

**OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN'S
GRANT FUNDS USED TO ADDRESS STALKING:
2016 AND 2018 REPORT TO CONGRESS**

Contents

Reporting Requirement	3
Defining Stalking	3
Stalking Victimization in the United States	3
Office on Violence Against Women Background	6
OVW Discretionary Grantees Addressing the Crime of Stalking	8
Criminal Justice Activities: Snapshot of the ICJR Program	14
STOP Program Subgrantees Activities	15
Technical Assistance to OVW Grantees	17
Reported Areas of Remaining Need.....	17

Reporting Requirement

The Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (VAWA) required that the Attorney General submit to Congress an annual report, beginning one year after the date of enactment of the Act, providing information about the incidence of stalking and domestic violence, and evaluating the effectiveness of anti-stalking efforts and legislation. In the 2005 reauthorization of VAWA, the reporting requirement was changed from an annual report to a biennial one, to be due on each “even-numbered fiscal year.” This requirement can be found at 34 U.S.C. § 12409.

Defining Stalking

Stalking is a crime in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and under federal law. While stalking laws and definitions vary from state to state, it is generally defined as a course of conduct directed at a specific person that causes actual fear or would cause a reasonable person to feel fear. In establishing fear, some states require that the victim fear serious bodily injury or death, either to themselves or a third person, while others require that the victim to fear for their safety or suffer from emotional distress. Course of conduct is generally defined as two or more acts that take place on separate occasions, without legitimate purpose or lawful authority, that evidence continuity of purpose. Depending on the state, stalking is either a crime of general or specific intent.

Stalking Victimization in the United States

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reports that approximately 3.8 million people age 16 or older were stalked in 2016,¹ and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), has found that about 1 in 7 (15.2%) women and 1 in 19 (5.7%) men have experienced stalking at some point in their lives.² Women who are divorced or separated face the highest rate of stalking.³ The majority of victims are stalked by people they know, and 60.8% of female victims and 43.5% of male victims of stalking are stalked by a current or former intimate partner.⁴ Female stalking victims report that stalking tactics most often include unwanted phone calls (78.8% of victims reported this), being approached by the perpetrator or having the perpetrator show up where the victim is (57.6%), being watched or followed (38.6%), receiving unwanted gifts from the perpetrator (26.4%), and the perpetrator sneaking into the victim’s home or car (22.9%).⁵

¹ Truman, J. L., & Morgan, R. E. (2021). *Stalking victimization, 2016*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at: <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/sv16.pdf>.

² Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M.T. (2014). *Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization—National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011*. MMWR: Surveillance Summaries, 63(SS-8), 1-18 *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: Surveillance Summaries*, 63(8).

³ Truman & Morgan (2021).

⁴ Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick (2014).

⁵ Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. Atlanta, GA:

Perpetrators who stalk victims do so repeatedly, and over a significant period of time: Twenty-four percent of stalking victims said the stalking behavior lasted for two years or more, and one in 10 victims said it happened too many times to count.⁶

In addition to the relentless nature of the crime, stalking is also a significant risk factor for domestic violence-related homicide. In a study of cases of actual or attempted domestic violence homicide involving a female victim who was physically assaulted by her violent partner in the preceding year, nearly all (90%) of the victims were also stalked by their assailant.⁷ Of the women in that study who were murdered, 54% had reported the stalking to police before they were killed. Another study assessing police records found that domestic violence cases with features of stalking or stalking charges were more threatening and violent than cases without elements of stalking.⁸

Young adults and people in the lowest income brackets experience higher rates of stalking: people in households with incomes under \$10,000 were more likely to be stalking victims than people with household incomes over \$10,000.⁹

More than half of female stalking victims (53.8%) were first stalked before they were 25 years old; that figure is similar for male victims of stalking (47.7%).¹⁰ Research has found that stalking may be more common on college campuses than in the general population.¹¹ According to one study of nearly 1,600 college students, 42.5% had experienced some form of stalking victimization. However, victims may not recognize stalking as a crime.¹² Of those students reporting behavior that qualified as stalking, only about one quarter (24.7%) self-identified as stalking victims, and their likelihood of acknowledging the behavior as stalking was linked with more severe and injurious actions by the offenders.¹³

Being stalked, and suffering the fear and threats that characterize the crime, is significantly correlated with the severity of symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and psychological distress endured by female victims.¹⁴ Stalking burdens victims with numerous tangible and intangible costs, from emotional trauma to financial ruin. Anxiety, insomnia, and depression, and other symptoms of traumatic stress are

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from: http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_Report2010-a.pdf.

⁶ Truman & Morgan (2021).

⁷ McFarlane, J., Campbell, J.C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C., Ulrich, Y., and Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies*, 3(4), 300–316.

⁸ Klein, A. K., Salomon, A., Huntington, N., Dubois, J., & Lang, D. (2009). *A statewide study of stalking and its criminal justice response*. (NCJ 228354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

⁹ Truman & Morgan (2021).

¹⁰ Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick (2014)

¹¹ See, for example: Buhi, E. R., Clayton, H., & Surrency, H. (2009). Stalking victimization among college women and subsequent help-seeking behaviors. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(4), 419–426.

¹² McNamara, C. L., & Marsil, D. F. (2012). The prevalence of stalking among college students: The disparity between researcher-and self-identified victimization. *Journal of American College Health*, 60(2), 168–174.

