



State of Georgia

**2011-2013
Services*Training*Officers*Prosecution (STOP)
Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
Implementation Plan**

Respectfully Submitted by:

Lateefah Raheem, **STOP Administrator**

Stefanie Lopez-Howard, **Planning & Policy Development Specialist, Victim Services**

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

104 Marietta Street, Suite 440

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

(404) 657-1965 phone

(404) 657-1957 fax

STOP Formula Grant Award: 2010-WF-AX-0068

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

WORKING MISSION 3

PLANNING PROCESS 4

Sources of Information that Shaped VAWA Implementation Planning Discussion 4

STOP VAWA Implementation Planning Meeting 5

NEEDS AND CONTEXT 6

General Demographic Information 6

Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Service Provision 8

PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES 11

Progress on and Relation to 2007 Implementation Plan Goals11

Current and Future Priorities and Approaches11

Steps Toward Implementing these Principles and Attaining Priorities13

 Encouraging Implementation of Fatality Review and Safety Audit Recommendations13

 Revamped Grant-making and Grant-management Strategy13

MONITORING AND EVALUATION 15

Statistical Reports15

Victim Services Program and Policy Monitoring Committees15

REFERENCES..... 17

APPENDIX LIST..... 19

Introduction

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) is the state planning and grants agency for criminal justice and victims' assistance programs that the Governor of Georgia has designated as the State Administering Agency. CJCC's enabling statute (O.C.G.A. § 35-6A-2) ensures its members represent all components of the criminal justice system. CJCC builds knowledge and partnerships among state, local, and non-governmental organizations to enhance the effectiveness of Georgia's criminal justice system and to develop and sustain results-driven programs, services and activities. This mission fits squarely with the message that Office on Violence Against Women's (OVW) Director, the Hon. Susan Carbon, delivered in her keynote speech at the Georgia Commission on Family Violence Conference on September 13, 2010. Judge Carbon focused on the importance of collaboration and coordinated community response in addressing crimes of violence against women so that victims who encounter the criminal justice system will see the various agencies working in harmony to hold the perpetrator accountable and ensure victim safety.

For this reason, in part, this year's STOP VAWA implementation planning meeting focused on a discussion of the innovative ways our agencies are collaborating across the state (see Appendix A). Coordinated community response efforts are one of the few practices for addressing domestic violence that are backed with sound research (see, e.g. Harrell et al., 2006; Shepard, 2009; and, Shepard et al., 2000). In an effort to keep up with the movement in federal agencies to direct dollars toward evidence-based practices (Orszag, 2009), CJCC has begun researching various program models, including coordinated community response.

With static federal funding and an increasing demand on our local criminal justice and nonprofit service agencies for services, CJCC is asking its subgrantees to imagine new partnerships and collaborations that may enhance service delivery and maximize resources. This implementation plan provides a brief update on the progress made on the objectives outlined in CJCC's 2007 implementation plan, and on the new directions the organization plans on taking with STOP VAWA monies.

First, we discuss this year's planning process. Next we describe the current social context in Georgia that has led CJCC to re-examine our methods to increase offender accountability and ensure women victims of violence attain safety, recovery, and self-sufficiency. Finally, this document updates OVW on progress toward achieving the 2007 goals and discusses CJCC's reconfigured priorities with an eye toward achieving the mission stated below:

Working Mission

Between 2011 and 2013, the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council will use STOP VAWA funding to both encourage the creation and maintenance of innovative partnerships between community and criminal justice agencies so that all women victims of violence have access to core services; and, to ensure that all branches of Georgia's criminal justice system provide an enlightened and sensitive response to crimes of violence against women.

Planning Process

Sources of Information that Shaped VAWA Implementation Planning Discussion

In September 2010, CJCC staff attended the Georgia Commission on Family Violence (GCFV) Conference in Peachtree City, GA. As mentioned above, the Hon. Susan Carbon was the keynote speaker at the conference. Her speech focused on the importance of coordinated community response in addressing violence against women, especially to enhance victim safety and ensure women are not falling through the system's cracks. The conference was also abuzz with discussions about a number of burning issues that many attendees raised in other regional meetings that staff attended.

Between September and October 2010, CJCC staff also attended regional meetings that the Governor's Office for Children and Families (GOCF) hosted with domestic violence and sexual assault service providers. The purpose of these meetings was to gain qualitative information towards the development of a state plan to reduce and thus end the effects of family violence. Many of CJCC's subgrantees attended these meetings and raised similar issues to those discussed at the GCFV conference. These included: the need for services for elderly, disabled, immigrant and single women victims, issues with firearm removal for offenders subject to temporary protection orders (TPO's) or convicted of family violence misdemeanors, and issues with the law enforcement and judicial response to domestic violence and sexual assault cases. Participants also pointed to many service gaps, the most pressing of which include shelter overcrowding due to the economic recession, the need for more sexual assault centers, and a dire need for qualified therapists.

