The media frenzy surrounding the Kobe Bryant case is depressingly familiar. Journalists debate the ethics of withholding the victim’s name. Sports fans lament the cost of the star’s actions to his career. Newspapers describe Bryant’s pain, and coaches calculate the potential “benefit” of the publicity for their teams. Lost in the shuffle is the victim’s anguish.

The coverage of the Bryant case only reinforces how much our nation still needs to learn about victims. The National Center’s Rape in America study indicated that rape victims’ number-one concern is that people will know they’ve been attacked. Why? Because society will not support them and may even blame them for the crime. Reporters still explore victims’ sexual and psychological histories, searching for past indiscretions and moments of instability. Sensationalistic Web sites vilify and humiliate victims. No detail—except what crime does to victims—escapes public scrutiny.

Our nation’s failure to understand the experience of victims, of course, extends to all crimes. Our society’s generally anemic response to stalking, for example, has endangered victims and emboldened stalkers. This issue of NETWORKS features “A Tragic Murder,” the story of Peggy Klinke, murdered in January by a stalker who pursued her for almost a year. In July, the National Center—in partnership with Representative Heather Wilson (R-NM), Lifetime Television, and community activist Erin Brockovich—brought Peggy’s story to Capitol Hill. The event highlighted the link between murder and stalking and the steps states can take to protect victims.

The Congressional briefing resulted from a call to the National Center after the victim’s sister saw the National Center’s Stalking Resource Center director Tracy Bahm on the Today Show. The Stalking Resource Center is making great strides in educating citizens, law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, mental health professionals, and victim advocates about the crime of stalking. The Stalking Resource Center’s recent conferences—Intimate Partner Stalking: Keeping Victims Safe and Holding Offenders Accountable—in Memphis, Tennessee, in March and in Portland, Oregon, in August attracted several hundred participants. During the past six months, the Stalking Resource Center has handled more than 100 requests for technical assistance, received almost 4,000 unique visitors per month at its Web site, and reached thousands of practitioners through presentations at trainings, conferences, and other events throughout the country. The Web site (www.ncvc.org/src) publishes the SRC’s newsletter, fact sheet, case law digest, and many other useful resources.

On the legal front, states have made considerable progress. All 50 states have stalking laws. One-third of states have amended their statutes to prohibit stalking through electronic means, and states are beginning to address related crimes, such as video voyeurism. The Washington legislature, for example, recently passed a law to prohibit “upskirting,” photographing intimate areas of another person without that person’s knowledge or consent.

NETWORKS also features great progress in several other areas. “Washington’s ‘Victim Wrap Around’ Program Saves Lives” describes an innovative program to protect victims from potentially dangerous offenders reentering society. The brainchild of Washington’s Department of Corrections Victim/Witness Notification Administrator William Stutz, the Victim Wrap Around Program mobilizes a multi-agency task force that has helped keep more than one hundred victims safe.

Also encouraging is the emergence of forensic nursing, addressed by Rusty Rooms in “Forensic Nurses: Linking Law and Healthcare to Help Victims.” In the decade since the founding of the International Association of Forensic Nursing in 1992, forensic nursing has effectively supported victims and advanced the application of forensic science. Mobilizing community resources to treat victims and solve crimes, forensic nursing is a boon to victims and society.

We have made enormous progress with allied professionals—legislators, corrections officials, forensic nurses. But the Kobe Bryant case reminds us how far we need to go in educating the public at large.

Susan Herman
Executive Director
A Tragic Murder:

A Powerful Force to Improve the Nation’s Response to Stalking

In late February 2003, Debbie Riddle contacted the Stalking Resource Center of the National Center for Victims of Crime seeking help. Peggy Klinke, Debbie’s sister, had been brutally murdered two months earlier by a former boyfriend who had stalked her before killing her and then himself. Debbie wanted to translate her family’s painful tragedy into a force for positive change. In particular, she wanted to find ways to improve law enforcement’s response to stalking. She wanted to help save lives.
Debbie Riddle’s call set into motion a series of remarkable events that within four months resulted in a Congressional briefing, a concurrent Congressional resolution, and a national television program featuring Peggy’s story. On July 8, 2003, the National Center for Victims of Crime, in partnership with Representative Heather Wilson (R-NM) and Lifetime Television, brought Peggy’s story to the attention of Congress at a briefing on Capitol Hill. Debbie Riddle and Mark Sparks (Peggy Klinke’s boyfriend at the time of her murder) described the terror of Peggy’s last months. They shared how Peggy worked with the police, obtained restraining orders, and even succeeded in having the case set for trial. Yet six days before the trial date, Peggy was killed.

The briefing highlighted ways law enforcement can strengthen its response to stalking. Speakers included Erin Brockovich, host of Lifetime’s Final Justice; Diane Stuart, director of the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice; Tracy Bahm, director of the Stalking Resource Center, National Center for Victims of Crime; and Mark Wynn, former police officer and stalking expert. Susan Herman, executive director of the National Center for Victims of Crime, moderated the briefing.

That same day, Representative Wilson—sponsor of the briefing—introduced a resolution to support National Stalking Awareness Month, which will focus a national spotlight on stalking every January. (A copy of the resolution and more information about National Stalking Awareness Month are available at www.ncvc.org.) Through their powerful statements, Debbie Riddle and Mark Sparks urged both increased awareness and immediate action to help save lives. And Mark Wynn outlined steps law enforcement can take to prevent more tragedies like Peggy Klinke’s death. Below we present their remarks (edited for length).

Debbie Riddle
Peggy Klinke’s sister

It all began in the fall of ’98. At the age of 28, my sister Peggy began preparing for medical school with some undergraduate classes in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

She met and began dating a man named Patrick Kennedy. She brought him home to meet the family that New Year’s, and he was a little too nice to all of us, a little too overbearing, and wanted Peggy all to himself. When he brought a gun to the beach on a family vacation, we warned Peggy to be careful with him. After that, we only saw him a few more times.

Peggy and Patrick’s relationship lasted about three years altogether. In March of 2002, Peggy cut all ties with him. From the day she left him, he began stalking her. He followed her everywhere that she went. He called her cell phone constantly. He waited for her outside of her work and gym, and finally used his young daughter as a way to get Peggy to return his phone calls.

When Peggy did not respond to any of this, he posted a vulgar flyer with Peggy’s picture and her cell phone number on it around the city of Albuquerque, mainly at the places where Peggy had visited.

That June, our family gathered in Orlando, Florida, for my brother’s wedding. Peggy brought a new man she had begun dating, Mark Sparks. While we were in Florida... Patrick left my brother a message saying how sorry he was that he could not attend the family wedding. Patrick then flew to Ohio to spray-paint “PK is a whore” on my mother’s garage. He then returned to Albuquerque to set fire to Mark’s house.

This was the first time Patrick had reached beyond Peggy. I then had to tell my six-year-old daughter that if she ever saw him that she was to run away no matter what he said.