¹³ McNamara, C. L., & Marsil, D. F. (2012).

¹⁴ Fleming, K. N., Newton, T. L., Fernandez-Botran, R., Miller, J. J., & Burns, V. E. (2012). Intimate partner stalking victimization and posttraumatic stress symptoms in post-abuse women. *Violence Against Women*, 18(12), 1368–1389.

much higher among stalking victims than people who have not been stalked.¹⁵ Furthermore, stalking by a current or former intimate partner has been found to escalate victims' fear and distress, with victims being significantly afraid that their stalkers would physically or sexually assault them, harass them and their loved ones, threaten their children, cause financial problems, or humiliate them publicly.¹⁶

In addition to the emotional and psychological toll of stalking, victims also face financial hardship as they may have to move, cancel cell phone plans, change jobs, reduce employment, or purchase expensive security systems in attempts to remain safe. One study found that domestic violence victims who were stalked after obtaining a protection order incurred an average of \$610 in property damage or loss in a six-month period, compared to \$135 for victims whose abusers violated protection orders in ways that did not include stalking, and \$15 for those whose protection orders were not violated and who were not stalked.¹⁷ Victims who were stalked after the protection order was issued also lost more work time (78 hours) than victims who did not experience further abuse or stalking while a protection order was in place (4 hours). Loss of productivity as a result of stalking, regardless of whether the victim had a protection order, was also studied through the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which found that of stalking victims who had jobs, about 1 in 8 reported they had missed work due to concern for their safety or to pursue activities like obtaining a restraining order or testifying in court. More than half of victims lost five or more days of work during the previous 12 months.¹⁸

Stalking is an underreported crime: the NCVS found that 41% of female stalking victims either reported their victimization to law enforcement themselves or someone else who was aware of the crime reported it.¹⁹ Victims' reasons for not reporting include: a belief that the police cannot or will not do anything, fear that they will not be believed, being afraid of the perpetrator, not wanting law enforcement or courts involved in the matter, thinking that the perpetrator's actions are not serious enough to warrant reporting to police, and not having proof of stalking.²⁰ Of victims who did report stalking to the police, 20% said no action was taken after they reported it, and 20% of those victims said they perceived the reason for inaction to be that police did not want to get involved,

¹⁵ Blaauw, E., Winkel, F. W., Arensman, E., Sheridan, L., & Freeve, A. (2002). The toll of stalking: The relationship between features of stalking and psychopathology of victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(1), 50-63; and, Brewster, M. (2002). Trauma symptoms of former intimate stalking victims. *Women and Criminal Justice, 13*(2/3), 141-161.

¹⁶ Logan, T. K., Walker, R., Hoyt, W., & Faragher, T. (2009). *The Kentucky civil protective order study: A rural and urban multiple perspective study of protective order violation consequences, responses, and costs*. (NCJ 228 350). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228350.pdf>.

¹⁷ Logan, T. K., & Walker, R. (2010). Toward a deeper understanding of the harms caused by partner stalking. *Violence and Victims, 25*(4), 440-455.

¹⁸ Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009). Stalking victimization in the United States. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from: <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ovw/legacy/2012/08/15/bjs-stalking-rpt.pdf>.

¹⁹ Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose (2009).

²⁰ Logan, T. K., Cole, J., Shannon, L., & Walker, R. (2006). *Partner stalking: How women respond, cope, and survive*. New York: Springer Publishing Company; Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. (NCJ 169 592). Washington, DC/Atlanta, GA: National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and Logan, T. K., Walker, R., Hoyt, W., & Faragher, T. (2009).

had no legal authority, or were inefficient or ineffective. About half of victims who reported stalking to the police said the stalking situation remained the same after making the report.²¹ Furthermore, research has documented that stalking is rarely identified in domestic violence cases that include elements of stalking,²² and people arrested for stalking often are not prosecuted.²³ For a summary of research on intimate partner stalking, see [Research on Partner Stalking: Putting the Pieces Together](#).²⁴

Office on Violence Against Women Background

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), a component of the U.S. Department of Justice, provides national leadership in developing the nation's capacity to reduce violence against women through the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Created in 1995, OVW administers financial and technical assistance to communities across the country that are developing programs, policies, and practices, aimed at ending domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Since OVW's inception, the Office has awarded over \$9 billion in grants and cooperative agreements and launched a multifaceted approach to implementing VAWA. By forging state, local, and tribal partnerships among police, prosecutors, victim advocates, health care providers, and others, OVW grant programs help provide victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, with the protection and services they need to pursue safe and healthy lives, while simultaneously enabling communities to hold offenders accountable for their crimes.

OVW currently administers four formula grant programs and 15 discretionary grant programs. Each discretionary program explicitly defines eligible recipients, which vary based on the program (e.g., states, tribal governments, city and county governments, universities, and private nonprofit organizations, including those serving victims/survivors). Grants are typically awarded for a period of two to three years, although grantees may apply for continuation funding. Formula grants are awarded

"Funding allowed us to partner with prosecutors to support initial work on a stalking protection order enhancement to the county's domestic violence protection order resources, so that we can serve victims of stalking who do not qualify for a DV protection order. It helps us ensure that victims are aware of new state rights and system protocols in stalking cases, and can access stalking protection order forms, information, and resources."

²¹ Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose (2009).