GOCF meeting attendees repeatedly mentioned that one of the strengths in responding to violence against women in their communities was a coordinated response between agencies. These efforts take on many forms including Domestic Violence Task Forces (DVTFs), Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs), Special Victims Units (SVU's), Multi-disciplinary Teams (MDT's), relationships between the family violence intervention program (FVIP) and local shelters, and/or between local shelters and law enforcement. Especially of note, meeting attendees often related coordinated community response efforts to better prosecution of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Finally, attendees at the GOCF regional meetings focused extensively on the needs for law enforcement and judicial training. In the five such meetings CJCC staff attended, this issue was raised 48 times. Participants also mentioned that they felt law enforcement may benefit from additional training on capturing crime details in their reports. These details will ultimately help advance prosecution and factfinding efforts and on assessing the primary aggressor when responding to domestic violence incidents. With respect to judges, the foremost concern was that not all judges are sentencing offenders to family violence intervention programs as required under Georgia law (O.C.G.A §19-13-16(a)). Moreover, participants reported that they feel that judges and/or law enforcement sometimes fail to notify defendants that they must surrender their firearms while subject to a TPO or convicted of a misdemeanor. These issues demonstrate a continuing need for judicial and law enforcement education about best practices and legal requirements for responding to domestic violence to ensure victim safety and curb domestic violence

homicides.

STOP VAWA Implementation Planning Meeting

The issues subgrantees raised at these GOCF meetings, as well as the major themes discussed at the GCFV conference, helped shape the agenda for the STOP VAWA Implementation Planning Meeting (see Appendix A). The CJCC opened this year's meeting with a discussion of the current allocation structure and an assessment of Georgia's strength on the STOP legislative purpose areas (non-scientific scale: strong, moderately strong, weak) (see Appendix B). To arrive at this assessment, CJCC staff examined the current continuation applications to determine what types of projects are funded under the current 4-year grant cycle (most subgrantees are currently in the 3rd year of this cycle). A review of the programs demonstrated the following:

- Georgia is moderately strong on formal training efforts for law enforcement, but weak on training for judges and prosecutors;
- The CJCC provides robust funding for victim service programs, but funding is skewed toward domestic violence programs, and culturally appropriate services are concentrated in the Atlanta-metro area;
- Georgia has significant funding for special victim units, which represent 36% of the total number of full-time equivalents (FTE's) funded. This is important because specialized prosecution units have been linked with reduced offender recidivism, less severe re-victimization, and increased resources for both victims and offenders (Friday et al., 2006);
- A substantial number of our subgrantees are involved in some form of coordinated community response;
- Almost no programs are addressing stalking issues specifically.

These and other findings (see Appendix B for comprehensive discussion of findings) shaped the priorities the CJCC presented to the Implementation Planning Meeting attendees for discussion.

This year's meeting was extremely well attended. CJCC normally sends an email to all subgrantees inviting them to the implementation plan discussion. Invited agencies registered 57 people to attend. Below is a chart summary of the types of agencies that registered to attend the meeting:

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:	17
SEXUAL ASSAULT:	5
PROSECUTION:	12
PROBATION:	1
LAW ENFORCEMENT:	2
JUDICIAL:	2

As the chart demonstrates, both domestic violence providers and prosecutor offices (many of these were represented by their victim advocate) were very well represented. Though

our representation from law enforcement, the judiciary and probation was minimal, both the Georgia Public Safety Training Center, which provides the majority of the law enforcement training, and the Administrative Office of the Courts, which implements a domestic violence court task force and pilot program, were in attendance. Our probation representative was a subgrantee from a pilot program we are funding in Athens-Clarke County that connects the probation office with the prosecutor's office and the family violence intervention program to ensure offender accountability.

Within our domestic violence group were subgrantees that provide culturally-specific services to immigrant and underserved communities. These included Raksha (who is not on the registration list, but on the attendee list, see Appendix C for both these lists), the International Women's House, Refugee Family Services, and Jewish Family & Career Services.

Needs and Context

General Demographic Information

Georgia is a populous and a diverse state. Based on the most recent census data, Georgia remains the 9th most populous state, and the 20th most densely populated (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a). From the 2000 to the 2010 census, Georgia's population increased by 18.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a). Population density is concentrated in urban areas where 82% of Georgians live (U.S.D.A, 2010). The remaining 18% live in rural areas (U.S.D.A., 2010) – many of which have few, if any, domestic violence and sexual assault services. For example, the 8-county rural area adjacent to the Albany metropolitan statistical area in southwest GA (which encompasses 5 counties), only has 1 state-certified domestic violence shelter providing services (Georgia Department of Human Services 2009)¹. This same area has only one sexual assault center as well (Paul, 2008). The state's 159 county structure and the geographic expanse of rural counties makes these populations particularly underserved.