Patrick’s behavior was escalating, and Peggy began to become terrified. She went...
“Please tell my mother that I love her. Please tell my niece that she will now have a guardian angel watching over her...And tell my sister to name her baby after me.”

to the police and filed for stalking charges and got a restraining order. She began to keep a record of everything Patrick did from then on and reported it all to the police.

My family and I developed a false sense of security. Patrick was breaking the law, and we thought the law would now, in turn, protect Peggy.

When police searched Patrick’s home and found a receipt for an assault rifle, we thought now that they would take action. There was a detective assigned to the arson case and a D.A. working on the stalking case.

Peggy soon left for Turlock, California, to begin a new life. She did everything she could to leave no trace or trail, to protect herself. She notified local authorities about what had been happening. And she had an unlisted address, unlisted phone number, and got a new cell phone.

She told everyone she worked with and all of her new neighbors about Patrick, showed them his picture, and urged them to call the police if they ever heard from him or saw him anywhere in the area.

During this time, my family and I were very careful talking on the phone with Peggy, never revealing her exact location. We began using Caller ID. My mother reactivated a security system that she had not used in years. My husband double-checked the neighborhood for strange cars while he was out running. I watched my girls like a hawk and kept our doors and windows locked at all times.

Even a car parked in front of my sister’s home one evening led her to call the police to have it checked out. These are things that we never ever had to do during our daily lives.

Things were quiet for awhile. And in mid-November [2002], the terror started again. A box full of damaged family photos arrived at my mother’s house. And two days before Thanksgiving, a phone call came to my mom’s house.

When I answered it, I heard Patrick say, “I
How can you help your community create a coordinated multidisciplinary response to stalking?

**Brown Bag Topic**

Many communities have resources for sexual assault or domestic violence victims—but do not for stalking victims. Can stalking victims get civil protection orders in your community? Do you have shelters for them? Do local agencies collaborate to protect stalking victims? As you prepare for National Stalking Awareness Month in January 2004, how can you help your community address stalking?

For help to answer these questions and additional resources visit [www.ncvc.org/src](http://www.ncvc.org/src).

know where she is, and in two minutes, there’ll be death.”

Peggy had just flown into Albuquerque that evening to visit Mark, and we called the Albuquerque police department to report the call and asked them to please check on Peggy and Mark. Peggy knew Patrick had watched Mark’s home constantly, because Mark would start receiving strange phone calls the minute Peggy would arrive in town. My mother and I filed statements in Ohio, sent them to the Albuquerque police, and called the D.A. He never followed up with a phone call, and, at this point, Peggy asked the D.A., “Will it take a bullet to my head for you to do something about this?”

We saw Peggy again over the holidays in 2002... but it’s what I refer to as two weeks of living hell.

Patrick’s sister-in-law called my mother’s home just before the holidays to tell her they didn’t know where Patrick was, and if Peggy was at home for the holidays, that we should keep an eye out for him. My mother called the Poland, Ohio, police to put her house on watch, and none of us felt safe knowing Patrick and his collection of guns.

Peggy returned to [California] in January. And two weeks later, six days before her stalking trial was to happen, Patrick found Peggy after months of searching. He caught up with her on her way out of the house early Saturday morning. He duct-taped her hands together. He choked her. And he beat her. He beat her so severely with his gun that her blonde hair turned bright red.

Despite all of this, Peggy managed to break free and flee to a neighbor’s apartment, where she was able to call 911. He followed her, broke through the sliding glass door, smashed through the door in the bedroom, where she was hiding.

With the police now surrounding the building, he held Peggy to the floor at gunpoint.

I think Peggy knew at this point this was going to be the end of her life. And she called to the police officers outside the bedroom to get these messages to her family. “Please tell my mother that I love her. Please tell my niece that she will now have a guardian angel watching over her...And tell my sister to name her baby after me.”

Patrick shot Peggy in the back of the neck, and then he killed himself.

Peggy was a wonderful, vibrant young woman. She loved life and everything about it. She loved her family, and especially her three young nieces. She loved traveling and exploring new things, and she was trying to build a life for herself.

To honor my sister’s last request and a tribute to her memory, the daughter that I am now carrying will be named after her.

We can never have Peggy back, but maybe my testimony today can help keep other families from going through what my family has gone through. In America, no one should have to live the life of fear like Peggy did. And no one should have to experience the pain of losing a loved one the way we lost Peggy.
Mark Sparks

Peggy Klinke's boyfriend at time of her murder

Peggy Klinke was my girlfriend up until the day that she was shot to death.

On my way to Peggy's funeral, I remember stopping at an airport gift shop, and I bought her a Valentine's Day card. And the clerk behind the counter complimented me and said, I'm amazed that you're buying this card weeks before Valentine's Day.

I didn't have the heart to tell her that I planned to place this card in my girlfriend's coffin to be buried with her.

I wrote in this card how sorry I was that I wasn't there to protect her, how I thought that, with the law's help, we would someday be free of her stalker. I wrote to her about the one-carat diamond ring that I had in my dresser to propose to her, and I hadn't because the stress of the upcoming stalking trial was just too much.

On January 24, Peggy and I were supposed to testify in court against her ex-boyfriend in a stalking trial, but instead of being in court on that particular day, I was in Ohio with Peggy's family. We walked into the funeral home and we saw her body for the first time.

I held her hand, and I tucked the card in the sheath of her casket. I thought about all of the things that we had done to prevent this from happening and to protect her. And that this was the final result.

So how did this happen?

After paying a private investigator for information, Peggy's stalker drove to the Albuquerque airport and checked a handgun and a hunting rifle at the airline counter and flew to San Jose, California. He retrieved his bag with his weapons, rented a car and arrived at her neighborhood. He posed as a private investigator, approached a delivery driver, who recognized her photo and gave him her exact address.

After the police informed me of her murder, I just remember being confused and shocked. I got down on one knee in front of a photo of the two of us, and I proposed to Peggy, but obviously, it was too late.

One week later I met Peggy's mother and sister in California, and we stopped at the coroner's office to retrieve Peggy's earrings, her keys and to inquire about her autopsy report.

We then drove to Peggy's apartment in Turlock, California, to help pack up her belongings. And despite restraining orders, stalking charges and police reports, we saw where Peggy struggled for her life. And we saw where she died.
Our final stop was at the Turlock Police Department, where we were given more details about Peggy’s murder. That night I talked with Peggy’s mother at the hotel, and I held her hand. I tried to think of anything I could say to comfort a woman who has just lost her daughter in this fashion. And I couldn’t think of anything.

…I think many problems need to be addressed.

Private investigators giving information to people with restraining orders filed against them.

Number two, allowing a man with a restraining order against him to check weapons on an airplane.

Number three, the need for experts in the field of psychology to serve as a resource to perform threat assessments so victims are more informed.