²² See, for example: Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2001). Stalking: Its role in serious domestic violence cases. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice; and Caperona, B. (2007). *Domestic Violence in New Mexico, 2006 Highlights*. Albuquerque, NM: State of New Mexico, Department of Health, Office of Injury Prevention.

²³ Klein, A. K., Salomon, A., Huntington, N., Dubois, J., & Lang, D. (2009).

²⁴ Logan, T. K. (2010). *Research on partner stalking: Putting the pieces together*. Available at: <https://victimsofcrime.org/docs/Common%20Documents/Research%20on%20Partner%20Stalking%20Report.pdf?sfvrsn=0>.

annually to each state, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories through the Services * Training * Officers * Prosecutors (STOP) Violence Against Women Formula Program and the Sexual Assault Services Formula Program (SAS Formula), with award amounts determined by population. The monies awarded to STOP Program and SAS Formula Program grantees are then allocated to subgrantees in their respective jurisdictions.

The Violence Against Women Act of 2000 requires grantees and subgrantees to report on the effectiveness of activities carried out with grant funds, including the number of people served and the number of people seeking services who could not be served. To meet this Congressional reporting requirement and those of the Government Performance and Results Act and subsequent legislation, OVW requires all discretionary program grantees to complete semi-annual progress reports and all formula grantees and subgrantees to complete annual progress reports about activities undertaken with their OVW funds.

The snapshot of data that follows is generated from reports from grantees and subgrantees under the STOP Program and OVW discretionary grant programs, spanning January 2013 through December 2016.

For more information on these and other OVW grant programs, please visit: <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/grant-programs>.

OVW Discretionary Grantees Addressing the Crime of Stalking

Between 2013 and 2016, grantees under 13 OVW discretionary grant programs reported directing some percentage of grant funds to address the crime of stalking (see table 1).

Table 1. Number of discretionary grantees directing some percentage of grant funds to address stalking, 2013 – 2016

Number of discretionary grantees directing some percentage of grant funds to address stalking, January to December 2013 and January to December 2014

Grant Program	2013 6-month average		2014 6-month average	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
Abuse in Later Life (ALL) Program (n=37, 42)	30	81%	31	74%
Campus Program (n=91, 83)	88	97%	80	96%
Consolidated Youth (CY) Program ¹ (n=24, 27)	11	46%	14	52%
Culturally Specific Services (CSSP) Program (n=56, 60)	21	38%	22	37%
Disabilities Program (n=35, 36)	13	37%	11	31%
Improving Criminal Justice Response (ICJR) Program (n=188, 166)	97	52%	84	51%
Justice for Families (JFF) Program ¹ (n=34, 53)	25	74%	41	77%
Legal Assistance for Victims (LAV) Program (n=172, 191)	101	59%	114	60%
Rural Program (n=112, 118)	93	83%	80	68%
Transitional Housing (n=208, 203)	46	22%	50	25%
Tribal Governments Program (n=196, 203)	105	54%	158	78%
Tribal Jurisdictions ²				
Underserved Program ³ (n=9)			6	67%

Number of discretionary grantees directing some percentage of grant funds to address stalking, January to December 2015 and January to December 2016

Grant Program	2015 6-month average		2016 6-month average	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
Abuse in Later Life (ALL) Program (n=44, 43)	33	75%	35	81%
Campus Program (n=88, 96)	82	93%	92	96%
Consolidated Youth (CY) Program (n=39, 49)	25	64%	30	61%
Culturally Specific Services (CSSP) Program (n=59, 49)	21	36%	20	41%
Disabilities Program (n=33, 34)	11	33%	12	35%
Improving Criminal Justice Response (ICJR) Program (n=156, 173)	74	47%	86	50%
Justice for Families (JFF) Program (n=83, 93)	65	78%	71	76%
Legal Assistance for Victims (LAV) Program (n=222, 208)	133	60%	115	55%
Rural Program (n=127, 136)	86	68%	87	64%
Transitional Housing (n=210, 208)	138	66%	49	24%
Tribal Governments Program (n=205, 194)	116	57%	111	57%
Tribal Jurisdictions Program (n=7)			2	29%
Underserved Program (n=13, 23)	8	62%	13	57%

Note: "n" is the number of discretionary grantees that submitted their semi-annual progress reports during the particular reporting period. The first number in the parentheses is n for the first column; the number after the comma is n for the second column. The percentages shown are percentages of grantees that directed at least 1 percent of their grant funds to address the crime of stalking. Percentages were rounded to the closest whole number. Additionally, due to rounding, percentages may add to more than 100%.

¹The JFF and CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to Dec 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to Dec 2013 reporting period.

²Tribal Jurisdiction (TJ) Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to Dec 2016 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2016 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to Dec 2016 reporting period.

³Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to Dec 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to Dec 2014 reporting period.

Stalking Victims

Between 2013 and 2016, grantees reported serving 2,400 stalking victims on average every six months (see table 2).

As discussed earlier in this report, stalking often occurs in the context of domestic/dating violence. The forms that OVW grantees used to report on services they provide for victims captured only the presenting victimization for which victims first seek services. A domestic violence victim who was stalked by her abuser and obtained OVW-funded services for both crimes—domestic violence and stalking—would have only registered in grantee reports as a domestic violence victim. For example, a victim who requested assistance with a protection order after being stalked by her estranged husband with a history of controlling behavior toward the victim may have been reported as a victim of domestic violence rather than a victim of stalking; the victim cannot be reported in both categories. Therefore, numbers in the tables throughout this report do not reflect all victims of stalking served or partially served, only those who first presented with a request for help with stalking victimization.