Not only is Georgia populous and expansive, but it is also diverse. The state is still majority white, however, almost a third of residents are African-American, and almost one-tenth are foreign born. Below is a table of the estimated state demographic characteristics based on four-year average estimates from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey Data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b)*:

¹ Shelters that receive funding from Georgia's Department of Human Services must be certified. CJCC does not know if all shelters in the state DHR money and are thus certified. DHR's list of shelters, therefore, may not be complete and there may be shelters in the area not captured on the map used for this assessment.

* Of note, 2010 census demographic data is not available as of yet.

Demographic	2009 ACS Estimated Population	% Total Population	±Error Margin (p=0.1)
Total Female	4,831,612	50.87%	0.05%
Total Speaking Language Other than English in the Home	1,055,920	11.12%	0.15%
White	5,899,345	62.11%	0.17%
African-American	2,818,524	29.68%	0.08%
Native American	23,947	0.25%	0.03%
Asian	268,831	2.83%	0.04%
Hispanic	735,125	7.74%	0.02%
Foreign Born	864,288	9.10%	0.10%
Foreign Born (Latin American)	475,358	5.01%	0.40%

(n=9,497,667 2009 ACS Estimated Georgia Population)

Many subgrantees expressed concern for meeting the needs of Hispanic victims of violence – especially those in rural areas. As the table shows, more than half of all foreign-born Georgians are from Latin America. Self-identified Hispanics are almost 8% of the population – a 1% increase over the proportion we reported in 2007. The Asian proportion of the population has remained constant from the 2007 report – nearly 3%.

While 62% of Georgians identified as “White” this figure includes White-Hispanics. The White Non-Hispanic population in Georgia is 58.4% ±0.1% (p=0.1). Also of interest to our subgrantees is the number of persons reporting they speak a language other than English at home – 11.12%. This indicates a definite need for multi-lingual services. To CJCC’s knowledge, there is only one Spanish crisis hotline in the state, which one of our subgrantees, the Cherokee Family Violence Center provides.² The demographic outlook and language access issues spurred a conversation at the planning meeting about the impact the federal 287(g) program being deployed in Gwinnett, Cobb, Hall and Whitfield counties (ICE, 2010) in Georgia is having on immigrant victims’ willingness to approach law enforcement when they are in trouble.³ Later, we discuss how we hope to use STOP funds to address some of these issues with officer training and outreach to immigrant communities.

Georgia also has a substantial population of disabled females, who are more vulnerable to victimization. Below is a table detailing the percent of women in Georgia with a disability (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006):

² While other crisis lines may contract with an interpreter service, to the best of our knowledge, this is the only hotline with a phone number dedicated strictly for Spanish-speaking victims.

³ The 287(g) program allows ICE to enter into a memorandum of agreement with local law enforcement agencies to delegate immigration enforcement authority.

Female Age & Disability Data	Total Pop	Percent of Female Pop	Percent Disabled	±Error Margin (p=0.1)
5 to 15 years:	721,204	16.53%		1.32%
With a disability	31,007		4.30%	0.87%
16 to 64 years:	3,129,904	71.75%		0.37%
With a disability	392,531		12.54%	0.61%
65 years and over:	510,859	11.71%		1.00%
With a disability	244,965		47.95%	2.23%

(females n= 4,361,967)

Of especial concern is that a substantial proportion of elderly females (almost 48%) are disabled, which compounds the vulnerability of an already-vulnerable population. Of note, the CJCC currently funds one program with STOP VAWA monies** that specifically addresses abuse against elderly women.

Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Service Provision

Georgia has the dubious distinction of being among the top-ten states for male-perpetrated homicides against women (Violence Policy Center, 2010). According to the Georgia Commission on Family Violence (Beck-Coon, 2010), there were 123 domestic violence fatalities in 2009. Based on the Violence Policy Center’s 2008 figures (2010), 64% of the women murdered by men were African-American. These figures point to the need for culturally-specific services for African-American women victims of violence, who may need additional risk or lethality assessment services to correct the disproportionate homicide statistics.

Moreover, seventy-six percent of domestic violence murders in 2009 were completed using a gun (Beck-Coon, personal communication, January 18, 2011). As mentioned above, CJCC subgrantees raised concerns that in some of their jurisdictions the judicial system sometimes fail to notify defendants, subject to TPO’s, that they must relinquish their weapons – even though there is model language and an extensive discussion of this issue in Georgia’s Domestic Violence Benchbook (Hunter, 2009, p. E:1) that provides such notice. CJCC hopes to work with subgrantees to develop a model enforcement mechanism for this STOP VAWA provision. Those that do often have a victim advocate with ties to a local domestic violence shelter located in the Sheriff’s Office, or similarly strong collaborative relationships between the domestic violence service providers and criminal justice agencies.

