obtain and preserve evidence, such as phone records, messages sent via texting, or Internet communications. The training also ensures officers will be informed of community resources to offer the victim who is in fear for her safety.

—Morgan County Prosecutor’s Office, Indiana
STOP administrators report that subgrantees are concerned about how to maintain and expand existing core services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking in an uncertain economic climate. Recent cutbacks in local and state budgets have threatened the stability of some victim-services programs.

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

A deteriorating economy and significant reductions in federal, state, and local support have resulted in chronic staff turnover, compromised services, and even program closures, particularly in rural areas of the state and in areas with increasing ethnic diversity.

—STOP administrator, Virginia

STOP administrators frequently discussed the lack of offender accountability in their states, noting that providing victims/survivors with services to put their lives back together only solves part of the problem. Further training is considered a critical need, as is providing adequate legal services for victims/survivors involved in family court cases:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

There is a critical need to train law enforcement officers on the dynamics of domestic violence. As officers are called out repeatedly to the same address on domestic violence calls over and over again, they become less likely to render assistance and often, will cite both parties, as the officer decides to "let the courts sort it out." A charge of domestic violence, even if dismissed, can substantially hinder the victim as she tries to access services. Also, due to gaps in the judicial system, repeat offenders are often 'allowed' to violate in different jurisdictions, knowing that the likelihood of being found out is almost non-existent. If courts, prosecutors and judges had access to this information, repeat offenders could be in jeopardy of substantial jail time because domestic violence charges can be enhanced with each and every conviction. But without this information, prosecutors lack the evidence necessary to request jail time for the offender.

—STOP administrator, Utah
ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE
The judiciary continues to resist holding offenders accountable to the full extent of their power. When offenders violate protection orders, for example, law enforcement officers know that few judges will act swiftly and decisively to uphold the court order. In a state with no laws restricting the use of firearms—judges are reluctant to act beyond the basic notification requirement of the Violence Against Women Act. They rarely take aggressive action to remove guns/ammunition from prohibited persons as a result of a protection order, many times assigning responsibility for the firearms to a relative.

—STOP administrator, Vermont

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE
There is a desperate need for offender accountability. There are many cases that do not make it to court, and in part, this is due to the victim not testifying. This goes back to educating law enforcement and prosecutors on the dynamics of such crimes. Many times victims will not testify because they are being threatened by the offender. If an investigation is done properly, the prosecution should be able to move forward based on evidence and statements collected at the time of crime, regardless if the victim testifies (evidence-based prosecution). In the cases that do make it to trial, many offenders are receiving deferred judgments. This sends the message that there are no consequences for their actions, and does not provide any deterrent of future behavior. Finally, there is a need for legislation change regarding no-contact orders. As it stands now, a victim cannot gain a civil protection order against an offender who is an acquaintance or a stranger.

—STOP administrator, Iowa

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE
Survivors of domestic violence need pro bono and affordable attorneys to work on a variety of legal issues, including orders of protection, divorce/custody proceedings, child support actions, landlord/tenant cases, immigration, juvenile court cases regarding child custody, and government benefits. The caseload of Legal Services and Legal Aid offices in Missouri cannot handle all of the needs of those who seek their services. Merely obtaining protection orders is not sufficient to ensure victim safety and does not represent the breadth of the legal needs of survivors of sexual assault, domestic assault and stalking.

—STOP administrator, Missouri
Focus groups with victims/survivors in Ohio demonstrated that some domestic violence victims/survivors do not know where to turn for help with an abusive relationship. A lack of awareness of support services, coupled with a lack of availability of long-term services to ensure economic stability, makes it difficult for victims/survivors to leave an abusive relationship:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

Many victims prefer to access a less punitive civil system for legal relief and since the majority of battered women have children, it is often necessary for them to look to family court for help with issues of custody and support. New York State needs to address the problem of offenders using custody proceedings to continue power and control dynamics, particularly in family court. Accordingly, family court probation practices must address concerns for victim safety and offender accountability. This is increasingly important as New York moves toward the creative implementation of integrated domestic violence courts, consolidating civil and criminal court actions.

—STOP administrator, New York

STOP administrators also indicate that victims/survivors in the rural areas of their states continue to struggle with challenges, both economic and geographic:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**

Specifically, victims lack information about the availability of services. 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. In addition, participants expressed a need for extended length of shelter stays, and improved responses from law enforcement.

... Regardless of agency type or county size, services such as financial assistance to victims, housing, public transportation, child care, job training, and job placement are all lacking in some communities. Housing, especially shelters, is more likely to be sufficient at the initial stage to meet the immediate needs of victims. However, as victims move through the process, meeting housing needs becomes more challenging, and housing is deficient at the intermediate and long-term stages for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

—STOP administrator, Ohio
STOP administrators frequently mentioned the unmet needs of underserved populations, particularly immigrant victims/survivors and those with limited English proficiency. Access to civil legal representation for immigration issues is paramount for many immigrant victims/survivors, who face even greater challenges in leaving an abusive relationship. Those with limited English proficiency encounter significant difficulties navigating and accessing services and legal remedies:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
Because South Dakota is a predominantly rural state, many victims have to overcome transportation obstacles to access services. This does not only include the service of safe shelter, but also includes filing protection orders, accessing counselors and support groups, and obtaining medical advocacy. Victim services programs report their agencies do not have the necessary funding to provide all of the requested transportation. Many victims do not have access to reliable transportation, as public transportation is not available in many rural communities. In order to file a protection order, victims may have to travel 45 or more miles.