Furthermore, readers should note that the number of victims served, as reported here, includes those victims counted on grantee progress reports as “served” and “partially served.” The OVW progress report forms define “victims/survivors served” as those who received the service(s) they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant; and “victims/survivors partially served” as those who received some, but not all, of the services they requested.

“The OVW grant has allowed us to significantly enhance stalking investigations. The use of video surveillance and forensic phone analysis equipment, made possible through grant funding, have become indispensable to law enforcement agencies across the county for evidence documentation and case preparation.”

State College Police Department (PA)

Table 2. Number of stalking victims served, 2013-2016

Number of stalking victims served, January to December 2013 and January to December 2014

Grant Program	2013 6-month average ¹	2014 6-month average
ALL Program (n=10, 15)	14	20
Campus Program (n=53, 53)	99	104
CY Program ² (n=1, 9)	0	8
CSSP Program (n=47, 53)	41	37
Disabilities Program (n=0, 1)	0	0
ICJR Program (n=148, 133)	1,004	915
JFF Program ² (n=2, 7)	13	23
LAV Program (n=169, 182)	573	622
Rural Program (n=91, 100)	552	655
Tribal Governments Program (n=166, 167)	138	181
Tribal Jurisdictions Program ³		
Underserved Program ⁴ (n=3)		6
TOTAL SERVED⁵	2,434	2,571

Number of stalking victims served, January to December 2015 and January to December 2016

Grant Program	2015 6-month average	2016 6-month average
ALL Program (n=22, 21)	40	31
Campus Program (n=53, 48)	97	107
CY Program (n=15, 24)	19	31
CSSP Program (n=50, 42)	46	34
Disabilities Program (n=2, 2)	0	1
ICJR Program (n=113, 132)	705	734
JFF Program (n=16, 23)	124	206
LAV Program (n=217, 202)	675	608
Rural Program (n=107, 111)	540	522
Tribal Governments Program (n=159, 155)	134	135
Tribal Jurisdictions Program (n=0)		0
Underserved Program (n=7, 14)	9	58
TOTAL SERVED⁵	2,389	2,467

Note: "n" is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services during that particular reporting period. These numbers do not reflect all victims of stalking served or partially served, because programs must report victims by their *primary victimization* only. For example, a victim who requests assistance with a protection order after being stalked by an estranged intimate partner with a history of controlling behavior toward the victim may be reported as a victim of domestic violence rather than a victim of stalking; the victim cannot be reported in both categories.

¹The number of victims served reported here includes those victims reported as "served" and "partially served." The OVV progress report defines "victims served" as those who received the service(s) they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant; and "victims partially served" as those who received some, but not all, of the services they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant.

²The JFF and CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2013 reporting period.

³Tribal Jurisdiction (TJ) Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2016 reporting period; TJ Program averages for the previous periods are unavailable.

⁴Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2014 reporting period.

⁵A victim/survivor may be served by more than one grant program. Therefore, there is a small possibility that this is not an unduplicated count.

For the discretionary grant programs that reported serving victims of stalking, the victims were most often (around 60% each reporting period) a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the offender. About a quarter of the time, the victims served were either an acquaintance or a current or former dating partner of the offender. (See tables 3a through 3d on the next pages.)

Table 3a. Number and percent of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program, 2013

January to December 2013: 6-month average of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program¹

Type of Relationship January to December 2013	ALL Program (n=10)	Campus Program (n=53)	CY Program ^{2,3} (n=1)	CSSP Program (n=47)	Disabilities Program (n=0)	ICJR Program (n=148)	JFF Program ³ (n=2)	LAV Program (n=169)	Rural Program (n=91)	Tribal Governments Program (n=166)	Underserved Program ⁴ n/a	Total
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	13 (93%)	19 (19%)		39 (51%)	0 (0%)	459 (43%)	9 (69%)	973 (77%)	248 (42%)	111 (65%)		1,871 (57%)
Other family or household member	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	77 (7%)	0 (0%)	37 (3%)	67 (11%)	13 (8%)		199 (6%)
Acquaintance	1 (7%)	47 (48%)	0 (0%)	5 (7%)	0 (0%)	224 (21%)	0 (0%)	98 (8%)	130 (22%)	15 (9%)		520 (16%)
Current or former dating partner	0 (0%)	24 (24%)	0 (0%)	28 (37%)	0 (0%)	189 (18%)	3 (23%)	132 (10%)	125 (21%)	28 (16%)		529 (16%)
Stranger	0 (0%)	6 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	124 (12%)	1 (8%)	20 (2%)	26 (4%)	3 (2%)		181 (5%)
Current or former spouse or intimate partner of parent or caregiver			0 (0%)									0 (0%)
Current or former dating relationship of parent or caregiver			0 (0%)									0 (0%)
Parent/grandparent	0 (0%)											0 (0%)
Patient/client care receiver	0 (0%)				0 (0%)							0 (0%)
Totals	14	98	0	76	0	1,073	13	1,260	596	170	0	3,300

Note: "n" is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services. Percentages are based on the total for each victimization category; percentages were rounded to the closest whole number and may not equal 100 percent. A victim may have multiple stalking victimizations and/or offenders, so the number of relationships can be higher than the number of victims served.

