



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

120 South Riverside Plaza • Suite 1016 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MINUTES

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Monday, September 18, 2006 and Tuesday, September 19, 2006
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016
Chicago, Illinois 60606

The Authority's Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee met on September 18, 2006, and September 19, 2006, at the Authority offices.

Call to Order and Roll Call, September 18, 2006

Committee Chair Becky Jansen (Effingham County Circuit Court Clerk) called the meeting to order at 1:17 p.m. The Authority's Associate Director of the Federal and State Grants Unit, John Chojnacki, called the roll. Members present were:

Kathleen Argentino – Chicago Police Department
Barbara Brooks – Illinois Department of Human Services
Kelly Cassidy (for Bridget Healy Ryan) – Office of the Cook County State's Attorney
Kim Donahue – Illinois State Police
Barbara Engel – Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Judy Erickson (for Cynthia Cobbs) - Administrative Office of Illinois Courts
Lou Ann Hollon (for Sheriff Dawson) – Macon County Sheriff's Department
Rick Krause (for Roger Walker / Cherri Gass) – Illinois Department of Corrections
Leslie Landis – Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, City of Chicago
Ellen Mandeltort (Vice Chair) – Office of the Illinois Attorney General
Lois Moorman – Illinois Department on Aging
Kathryn Beasley Pomahoc (for Billie Larkin) – Children's Advocacy Centers of Illinois
Polly Poskin – Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Joan Rappaport (for Cheryl Howard) – Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Ana Romero – Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network
Lori Saleh (for Idetal Shalabi) – Arab American Family Services
Jennifer Welch – Office of the Illinois Attorney General

Members unable to participate included:

Vernie Boerkrem – Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council
Norbert Goetten – Office of the State’s Attorney’s Appellate Prosecutor
Thomas Jurkanin – Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board
Barbara Shaw – Illinois Violence Prevention Authority
David Bradford – Chief, Glen Carbon Police Department
Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone, and other Authority staff.

Purpose of the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Chairwoman Jansen, referring to the memo under Tab 1, dated September 6, 2006, said that the purpose behind this two-day meeting was to develop a multi-year plan for the use of the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant funds in the State of Illinois. Authority staff will make a series of presentations to the committee for its consideration. Once all the material is presented and fully discussed, the committee will be asked to develop an action plan for the use of the funds and a set of priorities for each program fund, which will guide staff in the designation of the funds for the next three years. This plan will then be presented to the full Authority Board as the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee recommendations for these funds. Time at this meeting should not be spent talking about specific program designations. Rather, a plan should be developed for the use of these funds during the next few years that will be inclusive of all factors relevant to Illinois’s criminal justice system.

Director Levin added that the proper forums for the discussion of individual program funding are the Authority’s Budget Committee meetings. She reiterated that the purpose of this meeting is to develop a comprehensive plan for the use of VOCA and VAWA funds. She added that the plan must be submitted to the federal government within 120 days after the Authority’s receipt of the VAWA FFY06 award.

Federal and State Grants Unit Presentation: Funding Histories VAWA, VOCA, and Other Federal Funds

Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt, referring to the memo dated September 6, 2006 and the charts under Tab 2, said the purpose of these materials was to provide background information detailing various aspects of past and present fund allocations of VAWA, VOCA, and other federal programs. He said that the Authority is currently anticipating the announcement of its FFY06 VAWA award. Staff expects that the award amount will be approximately \$4.5 million, comparable to awards of recent federal fiscal years. It is

important to note that for the charts in the materials, VAWA FFY06 figures represent the projected award. Mr. Reichgelt then presented the funding charts via PowerPoint.

During the presentation, Mr. Reichgelt noted that the Authority does not provide any funding to any program designed to deal specifically with the issue of stalking. If any program addresses stalking, it is done so within a larger context. He suggested that if any service provider grantees address stalking, they make sure to include any pertinent information in the narrative portion of their data reports if the reports do not otherwise provide such data.

Ms. Poskin said that victims turn to rape crisis centers as a result of sexual assault, not stalking, although, in some instances stalking may have been a precursor to the assault. Often, a stalking victim will go directly to the police.

Discussion revealed that it would be beneficial in the future to separately identify funds to child advocacy centers, as individual centers might identify themselves as serving different components and types of violence of the criminal justice system. Mr. Reichgelt said that information on specific designations can be found on the Attachment A documents posted on the Authority's website (<http://www.icjia.state.il.us>). A consensus was also reached that funds to statewide agencies that are spent in a specific region should be identified as such, if possible.

Research and Analysis Unit Presentation

Currently Funded VAWA Programs

Authority Research Analyst Adriana Perez delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Currently Funded VAWA Programs," that provided general background information on the types of programs currently receiving VAWA funds. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was contained under Tab 3 of the meeting materials.