And finally, in my opinion, training for law enforcement, to help them see the bigger picture of what’s going on, the continuum as I heard earlier of stalking. Instead of just a series of isolated reports and getting a different officer to respond to each different call, because they just can’t piece it all together. And making sure that law enforcement communicate across different jurisdictions.

Peggy’s stalker made a loud statement. He sent the message that he owned Peggy’s life, and he challenged the legal system, and he won. And this was a man that I never saw in my entire life.

So please help us to send a message of our own, a message that stalking will no longer be tolerated by our society. And my hope is that we develop systems to intervene at the earliest signs of potential violence.

Peggy was a beautiful person, as you can see, not just on the outside, but the inside. And I really loved her.

She deserved to live a life without fear, without constant harassment. And I trust that if we are all people of integrity and who do really value individual freedoms, that we’ll increase our efforts to prevent this tragedy from happening to another family.

Strengthening Law Enforcement’s Response to Stalking

According to Mark Wynn, former lieutenant of the Nashville Metropolitan Police Department and a nationally recognized stalking expert, all responsible elements in the criminal justice system—law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, probation, parole, corrections—should take responsibility to ensure that the law keeps its promise to victims of stalking and domestic violence. During the Congressional briefing, he outlined a series of concrete recommendations for improving law enforcement’s stalking response:

All stalking cases should be pursued vigorously. The law has to be the same for everyone in this country, not just someone of means or standing, such as a celebrity or politician.

Every domestic violence case should be looked at as a potential stalking case. When dating Peggy Klinke, Patrick Kennedy had shown the kind of aggressive, controlling behavior that is typical of stalkers. Years of study show that there are common signs before a violent attack, a hostage situation, a murder. And stalking is at the top of that list of signs.

Safety planning should become a top priority before and after an arrest. Stalking victims don’t report because they are afraid of the consequences of the report itself and what will happen to them. Every stalking victim in this country who walks into a police station, a sheriff’s office, or a prosecutor’s office should walk out with a safety plan or have contact with someone in that office who can work with the victim to develop a safety plan.

Victims should be active participants in safety planning. Stalking victims deal with an incredible amount of anxiety. Their active participation will help increase their trust in law enforcement.
Violators of orders of protection should be aggressively pursued. Protective order violations are strong pre-incident indicators before murder. Protective orders should be available to all stalking victims, not just in domestic violence cases, and weapons prohibitions must be enforced.

Police officers, prosecutors, and judges should receive training on how to identify stalking cases and the different types of stalkers. As with sex offenders, there are many different types of stalkers. All are potentially dangerous. All must get the message that their stalking behavior will not be tolerated.

Police officers should be trained in gathering evidence. Lack of evidence makes prosecuting stalkers very difficult. Stalking evidence is usually available, but officers are frequently not familiar with how to collect and integrate those pieces for prosecution.

Stalking protocols should be developed and implemented. Law enforcement agencies should implement stalking protocols, like those for high-speed pursuit, use of deadly force, and domestic violence. Stalking protocols should require timely and responsive incident investigations and include counter-stalking strategies. There is no margin of error, no time to wait when someone is being stalked.

Interagency agreements should be established between jurisdictions. Stalkers frequently cross state and county lines, and even international borders, to reach their victims. Stalkers need to know that law enforcement agencies won’t stop at jurisdictional lines, that they will be pursued wherever they go, wherever they repeat their stalking behavior. Police officers must be trained on violations of the federal stalking law, which makes it a federal offense to stalk someone across state lines or on tribal or federal lands. Federal prosecutors also must be involved in this educational effort.

As host of Lifetime’s Final Justice, community activist Erin Brockovich brought Peggy Klinke’s story to a national television audience. Brockovich (left) participated in the Congressional briefing with Stalking Resource Center Director Tracy Bahm (above) and National Center Executive Director Susan Herman.
Stalking Victims Seek Relief in Civil Court

More and more stalking victims are successfully pursuing civil lawsuits against their stalkers and other responsible parties. Summarized below are three recent civil stalking cases from the National Crime Victim Bar Association’s database of crime-victim-related civil justice cases (www.victimbar.org/database_introduction.htm).

Investigation Firm May Be Held Liable for Helping Killer Find Victim

Remsburg v. Docusearch, Inc. 816A.2d 1001, N.H., 2/18/2003

Liam Youens maintained a Web site documenting his obsession with Amy Boyer and his intention to kill her. Youens paid a total of $204 to an Internet-based investigation company, Docusearch.com, to obtain various pieces of information, including Boyer’s date of birth, Social Security number, place of employment, and home address. With this information, Youens tracked the woman to her workplace and shot and killed her as she was leaving her office. He then killed himself.

Boyer’s estate sued Docusearch in federal court. Hampshire Supreme Court about whether Docusearch could be liable to the estate under various applications of state law. The Supreme Court of New Hampshire found that Docusearch could be held liable for violating several legal duties. The court concluded that the risk of criminal misconduct arising from stalking and identity theft is sufficiently foreseeable that an investigative service has a duty to act with reasonable care when disclosing a third party’s personal information to a client.

Man Held Liable for Directing Stalker to Victim

Homan v. Goyal


Devinder Goyal had given the name and phone number of Robert Homan to Gabriel DaSilva. DaSilva called Homan, sometimes twenty times a night, claiming that Homan was with DaSilva’s wife and demanding to speak with her. DaSilva showed up at Homan’s house and later threatened to kill him. DaSilva’s constant harassment caused Homan to relocate and change his phone number, and Homan sued Goyal for intentional infliction of emotional distress. The jury awarded Homan $40,000. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals approved the award, holding that Goyal’s actions were sufficiently extreme and outrageous to establish a claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress.

Department Store May Be Liable for Abduction


Anita Gayle Staples was abducted from a mall where she was shopping while waiting for her car to be repaired. While shopping in the store from which she was later abducted, she had notified two employees that a man was following her from store to store. The employees failed to notify security. The woman later sued the department store and the mall’s security company for failure to maintain adequate security and to protect her from abduction.

Although the trial court ruled in favor of the department store (because Staples had returned to the store after retrieving her car), the Supreme Court of Tennessee reversed the judgment and remanded the case to the lower court. The Supreme Court stated that the jury should have decided the issue of Staples’s fault, that her abduction was foreseeable, and that the defendants owed her a duty of care.

New Stalking Fact Sheet
Do you need concise yet comprehensive information about stalking that you can use in your trainings, news releases, speeches, and advocacy work? Our new fact sheet contains current information about stalking behavior, prevalence, impact, and laws. See opposite page or download at www.ncvc.org/src.
WHAT IS STALKING?

While legal definitions of stalking vary from one jurisdiction to another, stalking generally refers to a course of conduct that involves a broad range of behavior directed at the victim. The conduct can be as varied as the stalker’s imagination and ability to take actions that harass, frighten, threaten and/or force himself or herself into the life and consciousness of the victim.