¹ Because Tribal Jurisdiction (TJ) Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2016 reporting period, and at that time there were no grantees using funds for victim services activities, Tribal Jurisdictions is not represented on this table.

² The CY Program reporting form includes additional language specifying "of child" for the "Current or former dating partner" category.

³ The JFF and CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2013 reporting period.

⁴ Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2014 reporting period.

Table 3b. Number and percent of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program, 2014

January to December 2014: 6-month average of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program¹

Type of Relationship January to December 2014	ALL Program (n=15)	Campus Program (n=53)	CY Program ^{2,3} (n=9)	CSSP Program (n=53)	Disabilities Program (n=1)	ICJR Program (n=133)	JFF Program (n=7)	LAV Program (n=182)	Rural Program (n=100)	Tribal Governments Program (n=167)	Underserved Program ⁴ (n=3)	Total
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	4 (21%)	11 (11%)		49 (64%)	0 (0%)	554 (56%)	7 (30%)	916 (76%)	387 (48%)	131 (68%)	6 (75%)	2,065 (60%)
Other family or household member	5 (26%)	2 (2%)	4 (27%)	5 (6%)	0 (0%)	54 (5%)	6 (26%)	45 (4%)	74 (9%)	8 (4%)	0 (0%)	203 (6%)
Acquaintance	8 (42%)	38 (37%)	4 (27%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	180 (18%)	3 (13%)	101 (8%)	180 (22%)	30 (16%)	1 (13%)	548 (16%)
Current or former dating partner	0 (0%)	34 (33%)	3 (20%)	17 (22%)	0 (0%)	159 (16%)	7 (30%)	119 (10%)	137 (17%)	20 (10%)	1 (13%)	497 (14%)
Stranger	2 (11%)	17 (17%)	3 (20%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	44 (4%)	2 (9%)	19 (2%)	26 (3%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	119 (3%)
Current or former spouse or intimate partner of parent or caregiver			0 (0%)									0 (0%)
Current or former dating relationship of parent or caregiver			1 (7%)									1 (0%)
Parent/grandparent	0 (0%)											0 (0%)
Patient/client care receiver	0 (0%)				0 (0%)							0 (0%)
Totals	19	102	15	77	0	991	25	1,200	804	192	8	3,433

See footnotes in table 3a, above.

Table 3c. Number and percent of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program, 2015

January to December 2015: 6-month average of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program¹

Type of Relationship January to December 2015	ALL Program (n=22)	Campus Program (n=53)	CY Program ^{2,3} (n=15)	CSSP Program (n=50)	Disabilities Program (n=2)	ICJR Program (n=113)	JFF Program ³ (n=16)	LAV Program (n=217)	Rural Program (n=107)	Tribal Governments Program (n=159)	Underserved Program (n=7)	Total
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	10 (24%)	20 (20%)		43 (64%)	0 (0%)	403 (48%)	60 (50%)	1,223 (77%)	311 (51%)	88 (62%)	10 (71%)	2,168 (61%)
Other family or household member	3 (7%)	1 (1%)	3 (14%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	63 (7%)	10 (8%)	53 (3%)	51 (8%)	7 (5%)	0 (0%)	194 (5%)
Acquaintance	22 (54%)	34 (34%)	10 (45%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	154 (18%)	24 (20%)	99 (6%)	130 (21%)	25 (18%)	2 (14%)	506 (14%)
Current or former dating partner	1 (2%)	36 (36%)	6 (27%)	10 (15%)	0 (0%)	180 (21%)	27 (22%)	179 (11%)	99 (16%)	20 (14%)	1 (7%)	559 (16%)
Stranger	3 (7%)	8 (8%)	1 (5%)	5 (7%)	0 (0%)	47 (6%)	1 (1%)	25 (2%)	20 (3%)	2 (1%)	1 (7%)	113 (3%)
Current or former spouse or intimate partner of parent or caregiver			2 (9%)									2 (0%)
Current or former dating relationship of parent or caregiver			0 (0%)									0 (0%)
Parent/grandparent	2 (5%)											2 (0%)
Patient/client care receiver	0 (0%)				0 (0%)							0 (0%)
Totals	41	99	22	67	0	847	122	1,579	611	142	14	3,544

Note: "n" is the number of grantees that reported using funds to provide victim services. Percentages are based on the total for each victimization category; percentages were rounded to the closest whole number and may not equal 100 percent. A victim may have multiple stalking victimizations and/or offenders, so the number of relationships can be higher than the number of victims served.

¹ Because Tribal Jurisdiction (TJ) Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2016 reporting period, and at that time there were no grantees using funds for victim services activities, Tribal Jurisdictions is not represented on this table.

² The CY Program reporting form includes additional language specifying "of child" for the "Current or former dating partner" category.

³ The JFF and CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2013 reporting period.

⁴ Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2014 reporting period.