CJCC staff has also heard repeatedly that domestic violence incidents are increasing – even

** CJCC uses SASP monies to fund services and outreach provided by Rape Crisis and Sexual Assault Services in Augusta, GA for elderly victims of sexual abuse. Though not with STOP VAWA monies, CJCC also uses the state’s VOCA victim assistance block grant to fund the Elder Abuse Project in the Columbus Regional Office of Georgia Legal Services, the Elder Abuse Prevention/Intervention Program in Savannah, and the Long Term Care Ombudsman Project of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society.

though recent uniform crime report (UCR) data demonstrates overall crime is decreasing (Jonsson 2010). Based on data collected from our subgrantees through narrative responses for our annual Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) statistical report, 95 of the 233 subgrantees responded that they felt crime was on the rise. Indeed, for family violence crimes this is most definitely the case. The table below compares UCR data from 2007-2009 for family violence reported cases and total index violent crimes (Georgia Crime Information Center 2010):

Year	Reported Family Violence Cases	% Change	Total Violent Crime Incidents	% Change
2007	62,156	N/A	44,823	N/A
2008	58,420	-6.01%	45,816	2.22%
2009	61,464	5.21%	40,362	-11.90%
TOTALS:	182,040		131,001	

Over the past three years, there have been 1.39 times as many family violence cases as there have been violent crime incidents. In that same time period, violent crime has diminished by 11.9% while family violence incidents have increased by 5.21%. This increase in family violence incidents places a strain on our service providers and our criminal justice system – especially at a time when budgets have been slashed and personnel has been reduced.

The statistical picture for sexual abuse is equally grim. The table below compares the number of UCR forcible rapes to arrest rates from 2007-2009:

Year	UCR Rape Incidents	% Change	Arrests	% Change
2007	2,069	N/A	408	N/A
2008	2,236	0.05%	422	3.43%
2009	2,200	0.04%	397	-5.92%
TOTAL:	6,505			

While the number of reported forcible rape cases has increased (albeit very slightly), the number of arrests has decreased substantially in the past three years. As compared to other UCR violent crimes, rape and family violence incidents have the lowest arrest percentage as demonstrated in the table below (Georgia Crime Information Center 2010):†

† Data on arrest rates for family violence crimes for 2008 and 2007 are taken from the respective GCIC UCR summary reports, available here: http://www.georgia.gov/00/channel_modifieddate/0,2096,67862954_88103906,00.html. In the table, the letters “I” and “A” next to the years indicate “incidents” and “arrests,” respectively.

Crime Type	2007I	2007A	% Arrest	2008I	2008A	% Arrest	2009I	2009A	% Arrest
Murder	712	527	74.02%	622	458	73.63%	558	479	85.84%
Rape	2,069	408	19.72%	2,236	422	18.87%	2,200	397	18.05%
Robbery	16,837	3,740	22.21%	17,479	3,885	22.23%	14,257	3,526	24.73%
Assault	25,205	11,175	44.34%	25,479	11,025	43.27%	23,347	10,560	45.23%
Family Violence	61,464	19,654	31.98%	58,420	18,763	32.12%	62,156	20,038	32.24%

There may be myriad reasons for this discrepancy, but this should certainly be a topic of ongoing law enforcement education. CJCC staff has heard from our subgrantees that, at least with respect to domestic violence calls, often the offender may have fled the scene, or the responding law enforcement officer gives the victim the paperwork so that she can obtain a warrant for the offender's arrest – which may partially explain the lower arrest rates for these crimes. CJCC should also note that the arrests for family violence crimes are not summarized by who was arrested – so dual arrests may be counted in these figures.

Beyond concerns about the low arrest rates, the data on forcible rapes are likely underestimates. The UCR definition of forcible rape is impossibly narrow and likely results in a number of sex offenses being excluded from the count. Since Georgia is not currently on the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), a more accurate count of sexually-based offenses is unavailable. However, CJCC staff did examine the number of sexual crime victims our subgrantees reported serving in 2009 to gauge how discrepant UCR figures might be. According to the aggregated Victim Services Statistical Reports (VSSR) our Victims of Crime Act subgrantees (n=258) submitted last year, nonprofit and criminal justice agencies across Georgia served 2,126 adult victims of sexual abuse, 9,051 child victims of sexual abuse, and 348 adults who were molested as children. Thus, the number of persons who were sexually victimized and sought services in 2010 was 11,525 – which is more than 5 times the number of forcible rapes reported in 2009.