STALKING IN AMERICA

- 1,006,970 women and 370,990 men are stalked annually in the United States.
- 1 in 12 women and 1 in 45 men will be stalked in their lifetime.
- 77% of female and 64% of male victims know their stalker.
- 87% of stalkers are men.
- 59% of female victims and 30% of male victims are stalked by an intimate partner.
- 81% of women stalked by a current or former intimate partner are also physically assaulted by that partner.
- 31% of women stalked by a current or former intimate partner are also sexually assaulted by that partner.
- The average duration of stalking is 1.8 years.
- If stalking involves intimate partners, the average duration of stalking increases to 2.2 years.
- 61% of stalkers made unwanted phone calls; 33% sent or left unwanted letters or items; 29% vandalized property; and 9% killed or threatened to kill a family pet.
- 28% of female victims and 10% of male victims obtained a protective order; 69% of female victims and 81% of male victims had the protection order violated.


STATE LAWS*

- Stalking is a crime under the laws of all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government.
- 14 states classify stalking as a felony upon the first offense.*
- 34 states classify stalking as a felony upon the second offense and/or when the crime involves aggravating factors.*
- Aggravating factors may include: possession of a deadly weapon; violation of a court order or condition of probation/parole; victim under 16; same victim as prior occasions.

* For a complete list of state, tribal and Federal laws visit: www.ncvc.org/src
* Last updated July 2003

THE STALKING RESOURCE CENTER

The Stalking Resource Center is a program of the National Center for Victims of Crime. Our dual mission is to raise national awareness of stalking and to encourage the development and implementation of multidisciplinary responses to stalking in local communities across the country. We can provide you with:

- Training
- Technical Assistance
- Protocol Development
- Resources
- Help in collaborating with other agencies and systems in your community

Contact us at: 202-467-8700 or src@ncvc.org.

This document was developed under grant number 98-WF-VX-K008 from the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) of the US Department of Justice.
The opinions and views expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Office on Violence Against Women of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document may be reproduced only in its entirety. Any alterations must be approved by the Stalking Resource Center. Contact us at (202)467-8700, or src@ncvc.org

TYPOLOGIES OF STALKERS*

- Simple obsessional stalkers are the most common type. They have some prior relationship with the victim, usually an intimate one. These cases most often occur in the context of domestic violence.
- Love obsessional stalkers have had no existing relationship with the victim. Many of these stalkers target celebrities.
- Erotomanic stalkers delusionally believe that they are loved by the victim. This is the rarest category of stalkers.

* Individual perpetrators may not precisely fit any single stalker category, and often exhibit characteristics associated with more than one category; it is important to remember that these typologies are merely guides.


THE SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION OF COLLEGE WOMEN

- 13% of college women were stalked during one six to nine month period.
- 80% of campus stalking victims knew their stalkers.
- 3 in 10 college women reported being injured emotionally or psychologically from being stalked.


IMPACT OF STALKING ON VICTIMS

- 56% of women stalked took some type of self-protective measure; often as drastic as relocating (11%). (Tjaden & Thoennes. 1998). “Stalking in America,” NIJ)
- 26% of stalking victims lost time from work as a result of their victimization, and 7% never returned to work. (Tjaden & Thoennes.)
- 30% of female victims and 20% of male victims sought psychological counseling. (Tjaden & Thoennes.)
- The prevalence of anxiety, insomnia, social dysfunction, and severe depression is much higher among stalking victims than the general population, especially if the stalking involves being followed or having one’s property destroyed. (Blaus et. al. (2002). “The Toll of Stalking,” J. Interpersonal Viol.)

STALKING & INTIMATE PARTNER FEMICIDE*

- 76% of femicide victims had been stalked.
- 67% had been physically abused by their intimate partner.
- 89% of femicide victims who had been physically abused had also been stalked in the 12 months before the murder.
- 79% of abused femicide victims reported stalking during the same period that they reported abuse.
- 85% of attempted femicide cases involved at least one episode of stalking within 12 months prior to the attempted femicide.
- 54% of femicide victims reported stalking to police before they were killed by their stalkers.

* The murder of a woman
The convicted child molester dreamed for months about what he would do when he got out of prison. He would wait until dark. He'd break into the house where his former victim, now sixteen years old, lived with her mother. He'd move silently through the house—where he had been before—avoiding the spots where he knew the floor would creak. He would pull the sleeping women from their beds, tie them up, and slowly mutilate them. Then he would murder them both.

In 1998, a soon-to-be-released prisoner at Twin River Correctional Center in Washington state graphically described to his therapist how he would mutilate and kill his former victim and her mother as soon as he was free. Alarmed by the danger, the therapist alerted the Department of Corrections (DOC) that the prisoner might well act out his fantasies. The information soon reached DOC Victim Witness Program manager William Stutz, who knew that he could not stop the offender's release but resolved to stop the murders. Stutz pieced together an emergency plan that saved the victims and launched a ground-breaking program in his state.

First Wrap Around
When Stutz learned of the danger to the girl and her mother, he mobilized a team to prevent the crime. He alerted the intended victims and their county's law enforcement agencies. Stutz worked with the women and their county's sexual assault unit to create a safety plan. He informed law enforcement in the offender's new county of residence about the threat, and the agency issued a community-wide bulletin about the offender's impending release. Once the offender was free, law enforcement tracked him with help from DOC and rearrested him when he failed to establish a residence as required under the terms of his release. While he was in the county jail, the intended victims relocated and permanently escaped the offender, who is now back in prison on a subsequent charge.

Stutz's success convinced him to push for a new program to protect other victims in similar circumstances. With DOC Secretary Joseph Lehman's solid support, Stutz set up the Victim Wrap Around Program—a component of the state's risk management process for offender reentry. Since 1998, the program has protected more than 100 victims statewide and is currently making plans to safeguard 26 more. Reflecting Washington's commitment to involve victims in the corrections phase of the criminal justice process, the program also helps communities safely reintegrate high-risk offenders into society.

How It Works
When offenders are about to leave prison, DOC conducts a risk-based classification process and end-of-sentence review, scrutinizing offenders’ files and searching for any indications of risk to victims. Experts focus on offenders classified as high risk under the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) assessment tool: those convicted of a violent crime, level III sex offenders, sex offenders designated as dangerously mentally ill, and offenders who have a history of violent or threatening behavior. To identify offenders who pose an immediate threat to victims, the department uses three key criteria: Is the offender making current threats toward a past or potential victim, demonstrating fixated behavior toward the victim, or pursuing a relationship with a victim of violence without the victim’s consent? The department forwards the cases of offenders who meet these criteria to the victim witness...
Program Saves Lives

To identify offenders who pose an immediate threat to victims, the department uses three key criteria:

1. Is the offender: making current threats toward a past or potential victim?
2. demonstrating fixated behavior toward the victim, or
3. pursuing a relationship with a victim of violence without the victim’s consent?