Table 3d. Number and percent of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program, 2016

January to December 2016: 6-month average of stalking victims' relationships to offenders, by grant program¹

Type of Relationship January to December 2016	ALL Program (n=21)	Campus Program (n=48)	CY Program ^{2,3} (n=24)	CSSP Program (n=42)	Disabilities Program (n=2)	ICJR Program (n=132)	JFF Program ³ (n=23)	LAV Program (n=202)	Rural Program (n=111)	Tribal Governments Program (n=155)	Underserved Program (n=14)	Total
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	4 (12%)	21 (19%)		22 (18%)	1 (100%)	375 (44%)	121 (55%)	1,169 (80%)	308 (51%)	87 (65%)	47 (62%)	2,155 (59%)
Other family or household member	3 (9%)	3 (3%)	1 (3%)	51 (43%)	0 (0%)	44 (5%)	37 (17%)	40 (3%)	30 (5%)	5 (4%)	2 (3%)	216 (6%)
Acquaintance	19 (58%)	44 (40%)	21 (55%)	21 (18%)	0 (0%)	204 (24%)	45 (20%)	105 (7%)	160 (27%)	18 (13%)	6 (8%)	643 (18%)
Current or former dating partner	1 (3%)	29 (26%)	8 (21%)	18 (15%)	0 (0%)	208 (24%)	14 (6%)	128 (9%)	94 (16%)	20 (15%)	17 (22%)	537 (15%)
Stranger	5 (15%)	13 (12%)	5 (13%)	7 (6%)	0 (0%)	27 (3%)	3 (1%)	23 (2%)	11 (2%)	4 (3%)	4 (5%)	102 (3%)
Current or former spouse or intimate partner of parent or caregiver			1 (3%)									1 (0%)
Current or former dating relationship of parent or caregiver			2 (5%)									2 (0%)
Parent/grandparent	1 (3%)											1 (0%)
Patient/client care receiver	0 (0%)				0 (0%)							0 (0%)
Totals	33	110	38	119	1	858	220	1,465	603	134	76	3,657

See footnotes in table 3c, above.

Because the Justice for Families Program serves families involved in child custody exchanges and visitation, the program's semi-annual progress report identifies the number of *families* seeking and receiving services, rather than the number of *victims*. Justice for Families Program served over 2,200 families every six months in 2016. From 2013 through 2016, stalking was reported as the primary victimization for between 2% and 6% of families served in each reporting period.

Training on Stalking

Many OVW grantees provide training to professionals on sexual assault, domestic/dating violence, and stalking that enables participants to improve their response to these crimes. Between 2013 and 2016, many discretionary grantees reported training professionals (e.g., attorneys, court personnel, advocacy organization personnel, law enforcement, mental health professionals, prosecutors) on stalking issues, focusing on stalking statutes and codes, dynamics, and services (see table 4).

Table 4. Average number of discretionary grantees training on stalking topics by grant program, 2013 – 2016

Grant Program	2013 6-month average ¹		2014 6-month average		Grant Program	2015 6-month average		2016 6-month average	
	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws		Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking statutes/codes or laws
Campus Program (n=64, 65)	47 (73%)	21 (33%)	46 (71%)	20 (31%)	Campus Program (n=57, 56)	48 (84%)	13 (23%)	45 (80%)	16 (29%)
CY Program ¹ (n=0, 9)	0 (0%)		4 (44%)		CY Program (n=22, 29)	5 (23%)		8 (28%)	
CSSP Program (n=39, 39)	11 (28%)		10 (26%)		CSSP Program (n=38, 34)	8 (21%)		6 (18%)	
Disabilities Program (n=14, 15)	3 (21%)		1 (7%)		Disabilities Program (n=13, 14)	3 (23%)		3 (21%)	
ICJR Program (n=124, 112)	60 (48%)	44 (35%)	62 (55%)	36 (32%)	ICJR Program (n=91, 98)	44 (48%)	30 (33%)	48 (49%)	33 (34%)
JFF Program ¹ (n=7, 26)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	JFF Program (n=45, 51)	5 (11%)	1 (2%)	8 (16%)	5 (10%)
LAV Program (n=109, 104)	35 (32%)	36 (33%)	34 (33%)	36 (35%)	LAV Program (n=111, 101)	37 (33%)	40 (36%)	30 (30%)	35 (35%)
Rural Program (n=76, 84)	41 (54%)	24 (32%)	45 (54%)	23 (27%)	Rural Program (n=83, 88)	42 (51%)	19 (23%)	45 (51%)	18 (20%)
State Coalitions Program (n=75, 76)	34 (45%)	29 (39%)	34 (45%)	25 (33%)	State Coalitions Program (n=75, 74)	34 (45%)	26 (35%)	29 (39%)	25 (34%)
Technical Assistance Program (n=120, 126)	30 (25%)	18 (15%)	27 (21%)	16 (13%)	Technical Assistance Program (n=122, 134)	21 (17%)	15 (12%)	23 (17%)	15 (11%)
Tribal Coalitions Program (n=12, 13)	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	Tribal Coalitions Program (n=18, 17)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)	0 (0%)
Tribal Governments Program (n=66, 73)	24 (36%)	7 (11%)	25 (34%)	10 (14%)	Tribal Governments Program (n=60, 76)	19 (32%)	8 (13%)	24 (32%)	7 (9%)
Tribal Jurisdictions Program ²					Tribal Jurisdictions Program (n=4)			1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Underserved Program ³ (n=2)			0 (0%)		Underserved Program (n=8, 16)	2 (25%)		5 (31%)	

Note: "n" is the number of discretionary grantees that reported using their funds to provide training during that particular reporting period. Percentages were rounded to the closest whole number.