*—STOP administrator, South Dakota*

STOP administrators frequently mentioned the unmet needs of underserved populations, particularly immigrant victims/survivors and those with limited English proficiency. Access to civil legal representation for immigration issues is paramount for many immigrant victims/survivors, who face even greater challenges in leaving an abusive relationship. Those with limited English proficiency encounter significant difficulties navigating and accessing services and legal remedies:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
Consistent translator availability is a big issue within the justice system as a whole. Culturally appropriate responses within the justice system are hard to find outside of OVW-funded "special" projects and sometimes even within OVW projects. We believe that systems are beginning to understand the need for these services but see the financial restrictions as insurmountable.

*—STOP administrator, Wisconsin*

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
Programs all over the state are continuing to report higher numbers of people using their services who do not speak English or do not speak English well. Several programs have hired bilingual and/or bicultural advocates, but making services fully accessible to non-English-speaking persons still presents a huge challenge.

*—STOP administrator, Virginia*

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
Language presents barriers. Children are still being used as interpreters for their parents. Utah has been deemed as an 'English-only state' which makes it difficult for victims to secure protective orders.

*—STOP administrator, Utah*
Improving the response to sexual assault, in terms of the criminal justice system and victim services, continues to be a priority for many STOP administrators:

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
A second need expressed is the need for culturally-competent services in underserved populations such, but not limited to, Hispanic, Burmese, Arabic and African populations. There are several counties in our state that have a [large] immigrant population, making bilingual services and legal assistance imperative. Enhancing services to include more resources and language options would decrease barriers that often prevent underserved populations from reaching out for assistance. It is important to note that these services are not limited to victim-service programs. Victims need culturally-competent services in the courtroom and health care settings, as well.

—STOP administrator, Iowa

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
Prosecution faces the largest challenges. A well-documented shortage of prosecutors continues to erode the ability of DA’s [district attorneys] and ADA’s [assistant district attorneys] to effectively charge and prosecute crimes of violence against women. Sexual assault [cases are] particularly hurt by this process as less experienced prosecutors either lose cases or don’t charge them in the first place.

—STOP administrator, Wisconsin

**ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE**
For sexual assault, there is a need for training personnel from both the criminal justice system and non-government, non-profit organizations. There is a need for a coordinated sexual assault response as well as a need for an appropriate interview site for victims of sexual assault.

—STOP administrator, Hawaii
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 2009 and 2010.

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: 48,216 (94 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All staff</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim advocate (nongovernmental)</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program coordinator</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officer</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim assistant (governmental)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advocate</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator (prosecution-based)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault nurse examiner/sexual assault forensic examiner (SANE/SAFE)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officer/offender monitor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court personnel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator/interpreter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

STOP Program subgrantees provide training to professionals on issues relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking to improve their response to victims/survivors and 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** (43 percent of all subgrantees)
- Total number\(^49\) of people trained: **490,453**
- Total number of training events: **24,451**

### Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People trained</th>
<th>2009 &amp; 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people trained</td>
<td>490,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officers</td>
<td>148,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>67,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim advocates</td>
<td>51,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professionals</td>
<td>33,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>21,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>19,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service organization staff</td>
<td>18,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court personnel</td>
<td>18,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency staff</td>
<td>12,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>11,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections personnel</td>
<td>11,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health professionals</td>
<td>11,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys/law students</td>
<td>10,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization staff</td>
<td>10,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim assistants</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners</td>
<td>7,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization staff</td>
<td>6,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder organization staff</td>
<td>3,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services staff</td>
<td>2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability organization staff</td>
<td>2,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^49\) “Total” numbers are totals for 2009 and 2010.
Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People trained</th>
<th>2009 &amp; 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military command staff</td>
<td>2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant organization staff</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batterer intervention program (BIP) staff</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse organization staff</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government/Tribal government agency staff</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators/interpreters</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised visitation and exchange center staff</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offender treatment providers</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Coordinated Community Response