Despite the high service volume, there are only 36 child advocacy centers (which serve child sexual abuse victims) and 27 sexual assault centers (Child Advocacy Centers of Georgia 2009; Paul 2008). In fact, almost a quarter of all the counties in Georgia (36) do not have a sexual assault center accessible to them (Paul 2008). There are 326,405 (3.44%) Georgians living in these underserved counties (U.S. Census Bureau 2009). Based on the rape rate calculated using 2009 UCR data (22.2 per 100,000) that means that *at least* 73 rape victims will not have had access to services in 2009 (Georgia Crime Information Center 2009).

These service gaps are of particular concern to CJCC. The organization's goal is to ensure that all crime victims in the state – including female victims of violence – are treated justly and with sensitivity by the criminal justice system and that they have access to a core level of services.

Plan Priorities and Approaches

Progress on and Relation to 2007 Implementation Plan Goals

In our 2007 plan, CJCC reported that subgrantees suggested that the organization complete a comprehensive victim services needs assessment and create a strategic plan. In 2009, the CJCC deployed a first-phase survey to all organizations applying to receive state local victim assistance program (LVAP or 5%) funds.[#] This survey focused on respondents' training needs and on the current services direct victim service agencies are providing. Over the next year, the CJCC will deploy a second phase survey asking respondents to rate their most pressing service provision needs. The Criminal Justice Services Division is also working with the Victim Services Division on a survey of crime victims who have filed for victim's compensation to determine what their experience with the services they received was, as well as, to gain information about any service gaps the victim experienced. Based on the information gained from these surveys, CJCC plans to develop a set of core services each type of crime victim should have access to and a strategy for coordinating VOCA, SASP and STOP VAWA monies to maximize service provision and offender accountability.

CJCC also reported in our 2007 plan that future requests for proposals would focus on fostering coordinated community response – especially with regard to partnerships between law enforcement and service providers. Since then, CJCC has required all special victim units funded to have a formal memorandum of understanding with their local victim service providers. As shown in Appendix B, this is a purpose area that CJCC staff rated Georgia's performance as moderate. Of the 70 programs funded with STOP monies in 2010, 25 (36%) reported some form of formal or informal coordination. Related to this effort, CJCC hoped to increase service provision to sexual assault victims. SASP monies allowed us to increase funding for 3 current STOP VAWA subgrantees and to fund 2 new programs. However, sexual assault victims are still chronically underserved and the CJCC hopes to continue working with the state coalition and local service providers to develop innovative service models that might be deployed in underserved areas.

Current and Future Priorities and Approaches

In brief, the main issues to which participants continuously returned, and which the CJCC will make the focal point of future requests for funding, are listed below:

- The need for accountability and leadership in coordinated community response efforts.
- The need for training and/or a protocol for law enforcement and others about firearms removal from defendants who have been convicted of domestic violence misdemeanors or who are subject to temporary orders of protection (TPO's).

[#] The CJCC certifies all governmental and nongovernmental organizations providing direct victims services to receive local victim assistance program (LVAP) or so-called 5% funds – which are monies collected through fees and fines from criminal acts at the state court level. Not all applying agencies are CJCC subgrantees, however, the legislature has designated the CJCC as the certifying agency. Only certified agencies are able to receive CJCC grant funding.

- The need to identify gaps in service for immigrant communities and/or underserved communities (including elderly, disabled rural, and LGBTQI victims) and to strategize about how to reach out to these communities both to increase reporting and criminal justice system response to those victims who do report. Included in this gap analysis, especially, is overcoming language access issues.
- The need to compile and share training materials, increase the amount of multi-disciplinary training available, and develop a training calendar.
- Continued funding to sustain core services which are stretched thin due to increasing crime victim demand.

Subgrantees agreed with CJCC staff that coordinated community response approaches are effective when implemented well, but showed concern about consistent participation in these efforts. Moreover, sexual assault centers especially, worried about devoting staff time to leading such efforts when their services and time are already spread so thinly. We discuss ways to address these concerns below.

With respect to training issues, subgrantees expressed vociferous concern not only about the firearms issues, but also about the need for primary aggressor training for law enforcement. While CJCC currently funds strong formal training for law enforcement on domestic violence issues, subgrantees cited a need for different and innovative approaches to tackle these knowledge gaps. Moreover, Implementation Meeting attendees raised concerns that officers may not be able to take 2-5 days away from their schedules to go to training. CJCC discussed the possibility of adopting shorter distance-learning or roll-call training approaches that may be deployed multiple times throughout the year and that may reach more first-responding officers. These training approaches were viewed as useful not only for officers, but also for other criminal justice system officials such as judges and prosecutors. While subgrantees expressed skepticism that Georgia law would change to enable better enforcement of the anti-firearm provision in TPO's, subgrantees and CJCC staff feel this is an area where CJCC and its subgrantees could provide education and resources about any legislation that may arise.