¹The JFF and CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2013 reporting period.

²Tribal Jurisdiction (TJ) Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2016 reporting period; TJ Program averages for the previous periods are unavailable.

³Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2014 reporting period.

Education on Stalking

Some OVW grantees implement educational activities that provide information to increase public awareness of sexual assault, domestic/dating violence, and/or stalking. For example, more than half of Campus Program grantees report training on stalking (see table 5).

Table 5. Average number of discretionary grantees educating on stalking topics by grant program, 2013 – 2016

Grant Program	2013 6-month average		2014 6-month average		Grant Program	2015 6-month average		2016 6-month average	
	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking prevention	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking prevention		Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking prevention	Stalking overview, dynamics, and services	Stalking prevention
Campus Program (n=72, 69)	47 (65%)	44 (61%)	47 (68%)	49 (71%)	Campus Program (n=67, 66)	51 (76%)	48 (72%)	45 (68%)	48 (73%)
CSSP Program (n=40, 45)	13 (33%)		13 (29%)		CSSP Program (n=40, 38)	8 (20%)		9 (24%)	
CY Program ¹ (n=0, 5)	0 (0%)		3 (60%)		CY Program (n=9, 10)	4 (44%)		3 (30%)	
Disabilities Program (n=3, 7)	1 (33%)		2 (29%)		Disabilities Program (n=5, 5)	1 (20%)		2 (40%)	
Rural Program (n=84, 95)	48 (57%)		49 (52%)		Rural Program (n=94, 95)	47 (50%)		42 (44%)	
Tribal Coalitions Program (n=13, 13)	5 (38%)		4 (31%)		Tribal Coalitions Program (n=19, 17)	6 (32%)		6 (35%)	
Tribal Government Program (n=140, 143)	51 (36%)		55 (38%)		Tribal Government Program (n=135, 121)	50 (37%)		48 (40%)	
Underserved Program ² (n=3)			1 (33%)		Underserved Program (n=6, 14)	4 (67%)		6 (43%)	

Note: "n" is the number of discretionary grantees that reported using their funds to provide education during that particular reporting period. Percentages were rounded to the closest whole number.

¹CY Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2013 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2013 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2013 reporting period.

²Underserved Program grantees did not submit data prior to the July to December 2014 reporting period; therefore, the 6-month average for 2014 displayed is equal to the data reported in the July to December 2014 reporting period.

Criminal Justice Activities: Snapshot of the Improving Criminal Justice Responses (ICJR) Program

Law Enforcement

Over the four-year period covered in this report, 25% of ICJR Program grantees reported using their funds for law enforcement activities, and half of those grantees dedicated funds to stalking.

Law enforcement agencies receiving funds through the ICJR Program reported that they responded to 3,462 calls for assistance related to stalking, filed 3,919 stalking incident reports, investigated 3,220 stalking cases, and made 939 arrests for stalking crimes.²⁵

Prosecution

During the four-year period, 21% of ICJR Program grantees (an average of 37 grantees every six months) used funds for prosecution activities. Of those grantees, half used funds to prosecute stalking crimes. ICJR grantees reported accepting 8,136 stalking cases for prosecution between 2013 and 2016.

²⁵ The ICJR Program collects and reports agency-wide data for criminal justice activities.

Protection Orders

The chart below shows the number of temporary and final stalking protection orders that grantees assisted victims with during the four-year period.

Table 6. ICJR Program: Assistance with stalking protection orders, 2013 – 2016

ICJR Program-funded assistance provider	January to June 2013		July to December 2013		2013 Total	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Law enforcement	61	65	90	93	151	158
Victim services	351	124	240	151	591	275
Prosecution	32	29	7	9	39	38
Total	444	218	337	253	781	471

STOP Program Subgrantees Activities

The text and tables below include information reported on STOP subgrantees' activities related to stalking between 2013 and 2016.

Table 7. STOP Program subgrantees using funds for stalking

STOP General Information	2013		2014		2015		2016	
Total subgrantees reporting	2,452		2,332		2,404		2,339	
Subgrantees using funds for stalking	1,040	42%	1,029	44%	1,003	42%	999	43%
Total subgrantees addressing stalking purpose area ¹	312	13%	293	13%	270	11%	265	11%

¹ These subgrantees may have also addressed domestic violence, dating violence, and/or sexual assault.

Victims of Stalking

Every six months, on average, STOP subgrantees reported serving 8,736 stalking victims. Among stalking victims served by STOP subgrantees, about 67% were stalked by a current or former spouse or intimate partner or by someone with whom the victim had a current or former dating relationship. About 4% were stalked by strangers.

Training

Across the four years, between 49% and 52% of STOP subgrantees reported that they provided training on stalking. Training content included the dynamics of stalking, services for stalking victims, and stalking statutes and codes, among other related topics.

Criminal Justice Activities

Table 8. STOP Program subgrantees using funds for specialized stalking units

STOP Specialized Units ¹	2013		2014		2015		2016	
Subgrantees reported using funds for specialized units	550		528		531		525	
Subgrantees using funds for specialized prosecution units that addressed stalking	220	40%	215	41%	218	41%	212	40%
Subgrantees using funds for specialized law enforcement units that addressed stalking	201	37%	192	36%	201	38%	201	38%
Subgrantees using funds for specialized courts that addressed stalking	29	5%	27	5%	24	5%	18	3%
Subgrantees using funds for specialized probation units that addressed stalking	25	5%	22	4%	23	4%	22	4%

¹ A *specialized unit* is defined as a centralized or coordinated group, unit, or dedicated staff of police officers, prosecutors, probation officers, judges, or other court staff responsible for handling sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and/or stalking cases.