STOP administrators engage in an inclusive and collaborative planning process to improve their state’s responses to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. STOP Program subgrantees closely interact with other community agencies or organizations; these CCR activities include providing and receiving victim/survivor referrals, 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 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/organization</th>
<th>Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batterer intervention program</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence organization</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/organization</th>
<th>Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational institution/organization</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/mental health organization</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal organization</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor’s office</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offender management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault organization</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service organization</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government/tribal government agency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/organization</th>
<th>Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batterer intervention program</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence organization</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational institution/organization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/mental health</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/organization</th>
<th>Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal organization</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor’s office</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offender management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault organization</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service organization</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government/tribal government agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 452 (20 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 13a. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/protocol</th>
<th>2009 Subgrantees using funds (N = 477)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality (victim services)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory training standards (victim services)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying primary aggressor</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate access to protection order information</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order enforcement</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13b. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/protocol</th>
<th>2010 Subgrantees using funds (N = 426)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality (victim services)</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory training standards (victim services)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying primary aggressor (law enforcement)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate access to protection order information (law enforcement)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order enforcement (law enforcement)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Products

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

- Average number of subgrantees using funds for products: 466 (20 percent of all subgrantees)
- Number of products developed or revised: 50 2,825

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, distributed, and/or translated 636 products in the following 27 languages in 2009 and 2010:

---

50 These products included brochures, manuals, and training curriculums and materials, including those developed for websites.
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: 247 (11 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 14. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Subgrantees using funds 2009 (N = 245)</th>
<th>Subgrantees using funds 2010 (N = 249)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage data collection and communication</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information with other community partners</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand existing data collection/communication systems</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase computers/other equipment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new data collection/communication systems</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>2009 Subgrantees reporting</th>
<th>2010 Subgrantees reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection orders</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation/outcome measures</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests/charges</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident reports</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations of protection orders</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 532 (23 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 16a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new unit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train a specialized unit</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new unit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train a specialized unit</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17a. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17b. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System Improvement

To more effectively respond to the needs of victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, STOP Program subgrantees engage in system improvement activities. 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: 227 (10 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 18a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Victim services</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language lines</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety audits</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel or equipment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of forms and documents</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Victim services</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Probation/parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language lines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety audits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel or equipment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of forms and documents</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victim Services

During the two 12-month reporting periods, an average of 1,542 subgrantees (67 percent) used funds for victim services in 2009 and 2010. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of 452,893 victims/survivors (99 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence; only 1 percent of victims/survivors seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See Tables 19a, 19b, 20, and 21 for information on the level of service provided, the types of victims/survivors served, and the reasons victims/survivors were partially served or not served by subgrantees in 2009 and 2010.)

- Average number of subgrantees using funds for victim service: 1,542 (67 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, by level of service and type of victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of service</th>
<th>All victims</th>
<th>Domestic violence / dating violence victims</th>
<th>Sexual assault victims</th>
<th>Stalking victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All seeking services</td>
<td>482,507</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>412,907</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not served</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5,363</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, by level of service and type of victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of service</th>
<th>All victims</th>
<th>Domestic violence / dating violence victims</th>
<th>Sexual assault victims</th>
<th>Stalking victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served</td>
<td>461,545</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>394,425</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>435,451</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>371,471</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Served</td>
<td>14,720</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13,119</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,213</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 19b. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2010, by level of service and type of victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of service</th>
<th>All victims</th>
<th>Domestic violence / dating violence victims</th>
<th>Sexual assault victims</th>
<th>Stalking victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All seeking services</td>
<td>435,451</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>371,471</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not served</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5,386</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served</td>
<td>413,308</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>352,344</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Served</td>
<td>16,213</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010, by type of victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of victimization</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All victimizations</td>
<td>476,265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence / dating violence</td>
<td>407,544</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>58,047</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>10,674</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Subgrantees reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program reached capacity</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet statutory requirements</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services not appropriate for victim/survivor</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with mental health issues</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program unable to provide service due to limited resources/priority-setting</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics of Victims/survivors Served

Of the average 452,893 victims/survivors served in 2009 and 2010 for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (55 percent), female (91 percent), and age 25–59 (67 percent).

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Victims/survivors receiving services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and/or Alaska Native</td>
<td>9,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>98,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>76,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>238,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>46,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>419,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–12</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17</td>
<td>22,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>106,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 Although STOP subgrantees do not report a reason for not serving or for partially serving individual victims/survivors, they report reasons for not serving or partially serving victims/survivors in general by checking all reasons that apply.
Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Victims/survivors receiving services</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–59</td>
<td>285,166</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>261,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>16,713</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>45,029</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>37,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>24,919</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>24,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with limited English proficiency</td>
<td>39,158</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>38,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</td>
<td>20,981</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who live in rural areas</td>
<td>119,871</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>117,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom the information was known. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 452,893 victims/survivors. Because victims/survivors may have identified with more than one race/ethnicity, the total number reported in race/ethnicity may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors served.

Table 23a. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to offender</th>
<th>Domestic violence / dating violence</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</td>
<td>273,573</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>10,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family or household member</td>
<td>38,861</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating relationship</td>
<td>59,520</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>5,182</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>15,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>6,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>36,109</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding unknown)</td>
<td>377,855</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/survivors may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships in any one victimization category may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors reported as served for that victimization.
Table 23b. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to offender</th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/former spouse</td>
<td>239,764</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>10,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or intimate partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family or household member</td>
<td>34,425</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating relationship</td>
<td>61,745</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>5,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>31,952</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding unknown)</td>
<td>341,285</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/survivors may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships in any one victimization category may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors reported as served for that victimization.

Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and resources, health care, education, finances, transportation, 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/survivors as needed.

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>2009 (N = 476,265)</th>
<th>2010 (N = 429,521)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim/survivor advocacy</td>
<td>215,088</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>211,182</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice advocacy/court</td>
<td>158,060</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil legal advocacy/court</td>
<td>130,056</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling services/support group</td>
<td>115,725</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>2009 (N = 476,265)</th>
<th>2010 (N = 429,521)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil legal assistance</td>
<td>25,273</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>23,249</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/clinic/other medical response</td>
<td>15,516</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language services</td>
<td>14,436</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic exam</td>
<td>9,634</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other victim service</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Number receiving shelter services and number of bed nights in 2009 and 2010:

- An annual average of 20,759 victims/survivors and 18,871 family members received a total of 1,601,685 emergency shelter bed nights.
- An annual average of 755 victims/survivors and 841 family members received a total of 323,444 transitional housing bed nights.

Total number of hotline calls in 2009 and 2010:

- From victims/survivors: 679,049
- From all callers, including victims/survivors: 1,202,710

Total number of victim-witness notification/outreach activities: 350,904

Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims/survivors seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement of protection order violations, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders. STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims/survivors in the protection order process. In 2009 and 2010, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims/survivors in obtaining 372,197 temporary and final protection orders.
Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temp</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All providers</td>
<td>345,767</td>
<td>112,366</td>
<td>76,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim services staff</td>
<td>254,649</td>
<td>80,416</td>
<td>60,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>65,010</td>
<td>20,989</td>
<td>12,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>26,108</td>
<td>10,961</td>
<td>4,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An average of 473 (48 percent of all subgrantees using funds for training) addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and an average of 91 developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders in 2009 and 2010. These policies addressed the issues of protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection orders, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and mutual restraining orders. STOP Program subgrantees also used funds for data collection and communication systems for tracking and sharing information about protection orders: 120 subgrantees reported this, making it the third most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

Criminal Justice

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

Law Enforcement

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

Tables 26a and 26b summarize STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2009 and 2010. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- Average number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: 296 (13 percent of all subgrantees)
Table 26a. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2009\textsuperscript{52}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence/dating violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases/incidents investigated</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>72,961</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>78,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident reports</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>72,203</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>77,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for assistance</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>66,146</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>73,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals of cases to prosecutor</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>31,847</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>33,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>29,618</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>31,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of warrants</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests for violation of protection order</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual arrests</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests for violation of bail bond</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic medical evidence</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not applicable

Table 26b. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2010\textsuperscript{53}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence/dating violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident reports</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>72,551</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>78,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for assistance</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>71,292</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>76,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases/incidents investigated</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>68,496</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>74,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals of cases to prosecutor</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>36,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>26,998</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>28,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17,762</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of warrants</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests for violation of protection order</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic medical evidence</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual arrests</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests for violation of bail bond</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not applicable

\textsuperscript{52} 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.

\textsuperscript{53} See footnote 52.
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 2009 and 2010.

- Average number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: 294 (13 percent of all subgrantees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence / dating violence, stalking and related cases by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2009 and 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor domestic violence/dating violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony domestic violence/dating violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence/dating violence homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of bail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of probation or parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of protection order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of other court order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to violence against women—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.

Of the 15 courts (or court-based programs) that received STOP funding to conduct court activities each year, 54% used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders’ compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- An annual average of 3,276 offenders were monitored in 2009 and 2010.
- A total of 11,901 individual judicial review hearings were held in 2009 and 2010.

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 2009, 43 percent of all violations disposed of resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2010, 63 percent had this result.

- Average number of subgrantees using funds for court: 15 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

---

54 Although an average of 51 courts received STOP funding in 2009 and 2010, only 15 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 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Verbal/written warning</th>
<th>Partial/full revocation of probation</th>
<th>Conditions added</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>No action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order (N = 750)</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New criminal behavior (N = 55)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend BIP (N = 450)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other conditions (N = 869)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Verbal/written warning</th>
<th>Partial/full revocation of probation</th>
<th>Conditions added</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>No action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order (N = 122)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New criminal behavior (N = 108)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend BIP (N = 417)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other conditions (N = 607)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

55 The category “Failure to attend mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)” was not included in Table 28a because of a low N (13); 77 percent of the dispositions for this violation category resulted in partial or full revocation.

56 The category “Failure to attend other mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)” was not included in Table 28b because of a low N (35); 60 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 2009 and 2010 was 3,921; of those, 3,658 were being supervised for domestic violence or dating violence offenses, 248 for sexual assault offenses, and 16 for stalking offenses. These offenders received a total of 108,743 contacts, as shown in Table 29. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims/survivors as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. An annual average of 1,412 victims/survivors received a total of 8,869 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2009 and 2010.