Also regarding training, subgrantees expressed concern that there was significant duplication of efforts occurring throughout the state. CJCC hopes to curb these duplications in the future by providing a training calendar for subgrantees and collecting training materials that subgrantees are using to ensure consistency across approaches and avoid duplication. Connecting our subgrantees to each other and to national technical assistance providers other will also help stem these concerns and ensure good quality training materials.

Finally, meeting attendees agreed that to some extent the issues affecting immigrant victims, communities of color, LGBTQI and elderly victims are cross-cutting. If CJCC can ensure basic services for these underserved victims, services for all victims will increase. Of particular concern for participants was the lack of language-appropriate crisis services. The CJCC hopes to work with its subgrantees to consider ways to provide such services and to educate first-responders, judges, prosecutors, service providers, and others about the unique needs that immigrant victims, those of color, LGBTQI and elderly victims face.

In the immediate aftermath of the implementation meeting, the CJCC prepared a request for proposals for one-year demonstration projects that address some of these issues. CJCC's goal is to fund demonstration projects that address these issues so that these strategies may be deployed and evaluated in other areas of the state through future requests for proposals.

Over the next three years the CJCC will abide by the following guiding principles to administer STOP funds:

- A focus on providing technical assistance for subgrantees to implement evidence-based projects that they identify will meet the needs of their community. CJCC will also work on connecting subgrantees working on similar projects so they may trade insights and strategies for addressing violence against women.
- CJCC will also work with service providers to devise innovative modes of service delivery to ensure all women victims of violence have access to core services.
- CJCC will work with both our sister state agencies (e.g. the Administrative Office of the Courts, Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Council, Prosecuting Attorney's Council (PAC), etc.), and current subgrantees to develop effective partnerships between local and criminal justice system agencies, as well as, to develop innovative training models.
- CJCC will encourage subgrantees to adopt a comprehensive outreach plan for immigrant victims, communities of color, LGBTQQI and elderly victims. CJCC will also strive to fund services for these populations that have statewide impact.
- CJCC will encourage the use of currently-available communication systems to increase coordination between service providers and criminal justice agencies. Staff will also provide technical assistance to ensure all members of formal coordinated community response efforts are contributing to funded projects and receiving a fair share of funding.

Steps Toward Implementing these Principles and Attaining Priorities

Encouraging Implementation of Fatality Review and Safety Audit Recommendations

As mentioned in the 2007 plan, the CJCC has been funding a statewide fatality review and two local fatality review projects. In the most recent continuation grant cycle, we funded the Georgia Commission on Family Violence and the Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence to implement several programs that resulted from the fatality review studies. These include: a roll-call training model for victim service agencies to deliver to law enforcement officers about available services (we hope this will be the first of many such models); roundtable events with faith leaders on addressing domestic violence in their congregations; and, a training initiative for employers on providing a safe space at work for victims of domestic violence. The CJCC hopes to continue funding projects that address the gaps in service and system response identified through the safety audits and fatality reviews we fund.

Revamped Grant-making and Grant-management Strategy

The CJCC recognizes that our subgrantees are the experts on the needs of women victims of violence in their communities. Staff will strive to fund projects that subgrantees feel will meet these needs, while also encouraging innovation where possible. As cited in Appendix B, this is a STOP purpose area where the State of Georgia has moderate performance. While the CJCC has historically focused on sustaining and expanding services and the justice system's response to violence against women, staff will begin encouraging subgrantees to develop new approaches to stemming violence against women. Part of this approach will be to continue funding projects stemming from the state and local fatality reviews and safety audits.

The CJCC also hopes to encourage technical assistance between subgrantees. CJCC staff will recommend to its governing Council that some STOP VAWA funds be dedicated to innovative project models that agencies across the state can adopt. As mentioned in the 2007 implementation plan, CJCC funds on 4-year cycles, where the first of the 4-years is awarded on a competitive basis. This approach ensures project sustainability and gives subgrantees time to develop innovative projects they may want to deploy.

Moving forward, the CJCC intends to keep the four-year cycle but hopes to evaluate year-one competitive applications differently. Since CJCC hopes to encourage the deployment of best-practice, model programs throughout the state, staff will propose to the organization's Council a new rubric for assessing year-one competitive applications. CJCC has stated in the past that it uses VOCA, SASP and STOP VAWA funding complementarily and that will continue to be the case. The measures that CJCC staff will propose in the rubric will be based on the results from an ongoing statewide victim services needs assessment. With the Council's approval, this rubric will help CJCC measure, at a minimum:

- The degree to which the proposed project sustains core services for women victims of violence;
- The degree to which the proposed project is based on research-supported practices;
- The degree to which the proposed project addresses the needs of underserved populations in the region in which the applicant is located (this will require fine-tuned analysis of CJCC's needs assessment data to determine a set of needs for victims by region); and,
- The degree to which the proposed project can be documented and deployed in other areas across the state.