BY ELIZABETH JOYCE

Program Saves Lives

manager for assignment to a community victim liaison. The liaison then con-
tacts the victims to offer the services of the Victim Wrap Around Program.

If the victim requests the service, the liaison assembles a victim-centered wrap around team. Core team members include a DOC risk management specialist; a classifications counselor; community corrections supervisors; and victim support, such as family members or friends, as requested by the victim. The team also includes local law enforcement and local victim advocates from the victim’s community. As needed, the team invites mental health experts, sexual assault or domestic violence advocates, child or adult protective services staff, prosecutor-based legal advocates, and chemical dependence program staff to participate.

Sometimes—as in a recent response to a threat to bomb government buildings—the team may include the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. Team members provide knowledge (and sometimes resources) to support and protect the victim. The team devises a comprehensive safety plan based on the victim’s priorities and needs.

As part of the plan, the victim may directly participate in helping DOC establish the conditions of the offender’s release. Victims learn about the degree of supervision and monitoring to be imposed on the offender. Before the offender leaves prison, the victim is linked to a network of team members to help with any emerging need. DOC incorporates the victim’s safety plan into the overall supervision plan for the offender. Victims are relieved to learn, says Stutz, that “they don’t have to prepare for the offender’s release by themselves because the system comes together for them in the wrap around process.”

Wrap Around Strategies

The safety plans produced by the teams vary as widely as the victims’ situations, and DOC uses an array of tactics to keep the victim safe. As a condition of release, the state may prevent the offender from returning to the area where the crime was committed. To ensure that the offender does not leave his assigned geographic area, the state may track the offender with global positioning systems and electronic home monitoring. Wrap around teams often conduct safety “walk throughs” in victims’ homes, alerting them to security breaches, such as overgrown bushes where intruders might hide. Such strategies radically reduce the offender’s chances of finding or harming the victim.

When the offender is released, the court imposes terms of supervision that strengthen and support the wrap around plan. Offenders are required to avoid any patterns of behavior associated with their crimes (e.g., child molesters must avoid playgrounds and drug dealers their former environment). Community corrections officers assigned to the areas where the offenders live regularly monitor their compliance with the terms of their release. If offenders violate these terms, DOC hearing officers can impose a graduated set of sanctions that culminate in reconfinement.

Wrap around teams also use civil orders of protection to safeguard victims. Domestic violence advocates on the team may help the victim obtain protection.
orders and access community support. In one successful wrap around, an offender was released to a new county and a civil order of protection issued to protect a woman he had previously abused. The offender obtained a one-time permit to visit his ailing father, who lived in the same county as the victim. The potential danger prompted DOC to trigger the victim’s safety plan. When the offender contacted the victim, law enforcement was dispatched to the victim’s home, and the offender’s travel permit was then revoked. When the offender refused to return to his new county of residence, he was rearrested for noncompliance. In another case, an offender convicted of violating a protection order continued to make contact with the victim from prison, through calls, letters, and then through a third party. At a wrap around meeting, the victim submitted the phone records documenting the calls, and the offender was charged with eleven counts of felony violation. The offender was ultimately convicted of the new charges and remained in prison.

**Risk Management Transition**

The Victim Wrap Around Program works in tandem with the state’s Risk Management Transition Program, which carefully plans offenders’ reentry into society. DOC developed the program after the passage of the state’s 1999 Offender Accountability Act, a response to public alarm over the high rate of recidivism that occurred in the decade after the state abolished parole in 1984. Offenders were reentering society with little planning or support, “slipping through the cracks,” says Stutz, disappearing into the community and failing to report for supervision. They often lived “beneath the radar screen” until they were rearrested for a new offense. The new law expanded DOC’s authority to impose conditions of supervision on released prisoners and directed the department to invest heavily in supervising those identified as high risk.

The Risk Management Transition Program’s impact begins as soon as convicted offenders enter prison. Throughout all prison terms, the department constantly evaluates offenders’ capacity to reoffend and harm the community. Before a prisoner is released, DOC reassesses the risk levels and works with the offender to formulate a transition plan. The transition team maps out strategies for employment, transportation, medication, housing, and other issues that determine success in society. DOC strives to obtain the offender’s support for the entire plan, particularly when relocation is required.

Under the Offender Accountability Act, offenders convicted of violent crimes, sex offenses, and certain drug offenses are sentenced to terms of community custody (similar to parole) when they are released. The terms are subject to conditions set by the courts and DOC, and offenders must observe these terms to remain free. The department may meet with law enforcement, local advocates, and community representatives to foster a community safety plan. Both the courts and DOC may authorize punishment for violations of release requirements without the offender having to reappear in court. DOC’s role both enhances community safety and reduces burdens on the court.

**Committed to Victim Safety**

Washington State’s Victim Wrap Around Program, the first such victim protection program in the United States, reflects the state’s longstanding commitment to victims’ rights. Washington was the first state in the nation in 1983 to require by law that DOC notify victims of a prisoner’s release or transfer to the community. DOC has made victims a priority and their safety a paramount concern. DOC has a Victims’ Council—representing grassroots victim organizations, state agencies with victim programs, prosecutors’ victim/witness programs, and statewide coalitions—to advise the department on decisions that affect victims and to ensure that victims have a voice in the correctional system.

The 1999 Offender Accountability Act further advanced DOC’s victim-focused approach to corrections. The law not only directs resources to protect victims from harm but also lists victim input as a key source for determining the LSI-R risk level assigned to offenders. The law requires that offenders make amends for harm done to the victim or community. Forms of restitution include community service work crew participation, financial payment, or other activities designed to make amends or respond to victims. Every felony offender must pay a court-ordered crime victim compensation fee.

**Victim Awareness Education**

Another sign of DOC’s commitment to victims is the in-prison (and post-release) Victim Awareness Education (VAE) program, also launched by William Stutz. Based on a model originally used with California youth, the VAE program edu-
cate offenders about the impact of their crimes on victims. Prisoners usually enroll either to avoid penalties for pending violations or to fulfill a requirement of their in-prison education. The curriculum includes presentations by victims, who describe their experiences. As a result of this approach, many offenders have come to see their victims in a surprisingly different light. Many have learned, for example, that victims’ insurance can replace their possessions but not their sense of security. “Victims feel a sense of invasion and violation,” says Stutz, “that does not go away when their property is restored.” Stutz extended his in-prison VAE program to post-release transition programs, and the courses have long waiting lists.

As the Victim Wrap Around Program has expanded, the department has recently created a new position—community victim liaison—to coordinate the wrap arounds and serve as a bridge between DOC and crime victims and their advocates. The department has hired experienced victim advocates to work with the DOC’s Victims’ Council—as Stutz envisioned—in five regional offices throughout the state. The new community victim liaisons will advance and consolidate the state’s commitment to victims during the corrections phase of the criminal justice process.