Average number of grantees using funds for probation: 24 (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009 and 2010, by type and number of contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of contact</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>Number of contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>28,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>17,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled surveillance</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>10,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of offenders completing probation without violations: 655 (60 percent of those completing probation)

Average number of offenders completing probation with violations: 440 (40 percent)\(^{57}\)

\(^{57}\) Data from one subgrantee that reported on offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded pretrial services in 2010 was excluded from these computations. The number of offenders completing pretrial supervision without violations for this subgrantee was 333 (97 percent of those in supervision who completed during 2010) and the number completing with violations was 10 (3 percent).
The data in Tables 30a and 30b reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009 and 2010. Offenders received partial or full revocation when protection orders were violated (an average of 72 percent), when they failed to attend batterer intervention programs (60 percent), or when they engaged in new criminal behavior (56 percent).

**Table 30a. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Verbal/written warning</th>
<th>Partial/full revocation of probation</th>
<th>Conditions added</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>No action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New criminal behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 266)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend BIP</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 372)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend MOT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 735)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).

**Table 30b. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Verbal/written warning</th>
<th>Partial/full revocation of probation</th>
<th>Conditions added</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>No action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection order</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New criminal behavior</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 317)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend BIP</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 353)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend MOT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 737)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).
Batterer Intervention Program

- Average number of individual subgrantees using STOP Program funds for batterer intervention programs (BIP): **16** (1 percent of all subgrantees)
- Average annual number of offenders in BIP: **1,715**
- Average number of continuing offenders from last reporting period: **536**
- Average number of offenders entering during current reporting period: **1,179**

Table 31. Outcomes of offenders in STOP-funded BIP programs in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of outcome</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offenders</td>
<td>offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed program</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated from program</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to program after termination</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^\text{58})</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{58}\) Other outcomes included the following: transferred, deceased, referred to other court.
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Appendix A 2009
Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of subgrantee awards</th>
<th>Amount allocated to subgrantees ($)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table A1a are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2009.
Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Subgrantee Awards</th>
<th>Amount Allocated to Subgrantees ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subgrantee awards</td>
<td>Amount allocated to subgrantees ($)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total amounts awarded to victim services</th>
<th>2009&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Total amounts awarded to victim services</th>
<th>2010&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>605,500</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>771,353</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>222,836</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>297,040</td>
<td>57,830</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>455,146</td>
<td>455,146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>217,582</td>
<td>217,582</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>834,383</td>
<td>64,320</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>833,939</td>
<td>64,320</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>330,148</td>
<td>60,636</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>337,313</td>
<td>78,570</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,452,555</td>
<td>1,049,663</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4,301,657</td>
<td>1,150,212</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>481,648</td>
<td>74,989</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>677,784</td>
<td>174,394</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>424,553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>662,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>354,609</td>
<td>46,931</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>366,138</td>
<td>48,571</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Florida</td>
<td>208,946</td>
<td>65,250</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>215,233</td>
<td>215,233</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,891,547</td>
<td>161,920</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,555,483</td>
<td>161,482</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,602,093</td>
<td>257,573</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,391,536</td>
<td>470,247</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>349,634</td>
<td>349,634</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>353,057</td>
<td>105,219</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>418,779</td>
<td>153,019</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>372,196</td>
<td>76,085</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>281,617</td>
<td>43,787</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>281,617</td>
<td>89,788</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,185,970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1,185,205</td>
<td>138,044</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1,361,091</td>
<td>222,115</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>546,695</td>
<td>46,530</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>629,715</td>
<td>61,469</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>388,961</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>978,370</td>
<td>91,242</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>499,232</td>
<td>289,236</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>494,021</td>
<td>57,450</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>622,216</td>
<td>92,247</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>531,001</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>336,517</td>
<td>65,729</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>309,787</td>
<td>89,022</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>742,624</td>
<td>81,748</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>616,856</td>
<td>267,657</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,089,200</td>
<td>135,500</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1,153,648</td>
<td>142,455</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,520,883</td>
<td>191,167</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1,417,624</td>
<td>115,417</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>859,270</td>
<td>141,106</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>625,600</td>
<td>431,079</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>586,392</td>
<td>119,756</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1,148,183</td>
<td>153,169</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>946,541</td>
<td>117,121</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>906,566</td>
<td>109,122</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>255,040</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>318,540</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>300,160</td>
<td>33,983</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>308,611</td>
<td>48,847</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The Illinois STOP administrator reported that no victim services awards were made in 2009. The STOP administrators in Connecticut, Wyoming, and Kansas did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