From a grant-management perspective, the CJCC plans to use its subgrantees' expertise, as well as, its Council's and staff's expertise on violence against women issues to ensure projects are successful. Technical assistance will include:

- Connecting subgrantees to each other and to national technical assistance providers to solve problems they may encounter with service delivery, program implementation, training issues or any other problems;
- Providing ongoing one-on-one technical assistance through desk audits and periodic "progress report conversations" with subgrantees to ensure they are meeting the goals set forth in their Logic Models, as well as, to troubleshoot any problems they may be having;

- Completing in-person site visits to ensure proper fiscal and programmatic management of grant funds;
- Notifying subgrantees of training opportunities in the form of webinars, conferences, workshops or other means provided by our federal, national, state and local partners;
- Finding tools, such as listservs or newsletters, to better communicate agency news, funding opportunities, and model programs with subgrantees.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Statistical Reports

CJCC currently collects voluminous statistical information from its subgrantees by various means. The VSSR collects statistical information about the number of victims providers serve and the types of services those victims receive. The Criminal Justice System Statistical Report (CJSSR) tracks the kinds of services and training CJCC's criminal justice system improvement subgrantees (i.e. those funded under the law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and some discretionary categories) are providing. Finally, CJCC provides service providers with model surveys so they can track victim outcomes and their programs' success.

Moving forward, CJCC hopes to also develop model outcome surveys for those subgrantees providing training. Staff is currently working with a subgrantee funded with Edward-Byrne Justice Assistance Grants to develop a training evaluation protocol based on literature about evaluating criminal justice training programs (see, e.g. Bradley, K. 2007). Once we deploy and test the feasibility of using this protocol, we will work with our subgrantees to develop similar survey instruments and protocols for training evaluation.

Finally, CJCC staff will keep abreast with evaluation research on programmatic approaches to addressing violence against women. CJCC houses the state's statistical analysis center (SAC), which, with strong support and direction from the Council's Research & Evaluation Sub-Committee, will develop into the go-to source for knowledge, statistics, and programmatic information about the criminal justice system. This capacity will help CJCC provide technical assistance to subgrantees hoping to develop evaluation measures for their programs and stay up-to-date on research developments about program effectiveness across the country.

Victim Services Program and Policy Monitoring Committees

At the Implementation meeting, CJCC staff launched and invited subgrantees to participate on committees to monitor progress on this implementation plan. CJCC has established 4 committees – and upon participant recommendation, now a fifth – to track and evaluate progress on this plan. In the future, CJCC hopes to use the expertise in these committees to help shape funding and policy decisions for all victim services grants. These committees include: training, performance and evaluation, coordinated community response, underserved communities, and legislation and protocols. Below is a brief description of the goal and purpose of each committee:

- **Training:** This committee will help staff and subgrantees keep abreast of training issues across the state. The committee's role will be to identify training models that work, geographic or substantive areas where training is necessary, and to provide technical assistance to subgrantees who want to implement certain training programs.
- **Performance and Evaluation;** As mentioned above, CJCC captures myriad data from its subgrantees through various tools. The purpose of the performance and evaluation committee will be two-fold. First, to inform CJCC's use of the data to answer questions they will help subgrantees and the agencies better their work. Second, the members in this committee will help CJCC devise any new evaluation instruments to measure the impact of model programs that are useful for decision-making without being onerous for both the subgrantee and CJCC.
- **Coordinated Community Response:** This committee will help CJCC and other identify opportunities and models for collaboration to address the problem of violence against women. The coordinated community response committee will also help CJCC identify innovative service delivery modes and collaborative practices to fill gaps in service or knowledge that may exist.
- **Underserved Communities:** This committee will help CJCC track the needs of changing demographics around the state to devise service delivery modes and a criminal justice response to violent crimes against women in these communities.
- **Legislation and Protocols:** While neither the CJCC nor its subgrantees is allowed to use STOP VAWA funds to lobby, the purpose of the legislation and protocol committee will be to track legislation introduced in the state that may affect the criminal justice response or services to address violence against women. Committee members will use their expertise to educate lawmakers about the potential effects of any legislation proposed. Moreover, this committee will be a place where subgrantees can share and distribute promising protocols that they have implemented in their service area to address violence against women.