Law Enforcement

Table 9. STOP Program subgrantees' law enforcement data related to stalking

STOP Law Enforcement ¹	2013	2014	2015	2016
Subgrantees using funds for stalking	1,040	1,029	1,003	999
Subgrantees using funds for law enforcement activities	317	307	299	331
Number of stalking calls for assistance	1,148	1,289	1,449	1,761
Number of stalking incident reports	1,100	1,348	1,476	1,718
Number of stalking cases/incidents investigated	1,197	1,809	1,884	2,040
Number of stalking arrests	596	678	675	907

¹ STOP Program subgrantees only report activities funded by STOP Program funds. For example, if STOP Program funding was used to support a 911 dispatcher, detective, or patrol officer, only the activities engaged in by those personnel would be reported.

Prosecution

Table 10. STOP Program subgrantees' prosecution data related to stalking

STOP Prosecution ^{1,2}	2013		2014		2015		2016	
Subgrantees using funds for prosecution	307		305		323		329	
Stalking cases received	2,554		2,509		2,169		1,953	
Stalking cases accepted	2,067	81%	1,757	70%	1,471	68%	1,532	78%
Stalking ordinance dispositions	179		75		268		192	
Stalking ordinance convictions	97	54%	61	81%	125	47%	69	36%
Misdemeanor stalking dispositions	911		539		564		668	
Misdemeanor stalking convictions	508	56%	387	72%	402	71%	473	71%
Felony stalking dispositions	424		444		342		338	
Felony stalking convictions	328	77%	368	83%	287	84%	274	81%
Stalking homicide dispositions	1		1		0		3	
Stalking homicide convictions	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Total stalking dispositions	1,515		1,059		1,174		1,201	
Total stalking convictions	934	62%	817	77%	814	69%	819	68%

¹ Cases accepted, declined, or transferred in the current reporting period may have been received by prosecution in a previous reporting period.

² Convictions include deferred adjudications.

Protection Orders

Table 11. STOP Program: assistance with stalking protection orders, 2013-2016

STOP Program: Assistance with stalking protection orders, January to December 2013

STOP Program-funded assistance provider	2013	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Law enforcement	324	199
Victim services	2,036	1,579
Prosecution	317	198
Total	2,677	1,976

STOP Program: Assistance with stalking protection orders, January to December 2014

STOP Program-funded assistance provider	2014	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Law enforcement	516	325
Victim services	2,639	2,207
Prosecution	290	202
Total	3,445	2,734

STOP Program: Stalking protection orders granted by courts in STOP Program-funded courts, January to December 2013

Granted by Court	2013	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Courts	1,147	300

STOP Program: Stalking protection orders granted by courts in STOP Program-funded courts, January to December 2014

Granted by Court	2014	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Courts	1,404	313

STOP Program: Assistance with stalking protection orders, January to December 2015

STOP Program-funded assistance provider	2015	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Law enforcement	348	224
Victim services	2,318	1,802
Prosecution	322	215
Total	2,988	2,241

STOP Program: Assistance with stalking protection orders, January to December 2016

STOP Program-funded assistance provider	2016	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Law enforcement	336	201
Victim services	2,109	1,694
Prosecution	342	229
Total	2,787	2,124

STOP Program: Stalking protection orders granted by courts in STOP Program-funded courts, January to December 2015

Granted by Court	2015	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Courts	670	215

STOP Program: Stalking protection orders granted by courts in STOP Program-funded courts, January to December 2016

Granted by Court	2016	
	Temporary protection order granted	Final protection order granted
Courts	1,151	349

Technical Assistance to OVW Grantees

OVW issued a cooperative agreement to Aequitas: The Prosecutor's Resource on Violence Against Women in October 2017 to establish the Stalking Prevention, Awareness, and Resource Center (SPARC), which ensures first responders and allied professionals have specialized knowledge to identify and respond to stalking. SPARC provides training and other resources for victim advocates, law enforcement, and prosecutors. More information can be found at the SPARC website: <https://www.stalkingawareness.org/>.

Reported Areas of Remaining Need

Grantees are asked to report areas of remaining need related to the issues addressed in their OVW-funded projects. In recent years, they have cited the following areas of persistent need with regard to stalking:

- Providing education on the use of social media as a means to stalk victims, especially for young people and teens;
- Increasing community awareness of the stalking resources and service providers available;
- Reforming stalking laws to better incorporate the use of technology by perpetrators, and reforming laws where existing language makes it difficult to prosecute or obtain orders of protection for victims;

- Ensuring sufficient law enforcement staffing levels to allow for the significant time required to collect evidence and thoroughly investigate the unique dynamics of stalking cases;
- Addressing the persistent need for training and resources in the field, particularly to reduce the underreporting or misidentification of stalking cases by ensuring law enforcement officers understand the full extent of stalking laws and identify the unique dynamics of stalking, and stalking as a pattern of behavior as opposed to a single event;
- Ensuring orders of protection are enforced and violations are properly addressed; and
- Addressing stalking and the risk for lethality.