<sup>b</sup>It appears that the Virgin Islands did not make victim services awards in 2010; the STOP administrators in Connecticut, Illinois, and Nevada did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.
Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total amounts awarded to victim services</th>
<th>2009&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Total amounts awarded to victim services</th>
<th>2010&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>456,090</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>304,872</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>291,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>897,553</td>
<td>133,480</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,547,709</td>
<td>179,500</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>309,990</td>
<td>101,874</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>438,995</td>
<td>71,198</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,208,870</td>
<td>351,616</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2,428,484</td>
<td>436,885</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>243,346</td>
<td>16,890</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>181,171</td>
<td>14,583</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2,239,510</td>
<td>312,121</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>183,645</td>
<td>178,741</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>445,217</td>
<td>41,636</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>460,814</td>
<td>47,997</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2,370,655</td>
<td>817,794</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2,548,668</td>
<td>778,153</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>477,348</td>
<td>97,937</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>433,981</td>
<td>56,028</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>704,507</td>
<td>49,418</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>747,158</td>
<td>57,207</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>800,334</td>
<td>377,545</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>2,929,165</td>
<td>708,581</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>475,091</td>
<td>160,151</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>741,021</td>
<td>347,767</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>368,077</td>
<td>23,833</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>382,097</td>
<td>24,517</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>546,101</td>
<td>83,055</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1,382,698</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>235,664</td>
<td>39,693</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>216,025</td>
<td>30,885</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>962,949</td>
<td>89,317</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>879,623</td>
<td>89,317</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,960,368</td>
<td>1,241,330</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>2,707,887</td>
<td>1,310,441</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>368,697</td>
<td>98,722</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>311,767</td>
<td>459,054</td>
<td>147.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>293,133</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>283,295</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>543,275</td>
<td>543,275</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>770,607</td>
<td>74,908</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>821,621</td>
<td>81,958</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>884,995</td>
<td>130,088</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>905,284</td>
<td>113,980</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>372,309</td>
<td>37,250</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>355,983</td>
<td>77,609</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>738,666</td>
<td>243,088</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>979,459</td>
<td>289,889</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>13,583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196,297</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,784,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,610,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,974,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,634,157</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Data collection and communication systems</th>
<th>Specialized Units</th>
<th>System Improvement</th>
<th>Victim services</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Probation and parole</th>
<th>BIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Data Collection and Communication Systems</td>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>System Improvement</td>
<td>Victim Services</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Probation and Parole</td>
<td>BIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Subgrants</th>
<th>Subgrants using funds for victim services</th>
<th>Victims/survivors seeking services</th>
<th>Victims receiving services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Served</td>
<td>Partially served</td>
<td>Not served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7754</td>
<td>7414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>2360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5014</td>
<td>5006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5291</td>
<td>5148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21396</td>
<td>19730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15524</td>
<td>15236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5191</td>
<td>5191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>2710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19127</td>
<td>18139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13940</td>
<td>12767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20946</td>
<td>20606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13485</td>
<td>13015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7478</td>
<td>7394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6567</td>
<td>6479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8681</td>
<td>8107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21567</td>
<td>21424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10084</td>
<td>9641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10529</td>
<td>9988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15494</td>
<td>15270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5656</td>
<td>5365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13312</td>
<td>12264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>2749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3812</td>
<td>3653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9047</td>
<td>8849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12275</td>
<td>12131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Subgrants</td>
<td>Subgrants using funds for victim services</td>
<td>Victims/survivors seeking services</td>
<td>Victims receiving services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Served</td>
<td>Partially served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28740</td>
<td>26327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6037</td>
<td>5846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28587</td>
<td>27531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9419</td>
<td>8958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22983</td>
<td>22733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4285</td>
<td>4219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6248</td>
<td>6148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6426</td>
<td>6296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4746</td>
<td>4653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41030</td>
<td>37277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8257</td>
<td>7828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14746</td>
<td>14288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5785</td>
<td>5734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>3967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5455</td>
<td>4986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2305</strong></td>
<td><strong>1588</strong></td>
<td><strong>482507</strong></td>
<td><strong>461545</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Asian Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2943</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4372</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>8620</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>7857</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5054</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3868</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7109</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6857</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8781</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>13–17</th>
<th>18–24</th>
<th>25–29</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>9358</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>3273</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>22387</td>
<td>106970</td>
<td>285166</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>45029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>8399</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>98847</td>
<td>9788</td>
<td>7026</td>
<td>3743</td>
<td>76676</td>
<td>238615</td>
<td>46149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Limited English proficiency</th>
<th>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</th>
<th>Live in rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>4157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>3275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>4957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>5351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Limited English proficiency</th>
<th>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</th>
<th>Live in rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>5179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>6316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>5644</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>7768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>4281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>24919</td>
<td>39158</td>
<td>20981</td>
<td>119871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B5a. Victim’s relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</th>
<th>Other family or household member</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Relationship unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>9440</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10565</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>13856</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6653</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2482</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11342</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>6801</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>8520</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>9488</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6933</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5901</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>2453</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8516</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>5216</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4263</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>8272</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5921</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7531</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17610</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>3751</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B5a. Victim’s relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</th>
<th>Other family or household member</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Relationship unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>18445</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>4173</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>6184</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>14787</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>3954</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25620</td>
<td>7425</td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6152</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10459</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2867</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>290485</strong></td>
<td><strong>51756</strong></td>
<td><strong>67489</strong></td>
<td><strong>22527</strong></td>
<td><strong>7877</strong></td>
<td><strong>49995</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A 2010
Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010\textsuperscript{62}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of subgrantee awards</th>
<th>Amount allocated to subgrantees ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{62} Data in Table A1 are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of subgrantee awards</th>
<th>Amount allocated to subgrantees ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CRT</th>
<th>DISC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>905,284</td>
<td>697,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>821,621</td>
<td>643,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>979,459</td>
<td>1,100,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196,297</td>
<td>169,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>51,371,186</td>
<td>36,592,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010.
Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2009 Total Amounts awarded to victim</th>
<th>2009 Amounts awarded to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
<th>2010 Total Amounts awarded to victim</th>
<th>2010 Amounts awarded to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>605,500</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>771,353</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>222,836</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>297,040</td>
<td>57,830</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>455,146</td>
<td>455,146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>217,582</td>
<td>217,582</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>834,383</td>
<td>64,320</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>833,939</td>
<td>64,320</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>330,148</td>
<td>60,636</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>337,313</td>
<td>78,570</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,452,555</td>
<td>1,049,663</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4,301,657</td>
<td>1,150,212</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>481,648</td>
<td>74,989</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>677,784</td>
<td>174,394</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>424,553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>662,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>354,609</td>
<td>46,931</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>366,138</td>
<td>48,571</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>208,946</td>
<td>65,250</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>215,233</td>
<td>215,233</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,891,547</td>
<td>161,920</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,555,483</td>
<td>161,482</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,602,093</td>
<td>257,573</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,391,536</td>
<td>470,247</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>349,634</td>
<td>349,634</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>353,057</td>
<td>105,219</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>418,779</td>
<td>153,019</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>372,196</td>
<td>76,085</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>281,617</td>
<td>43,787</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>281,617</td>
<td>89,788</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,185,205</td>
<td>138,044</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1,361,091</td>
<td>222,115</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>546,695</td>
<td>46,530</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>629,715</td>
<td>61,469</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>388,961</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>978,370</td>
<td>91,242</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>499,232</td>
<td>289,236</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>494,021</td>
<td>98,002</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>336,517</td>
<td>65,729</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>309,787</td>
<td>89,022</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>742,624</td>
<td>81,748</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>616,856</td>
<td>267,657</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,089,200</td>
<td>135,500</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1,153,648</td>
<td>142,455</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,520,883</td>
<td>191,167</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1,476,624</td>
<td>115,417</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>859,270</td>
<td>141,106</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>625,600</td>
<td>431,079</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>586,392</td>
<td>119,756</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1,148,183</td>
<td>153,169</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>946,541</td>
<td>117,121</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>906,566</td>
<td>109,122</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>255,040</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>318,540</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>300,160</td>
<td>33,983</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>308,611</td>
<td>48,847</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>456,090</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 The Illinois STOP administrator reported that no victim services awards were made in 2009. The STOP administrators in Connecticut, Wyoming, and Kansas did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