CJCC hopes to convene these committees at least biannually – and perhaps quarterly as staff time permits. Each committee was limited to ten members (see Appendix E for current sign-ups). The committees' purpose will be to assist the CJCC by assessing and monitoring progress on these priorities based on the programs we fund. Committee members will also update CJCC on any developments or innovative programs occurring in their service area. CJCC's goal is to convene these committees to lay out the activities necessary to accomplish the goals set forth in this implementation plan and to strategize about meeting the needs identified in the statewide victim services needs assessment. CJCC hopes that this two-way communication will help us revisit the priorities we have set forth in this document and stay updated an emerging needs for victim services across the state. As new issues arise, CJCC will update its priorities and re-focus its energies when the State of Georgia has made significant progress toward achieving them. The organization's goal is to use the expertise housed in these committees to inform the staff recommendations for state priorities to the Council, as well as, to inform and update the priorities for funding decisions.

References

- Beck-Coon, M. (2010). *Domestic violence in Georgia*. (FactSheet Atlanta, GA: Georgia Commission on Family Violence.) Retrieved from <http://www.gcfv.org/files/factsheet.pdf>.
- Bradley, K., & Connors, E. (2007). *Training and evaluation model: Evaluating and improving criminal justice Training*. Institute for Law and Justice.
- Children's Advocacy Centers of Georgia. (2009). *Centers*. Retrieved January 10, 2011, from <http://www.cacga.org/centers/established/>.
- Friday, P., Lord, V., Exum, M. L., & Hartman, J. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence unit*. (No. 215916). Retrieved from www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/215916.pdf.
- Georgia Crime Information Center. (2010). *2009 summary report: Uniform crime reporting program*. Georgia Bureau of Investigation. Retrieved from http://www.georgia.gov/vgn/images/portal/cit_1210/13/41/1598322302009%20Summary%20Report.pdf.
- Georgia Department of Human Services. (2009). *Georgia family violence agencies: Service areas*. Retrieved from http://www.gadfcs.org/familyviolence/startdocs/service_area_map.pdf.
- Harrell, A., Shaffer, M., DeStefano, C., Castro, J. (2006). *Evaluation of Milwaukee's Judicial Oversight Demonstration*. Urban Institute. Retrieved from www.urban.org/publications/411315.html.
- Hunter, N. (2009). *Georgia Domestic Violence Benchbook: A Guide to Civil and Criminal Proceedings*. (5th ed.) Athens, GA: Institute on Continuing Judicial Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.uga.edu/icje/DVBenchbook.html>.
- Jonsson, P. (2010, September, 13 2010). Poverty rate paradox: Poverty rises, but FBI crime rate falls. *Christian Science Monitor*.
- Kilpatrick, D., & McCauley, J. (2009). *Understanding national rape statistics*. VAWnet: A Project of the National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women, Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main_Doc.php?docid=2103.
- Orszag, P. (October 7, 2009). Increased emphasis on program evaluation (M-10-01 ed.) Office of Management and Budget.
- Paul, S., Kelly, T., & Cook, S. (2008). *Sexual assault services needs assessment: 2007-2008*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault.
- Shepard, M. (2009, April). *Evaluating coordinated community responses to domestic violence*.

- Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved 11/3/2010 from www.vawnet.org.
- Shephard, M., Falk, D. with Raschick, M. (2000). *Final report on the evaluation of the enhanced domestic abuse intervention program*. Duluth, MN: Retrieved from <http://www.d.umn.edu/~mshepard/DAIP.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009) *Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area estimates: Annual estimates of the population, April 1, 2000-July 1, 2009*. Retrieved January, 7, 2011, from <http://www.census.gov/popest/metro/CBSA-est2009-annual.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *American Community Survey, Table C18002. Sex By Age By Disability Status For The Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population 5 Years And Over* Retrieved January, 7, 2011, from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/disability/2006acs.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010a). *2010 census data*. Retrieved January 5, 2011, from <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Georgia factsheet, 2005-2009 American Community Survey*. Retrieved January 5, 2011, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFacts?_event=Search&_lang=en&_sse=on&_geo_id=04000US13&_state=04000US13.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010b). *State & County Quickfacts: Georgia*. Retrieved January 5, 2011, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/13000.html>.
- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). (2010). *Fact sheet: Delegation of immigration authority section 287(g) immigration and nationality act*. Retrieved January, 7, 2011, from <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/287g.htm>.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (USDA). (2010). *State fact sheets: Georgia*. Retrieved January, 7, 2011, from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/statefacts/GA.htm>.
- Violence Policy Center. (2010). *When men murder women: An analysis of 2008 homicide data*. Washington, DC: Retrieved from <http://vpc.org/studies/wmmw2010.pdf>.

Appendix List

Appendix A: Copy of VAWA 2010 Implementation Plan Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: Copy of VAWA Implementation Plan Meeting Powerpoint

Appendix C: List of 2010 VAWA Implementation Plan Registrants
Copy of 2010 VAWA Implementation Plan Sign-In Sheet

Appendix D: Copy of current committee sign-ups