**Victim Response**

A bulging file of testimonials in William Stutz’s office tells what the Victim Wrap Around Program has meant to the victims it protects. “Thank you for everything!” writes a fourteen-year-old. “You saved my life. I hope you know how much you have helped me.” “I feel wrapped around,” writes another victim, praising the kindness and support she received. “I truly am grateful for everything that Mr. Stutz and his program have done, and continue to do, for my daughter and myself. Without his assistance, I honestly can tell you that I believe [the offender] would have murdered me.”

**Wrap Around as Model**

As news of the Washington Victim Wrap Around program spreads, other states are beginning to apply the model. Sherry Burnette, Ph.D., director of Victim Services for Vermont’s Department of Corrections, reports that well before an offender is released, she and her victim services staff have begun to hold wrap around meetings with victims and a team of experts to conduct safety planning. “We work with victims to identify the concerns they have about an offender reentering, give them as much information as we can about the offender and his/her release plan, and work closely with correctional staff to craft supervision conditions that increase a victim’s sphere of safety whenever possible,” Burnette said. Her department is moving to formalize the process, which partners her team with members of the community, neighbors, and friends chosen by the victim. To Burnette, the wrap around process helps the state meet—to the extent possible—a fundamental obligation to prepare victims for offenders’ reentry. She also finds the model particularly promising for use with her state’s small prison population of 1,400.

As hundreds of thousands of released offenders pour back into society every year, Washington’s Victim Wrap Around Program shows how states can protect victims while managing offender reentry. The cornerstone of the program’s success, says William Stutz, is the state’s and the Department of Corrections’ quest for victim safety, participation, awareness, and empowerment. Building a successful program, says Stutz, takes time and energy. Yet for Washington, the investment is paying off.

Elizabeth Joyce is Senior Writer at the National Center for Victims of Crime. For more information about Washington’s Victim Wrap Around Program, contact William Stutz, manager of the Department of Corrections Victim Witness Program at wastutz@doc1.wa.gov.
Forensic Nurses: Linking Law and Healthcare to Help Victims

BY RUSTY ROOMS, BSN, RN, DABFN

Urns have been assisting courts of law since the 14th century, when they were called to provide evidence on sexual assault cases in France.1 In the United States, forensic nursing formally emerged as a field of practice in 1992 at a Minneapolis, Minnesota, convention where healthcare providers working in the medical-legal arena met to discuss their common practices. Most conferees were registered nurses caring for victims of sexual assault; others worked with inmates in correctional facilities or served as nurse death investigators. This group of visionaries founded the International Association of Forensic Nurses (IAFN) and launched an exciting new specialty of American nursing.

A Blend of Disciplines

Forensic nursing applies nursing science to public or legal proceedings. Forensic nurses are involved “in the scientific investigation and treatment of trauma and/or death of victims and perpetrators of abuse, violence, criminal activity, and traumatic accidents….The forensic nurse provides direct services to individual clients, consultation services to nursing, medical and law related agencies, as well as providing expert court testimony in areas dealing with trauma and/or questioned death investigative processes.”2

The emergence of forensic nursing represents dramatic progress from the time when emergency department physicians—often overworked and poorly trained in both crisis intervention and evidence collection—normally saw rape victims, many of whom had waited up to twelve hours for care because their injuries were not seen as life-threatening. When these victims were finally treated, they were asked the same questions—which were often insensitive, inappropriate, and judgmental—by a series of different people, including physicians, police officers, and nurses. Gynecological examinations were sometimes performed in areas of the emergency department that were neither enclosed nor at all private. Protocols for forensic/medical examinations were inadequate or virtually nonexistent, and evidence collection was often
inadequate. Even when victims’ medical needs were met, their emotional needs were all too often overlooked or—even worse—victims were blamed for the rape.³

Through training and practice, forensic nurses have improved both patient care and evidence collection. Current forensic nursing protocols are based on the understanding that rape is about power and control. To help victims regain the control they have lost by being assaulted, the nurses make sure to obtain victims’ full consent for every step of the treatment process. For example, by saying something as simple as, “Hi, my name is Jane. Is it OK if I talk with you?”—and then waiting until he or she responds—the nurse gives the victim options. The patient must understand and accept the process before the care proceeds.

**Forensic Nursing in Clinical Practice**

The primary clinical forensic nursing role is that of Forensic Nurse Examiners (FNEs), registered nurses who care (in either inpatient or outpatient settings) for patients who have been involved as victims or perpetrators in interpersonal violence. FNEs serve as case managers, ensuring that the physiological, psychosocial, and legal needs of the victims are met. FNEs work with victims of adult and child sexual assault/abuse, child and elder abuse, intimate partner violence, or shootings and stabbings. Specially trained to provide comprehensive care, FNEs perform medical/forensic examinations and serve as expert witnesses in courts of law. FNEs also collect physical evidence from the alleged perpetrators of these crimes.

During a medical/forensic examination, a forensic nurse obtains an accurate history of events that may affect a victim’s health, safety, and future decision-making. FNEs are trained to recognize, document, interpret, and conduct detailed assessments of bodily injury, particularly to the genitalia in sexual assault. They collect forensic evidence by using a biological evidence collection kit and/or photographing a patient’s injury so that at a later date when injuries have healed, the facts surrounding the event can be accurately recreated for a jury. The patient record is considered a legal document that takes on significant value when used as evidence in a court of law. Forensic nurses are trained to use medical terms precisely and accurately so that evidence stands up in court. There is a forensic difference, for example, between a laceration, a cut, and other body surface injuries. In discussions and records, exact terms are used to ensure that the evidence is accurate and future testimony will withstand scrutiny.

**Forensic Nursing Specialization**

Until quite recently, forensic nurses working with victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and abuse had no formal designation. Yet the field is gradually carving out some specific areas of specialization, which include the following:

- **Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANEs)**, who perform medical/forensic examinations for sexual assault patients, provide emotional support, collect evidence, give testimony at trials, and provide advice for follow-up care.

- **Forensic Nurse Examiners (FNEs)**, the generalists of the field, who care for all trauma patients who are victims or perpetrators of interpersonal violence. These nurses may have training in other areas of forensic nursing and carry multiple certifications.

- **Forensic Psychiatric Nurses**, who assess, evaluate, and provide therapy for criminal defendants and assist staff members who have witnessed assaults or experienced patient suicide. These nurses have special training in psychiatric nursing.
Forensic Correctional/Institutional Nurses, who specialize in the care and treatment of large institutionalized populations in prisons or psychiatric facilities for the “criminally insane.” These nurses are specially trained in the legal and custodial requirements of their patients.

Forensic Nurse Investigators, who work with a coroner or medical examiner to investigate a death and may, according to protocols, determine if an autopsy should be performed.

Nurse Coroners/Death Investigators, who may determine cause of death and assist the police in collecting evidence at the scene. (In some communities, coroners may be someone other than a physician).