64 It appears that the Virgin Islands did not make victim services awards in 2010; the STOP administrators in Connecticut, Illinois, and Nevada did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.
Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2009 Total amounts awarded to victim</th>
<th>2009 Amounts awarded to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
<th>2010 Total amounts awarded to victim</th>
<th>2010 Amounts awarded to CSCBOs</th>
<th>Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>304,872</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>291,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>897,553</td>
<td>133,480</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,547,709</td>
<td>179,500</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>309,990</td>
<td>101,874</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>438,995</td>
<td>71,198</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,208,870</td>
<td>351,616</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2,428,484</td>
<td>436,885</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana</td>
<td>243,346</td>
<td>16,890</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>181,171</td>
<td>14,583</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2,239,510</td>
<td>312,121</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>183,645</td>
<td>178,741</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>445,217</td>
<td>41,636</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>460,814</td>
<td>47,997</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2,370,655</td>
<td>817,794</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2,548,668</td>
<td>778,153</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>477,348</td>
<td>97,937</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>433,981</td>
<td>56,028</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>704,507</td>
<td>49,418</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>747,158</td>
<td>57,207</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>800,334</td>
<td>377,545</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>2,929,165</td>
<td>708,581</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>475,091</td>
<td>160,151</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>741,021</td>
<td>347,767</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>368,077</td>
<td>23,833</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>382,097</td>
<td>24,517</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>546,101</td>
<td>83,055</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1,382,698</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>235,664</td>
<td>39,693</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>216,025</td>
<td>30,885</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>962,949</td>
<td>89,317</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>879,623</td>
<td>89,317</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,960,368</td>
<td>1,241,330</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>2,707,887</td>
<td>1,310,441</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>368,697</td>
<td>98,722</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>311,767</td>
<td>459,054</td>
<td>147.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>293,133</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>283,295</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>543,275</td>
<td>543,275</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>770,607</td>
<td>74,908</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>821,621</td>
<td>81,958</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>884,995</td>
<td>130,088</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>905,284</td>
<td>113,980</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>372,309</td>
<td>37,250</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>355,983</td>
<td>77,609</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>738,666</td>
<td>243,088</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>979,459</td>
<td>289,889</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>13,583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196,297</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42,784,737</td>
<td>9,610,196</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>47,974,638</td>
<td>10,634,157</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B 2010
## Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Data collection and communication systems</th>
<th>Specialized units of systems</th>
<th>System improvement</th>
<th>Victim services</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Probation and parole</th>
<th>BIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Data collection and communication systems</th>
<th>Specialized units</th>
<th>System improvement</th>
<th>Victim services</th>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Probation and parole</th>
<th>BIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Subgrantees using funds for victim services</td>
<td>Victims/survivors seeking services</td>
<td>Victims receiving services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgrants</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Served</td>
<td>Partially served</td>
<td>Not served</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7145</td>
<td>6886</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7145</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5982</td>
<td>5961</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5978</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>3843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14664</td>
<td>13007</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>14351</td>
<td>9090</td>
<td>5016</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7672</td>
<td>7115</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>6168</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19420</td>
<td>18258</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>19236</td>
<td>17304</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12390</td>
<td>11719</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12314</td>
<td>7461</td>
<td>4575</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>2224</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22990</td>
<td>22924</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22988</td>
<td>21133</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10996</td>
<td>10585</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10968</td>
<td>10027</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5334</td>
<td>5122</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>5139</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7264</td>
<td>7155</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7236</td>
<td>6857</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17109</td>
<td>16986</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17070</td>
<td>15092</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8626</td>
<td>8405</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8581</td>
<td>7658</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8139</td>
<td>7838</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8086</td>
<td>7323</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15665</td>
<td>15433</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15604</td>
<td>13469</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4098</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4016</td>
<td>3512</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13463</td>
<td>11601</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>13030</td>
<td>10540</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>4757</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>4704</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13031</td>
<td>12690</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13017</td>
<td>11436</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Subgrants using funds for victim services</th>
<th>Victims/survivors seeking services</th>
<th>Victims receiving services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgrants</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8784</td>
<td>8678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>2609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27473</td>
<td>23728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6826</td>
<td>6521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17158</td>
<td>16671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2921</td>
<td>2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7805</td>
<td>7450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14287</td>
<td>13858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5799</td>
<td>4886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6746</td>
<td>6014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8291</td>
<td>8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5893</td>
<td>5824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3991</td>
<td>3891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42030</td>
<td>40425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9420</td>
<td>9016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14717</td>
<td>13995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5139</td>
<td>5139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5161</td>
<td>5145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4887</td>
<td>3961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2274</strong></td>
<td><strong>1496</strong></td>
<td><strong>435451</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4735</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>9193</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>8438</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4547</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B
Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4041</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6063</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3095</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8291</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>12945</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5049</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>4529</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>3893</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>89701</td>
<td>82111</td>
<td>19961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              | American/Alaska Native |     |       |
|              | 20             | 1558  | 3091  |
|              | 41             | 90    | 1199  |
|              | 27             | 503   | 764   |
|              | 1328           | 478   | 924   |
|              | 230            | 188   | 350   |
|                  | 8549          | 37616  | 94761  |

|              | Hawaiian/Pacific Islander |     |       |
|              | 246            | 23    | 25    |
|              | 1199           | 3280  | 1199  |
|              | 27             | 3638  | 503   |
|              | 1328           | 1923  | 764   |
|              | 230            | 1473  | 1101  |
|                  | 5582          | 34988  | 261941  |

|              | Hispanic/Latino |     |       |
|              | 1224           | 479   | 9940  |
|              | 3280           | 0     | 3543  |
|              | 3638           | 1195  | 315   |
|              | 1923           | 218   | 149   |
|              | 1473           | 43    | 138   |
|                  | 2010          | 34988  | 37958  |
Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Limited English proficiency</th>
<th>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</th>
<th>Live in rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>2644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>2549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>3136</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>3006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>3124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>5636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>6226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Limited English proficiency</th>
<th>Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</th>
<th>Live in rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>4731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>7150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>3275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>24717</td>
<td>38791</td>
<td>21973</td>
<td>117884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B5b. Victims/survivors’ relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</th>
<th>Other family or household member</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Relationship unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3602</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4082</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>5786</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4599</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9354</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>13588</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>6134</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7417</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3659</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3561</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10382</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6834</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4488</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9035</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>4733</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7915</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7129</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>5035</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>15530</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>4565</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</td>
<td>Other family or household member</td>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>Relationship unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9879</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>4690</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5135</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8275</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>4166</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>27008</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>5553</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6611</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10808</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>255099</strong></td>
<td><strong>45841</strong></td>
<td><strong>68760</strong></td>
<td><strong>21907</strong></td>
<td><strong>6810</strong></td>
<td><strong>44502</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>