Legal Nurse Consultants and Nurse Attorneys, who are nurses with or without a degree in law, provide consultation and education to legal, criminal, justice, and healthcare professionals in areas such as personal injury, product liability, medical malpractice/negligence, worker’s compensation, toxic environmental issues, and risk management.

Professional Milestones
The dramatic growth of SANE programs, the largest forensic nursing subspecialty, is one of the clearest results of the 1992 meeting that launched the IAFN. More than 90 SANE programs have been established nationwide. More than 300 nurses have been certified as SANES and use the credential SANE-A (the “A” represents adult/adolescent patient population). The SANE-A certification marks a tremendous milestone for forensic nursing, providing a verification of competency that previously did not exist. In large measure through the efforts of forensic nurses, the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) has begun to develop standards of care for treating victims of sexual assault. IAFN has also recently defined the standards of care for nurses working with patients who are victims or perpetrators of intimate partner violence.

SART Model
The hallmark of forensic nursing is teamwork. Even before forensic nursing was formalized as a specialty, nurses were working with law enforcement and victim service providers to determine best practices for treating victims of violence and for collecting and preserving evidence. Today, ever-growing numbers of Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs) have been formed throughout the country to bring health care, law enforcement, victim advocacy, and other concerned citizens together to address the problem of sexual assault in America’s communities.

SARTs, which develop protocols and define responsibilities, are fundamentally interdependent. When law enforcement reaches the scene of a sexual assault, officers protect the victim and secure the crime scene. They take a limited statement to determine whether a crime has been committed. Law enforcement directs the victim to the hospital, where staff pages the forensic nurse and the victim advocate on call. The forensic nurse examines the patient. If the patient chooses, the victim advocate remains in the exam room to provide support. When the exam is complete, with the patient’s consent, the forensic nurse provides medications to treat sexually transmitted infections and for emergency contraception and makes any necessary arrangements for follow-up medical care. Team members have the opportunity to collaborate with other members—both through formal meetings for case review and problem-solving and informal gatherings that allow them to learn about their counterparts’ roles.

SARTs provide the district attorney with accurate forensic evidence and a capable victim who can withstand the rigors of the criminal justice system. When the multidisciplinary team provides a comprehensive investigatory package, the district attorney can often attain a just resolution and a guilty plea without going to trial, thus easing the victim’s burden and saving taxpayers’ money. In communities where health care, law enforcement, and advocacy do not come together, road-
blocks hinder the investigation, and the patient and community suffer—with or without a trial.

Texas Hospital's Model of Care

The emergence of the forensic nurse role at Memorial Hermann Hospital System in Houston, Texas—world-renowned for the treatment of trauma patients—illustrates how forensic nurses positively affect the treatment of victims of violence. In January 2001, eight years after launching its own SANE program, the hospital established a Forensic Nursing Services Department. Building on the SANE model, the new department has expanded the FNE role and begun serving new patient populations, including the elderly and intimate partner violence patients. Today, a cadre of 32 FNEs provides services to patients of interpersonal violence in nine system hospitals. This system includes two fully operational examination sites as well as a mobile unit to take personnel and equipment to other facilities.

Coordination with Victim Service Providers

Among the keys to the Houston program’s success is effective coordination with victim service providers. The forensic nurses and the victim service providers train one another. Victim service providers present eight hours of training on sexual assault and domestic violence for the nurses. This training emphasizes how the power and control dynamic behind rape and domestic violence affects victims. In turn, the nurses train the victim advocates on the medical care of sexual assault patients. Every time a forensic nurse is called, a victim advocate is called if the patient elects the service. The advocate works with the victim’s family while the nurse cares for the patient. In a sexual assault case, the advocate prepares the family for the impact of the assault on the victim and stresses that no matter what the circumstances of the assault (even if the victim's judgments and choices were poor), no one deserves to be assaulted. Victims need unqualified support.

After the nurses have completed the medical/forensic exam, victim service providers arrive to care for the patient. They ensure that the victims have whatever they need—transportation home, clothing, and food. The advocates refer the victims to counseling and legal advocacy and provide continued support. The collaboration and mutual respect between the forensic nurses and victim service providers—a “win-win” for victims—is one of the team’s greatest strengths.

Collaborating for the Victim

Forensic nurses, working effectively in multidisciplinary teams, help victims, law enforcement, and the communities they serve. The expanded role in investigating trauma, death, and crimes has unified disciplines and maximized community resources throughout the country. Through a team approach to healing wounds and solving crimes, forensic nurses are making victims the number-one priority.

Rusty Rooms, BSN, RN, DABFN, coordinator of forensic nursing services for the Memorial Hermann Healthcare System in Houston, Texas, is secretary/treasurer of the International Association of Forensic Nursing. He is currently completing his master’s degree in nursing science at the University of Texas-Houston, School of Nursing, graduating in July of 2004 from both the Emergency Nurse Practitioner and Emergency Clinical Nurse Specialist programs. For more information on forensic nursing, visit IAFN’s Web site at www.forensicnurse.org.

4 Personal communication with IAFN official, August 21, 2003.
Leadership Award Recipients Honored for Transforming Painful Experiences into Passionate Advocacy

The National Center for Victims of Crime honored Miss America 2003 Erika Harold and National Center board member and former model Marla Hanson at its 2003 Annual Leadership Awards reception, held in June in New York City. Erika Harold was a victim of severe racial and sexual harassment as a teen and is now using her year of service as Miss America to raise national awareness about bullying and teen violence. Miss Harold is the national spokesperson for the Teen Victim Project and is featured in a new music-video-style television public service announcement designed to reach teenage crime victims. Marla Hanson was a promising young model on the verge of stardom whose career ended when her face was cut with a razor multiple times during a brutal attack. Ms. Hanson underwent a series of lengthy reconstructive surgeries and struggled with the severe emotional pain that often follows victimization. She has become a vocal victim advocate on the state and national levels and is a spokesperson for a national public awareness campaign on posttraumatic stress disorder.

Miss America 2003 Erika Harold (left) accepts the National Center’s 2003 annual leadership award for her work combatting teen violence. Marla Hanson speaks about her painfully violent victimization and her subsequent victim advocacy.

WHAT’S NEW ON THE WEB
Check Out Your Members-Only Web Site

If you haven’t visited the National Center’s members-only Web site lately, you may not be aware of the resources available to you, including:

- Enforcing the Rights of Crime Victims Policy Packet—an overview of the issue, a comparison of state laws, talking points, related links, and supporting material.
- Electronic Alerts—the latest policy and information e-mail update from the National Center.
- Funding Information—a collection of on-line resources on available funding sources and grant writing guidance.

All this information is at your fingertips at www.ncvc.org/members. You just need your user name and password (see the renewal or membership confirmation form mailed to you within the past year).
**Power and Control in Stalking**

A new study examines the role of power and control in stalking situations and in the prior relationship between the stalker and the victim. In “Power and Control Dynamics in Prestalking and Stalking Situations,” researchers define power and control as the ability of one person to “get another person to do something that they would not otherwise do.”\(^1\) Data was gathered from interviews with 187 women stalked by former intimates.

Researchers found that 75 percent of the women in the study experienced controlling behavior during their former relationship with the stalker and that stalkers exercised control over their victims through financial, social, psychological, and physical acts. One-fifth of the women said that their former partner had possessed a form of financial control over them. Sixty-one percent of the women had had restricted access to family members and friends. More than half of the women were psychologically abused, 65 percent reported physical abuse, and 9 percent experienced sexual abuse during their prior relationship with the stalker.

Upon termination of the relationship, the former partners attempted to reestablish control over their victims through financial, social, psychological, and physical means. One-fourth of the victims reported the stalker’s financial control, for example by obtaining credit cards in the victim’s name, withholding child support payments, stealing from the victim, failing to pay the mortgage, or damaging property. Many stalkers (68 percent) attempted to control the victim socially by contacting the victim’s family or friends, showing up at locations where the victim was socializing, and sabotaging the victim’s new relationships. Ninety-eight percent of stalkers made reported phone calls, trespassed, and followed victims to gain psychological control over them. Although less than half of the women had children with their stalker, those who did reported that the stalker used the children to control the victim. The stalker would threaten to take the children away, try to gain custody, withdraw child support, or negatively discuss the victim with the children. Stalkers physically assaulted 46 percent of the victims.

Most victims felt there was more than one motivating factor for the stalking. They cited reconciliation, revenge, possession, jealousy, intimidation, a desire to see children, and mental illness as perceived reasons. The most significant triggers named by the victims were drug/alcohol use, the relationship break-up, jealousy, and court hearings.

---

**Research Update**

**Crime Victimization in the United States:**

The results of the 2002 National Crime Victimization Survey indicate that certain categories of crime have continued a downward trend with 23 million violent and property crimes in 2002, down from 25 million in the previous year. Survey findings include:

- Of the 23 million violent and property victimizations in the United States, 17.5 million were property related and 5.3 million were violent crimes.
- 49 percent of the violent crime and 40 percent of the property crime was reported to the police.
- Intimates perpetrated 20 percent of all violent crimes against women.
- Victims experienced 247,990 rapes/sexual assaults and 4.7 million assaults.
- 16,110 people were murdered, an increase of 0.8 percent from 2001.

These statistics must be put into context. This annual federal survey is based on interviews with 76,050 Americans, ages 12 years and older. The interviews track only six categories of crime: rape/sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault and simple assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and property theft. (Homicide information cited in the survey report comes from the FBI.) The survey does not collect information on stalking, identity theft, arson, crimes against business, and many other crimes. Nor does it include victims under 12 years of age, those who are homeless, or those who live on military bases or in institutional settings, such as prisons or psychiatric hospitals. Furthermore, many researchers believe that the structure and descriptions used in this survey significantly undercount rape and sexual assault.

Released in August by the Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics, “Criminal Victimization, 2002” (NCJ-199994) can be accessed at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cv02.htm.

---

TRADE TOOLS: PUBLICATIONS AND PRODUCTS

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) distributes publications for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). Contact NCJRS at P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000, or call 1-800-851-3420 for personal assistance and fax-on-demand service. Send e-mail orders to puborder@ncjrs.org and e-mail questions to askncjrs@ncjrs.org. Use the document’s “NCJ,” “FS,” or “BC” number when ordering. If a document is out of stock, it may be available through interlibrary loan or by purchasing a photocopy if copyright is granted. Most publications are also available for download using the Web address provided in brackets.

Batterer Intervention Programs: Where Do We Go from Here?
Jackson et al.
This National Institute of Justice report is written for administrators of batterer programs, advocates, and researchers. The report evaluates research studies on batterer intervention programs to determine whether these programs are effective. NIJ. NCJ 195079.
[http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/195079.pdf]

Criminal Victimization, 2002.
Rennison and Rand.
This report presents national levels and rates of personal and property victimization for the year 2002 gathered through the annual National Crime Victimization Survey. BJS. NCJ 199994.
[http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cv02.htm]

Factors that Influence Public Opinion of the Police.
Maxson et al.
Presents the results of a study on factors that influence public opinion of the police, including how prior victimization shapes one’s attitude toward law enforcement. NIJ. NCJ 197925.

Interagency Response to Domestic Violence in a Medium Sized City.
Lane et al.
This study examines one city’s efforts to reduce domestic violence through the coordinated work of the city police department and a wide range of criminal justice, social services, and community agencies. COPS. NCJ 201659.

Prisoners in 2002.
Harrison, P. and Allen Beck.
Reports the number of persons in state and federal prisons at year end, compares the increase in the prison population during 2002 with that of the previous year, and gives the prison growth rates since 1995. BJS. NCJ 200248.
[http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/p02.html]

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics.
Bureau of Justice Statistics.
The Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, 2001 presents a broad spectrum of criminal justice data from more than 100 sources in 6 sections. BJS. NCJ 196438.
[http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook]

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
This resource guide is written in Spanish and is intended for use by parents whose children have been kidnapped to another country. OJJDP. NCJ 199832.

Surveying Communities: A Resource for Community Justice Planners.
Paik, Leslie.
This monograph shares the experiences of those who have conducted successful surveys that helped to develop the Red Hook Community Justice Center in Brooklyn, New York. Their lessons can assist other jurisdictions in better understanding community needs and delivering more responsive programs to meet those needs. BJA. NCJ 197109.
[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/bja/197109/welcome.html]
FROM 60 TO 0
IN ONE SECOND

In 2000, 10,875 people were killed in alcohol-related crashes, representing an average of one alcohol-related fatality every 41 minutes.

If you or someone you know has been affected by an alcohol-related crash, we can help.

Order this National Center camera-ready public awareness poster on-line at www.ncvc.org/store, with room to add your local contact information.
DON'T MISS THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME'S

Training Institute

Quality training programs for victim service providers and allied professionals featuring:

- Information on cutting-edge issues and practices
- Interactive format
- Networking opportunities

16 New Topics including:

- drug facilitated sexual assault
- retelling violent death
- working with teen victims
- identity theft
- resilience
- civil justice for crime victims
- funding strategies
- safety planning for all crime victims
- stalking

Fall 2003 Locations

Midwest
Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 23-24, 2003

Mid-Atlantic
Washington, DC, October 15-17, 2003

South
Dallas, Texas, October 29-30, 2003

Look for your registration brochure in the mail or call 202-467-8700 for more information.

REGISTER ON-LINE NOW AT WWW.NCVC.ORG

The mission of the National Center for Victims of Crime is to forge a national commitment to help victims of crime rebuild their lives.
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