Ms. Perez said that it is important to remember that VAWA funds must be designated to programs representing the following categories per the respective percentages of the total VAWA award:

Category	Percentage
Law Enforcement	25
Prosecution	25
Service Provider	30
Courts	5
Discretionary	15

Ms. Perez said that in the case of multi-disciplinary team response (MDT) programs, funds are designated to county agencies representing these categories.

Ms. Engel added that in addition to providing funds for MDT programs, it is important that an organization such as the Authority provide technical assistance to the grantees.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the current commitments to the MDT programs were for three years, and these programs are now in their third year of funding. Director Levin added that the grantees had not been promised funds for these programs beyond the three years. Mr. Reichgelt also said that each grantee, upon accepting the three years of funding, said that they would be able to continue these programs once federal funding ended.

Ms. Poskin said that one of the core reasons that the VAWA program was created was not only to provide services to crime victims, but it was to also provide a means of building bridges between multiple disciplines within the criminal justice system to better serve crime victims. This is one of the reasons why VAWA funds must be distributed among the five categories per the respective percentages.

Mr. Reichgelt said that given the current political climate in Washington D.C. and the current administration's zeal to cut funding to failing programs, it is critical to maintain data on VAWA programs and to be able to demonstrate that the programs are successful. The four MDT programs that currently receive funding were culled from a larger group of protocol sites that had originally received funding, but the other programs were deemed unfit for participation in MDT programs pursuant to a needs-based analysis.

Ms. Landis said that as the committee deliberates whether MDT programs remain a focus of the VAWA Plan, it would be worth knowing if any of these programs have access to federal Family Justice Center awards or access to other funding streams. She added that local jurisdictions must subsume federally funded programs at some point. Where possible, we should advocate for the institutionalization of these programs. In addition to needs, the ability and willingness to pursue local funding should be considered when determining designations for MDT programs.

InfoNet

Authority Research Analyst Erica Hughes delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "InfoNet Data and Findings" that provided general background information on the InfoNet program and some statistical data provided by InfoNet. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation and other related documents were contained under Tab 3 of the meeting materials.

Ms. Hughes said that InfoNet is a user-driven information system. She said that not only are the users intended to be able to send information to necessary parties, such as fund providers, but also the system allows them to review reports themselves and evaluate their own progress and make any necessary adjustments to better serve their clients.

Ms. Hughes said that the data provided by InfoNet is only as good as the data that the users enter. Therefore, it is important that the Authority provide training and technical assistance to grantees that use InfoNet to help ensure that the users enter data correctly and accurately.

Ms. Welch said that the data provided in the meeting materials provides a useful snapshot of issues that InfoNet users are dealing with. This snapshot will help inform the committee's discussions in drafting a new VAWA plan, but there is no single bit of data that demands specific action. Ms. Shaw said that the important thing is to identify trends.

Ms. Poskin said that, given the many variables associated with domestic violence and sexual assault numbers, it is difficult to determine exactly what the prevailing numbers would be in some cases. She also said that InfoNet data has been tremendously useful in securing funds from local or independent fund providers. In many cases, those fund providers have never had this kind of data presented to them before.

Ms. Hughes said that the points that Ms. Poskin made regarding InfoNet's value are important because InfoNet is funded with VAWA dollars. Even if we don't have a clear picture as to what is going on statewide, we do know that the local agencies are benefiting from InfoNet. The eventual goal is to create a data system that not only victim service agencies can use, but one that law enforcement and prosecutors could access as well.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 3:37 p.m.

Call to Order and Roll Call, September 19, 2006

Committee Vice Chair Ellen Mandeltort (Office of the Illinois Attorney General) called the meeting to order at 9:23 a.m. The Authority's Associate Director of the Federal and State Grants Unit, John Chojnacki, called the roll. Members present were:

Kathleen Argentino – Chicago Police Department
Barbara Brooks – Illinois Department of Human Services
Kim Donahue – Illinois State Police
Barbara Engel – Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Judy Erickson (for Cynthia Cobbs) - Administrative Office of Illinois Courts
Lou Ann Hollon (for Sheriff Dawson) – Macon County Sheriff's Department
Nicole Kramer (for Bridget Healy Ryan) – Office of the Cook County State's Attorney
Rick Krause (for Roger Walker / Cherri Gass) – Illinois Department of Corrections
Leslie Landis – Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, City of Chicago
Lois Moorman – Illinois Department on Aging
Kathryn Beasley Pomahoc (for Billie Larkin) – Children's Advocacy Centers of Illinois
Polly Poskin – Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Joan Rappaport (for Cheryl Howard) – Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Ana Romero – Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network
Lori Saleh (for Itedal Shalabi) – Arab American Family Services
Barbara Shaw – Illinois Violence Prevention Authority
Jennifer Welch – Office of the Illinois Attorney General

Members unable to participate included:

Vernie Boerkrem – Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council
David Bradford – Chief, Glen Carbon Police Department
Norbert Goetten – Office of the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor
Becky Jansen (Chair) - Office of the Effingham County Circuit Court Clerk
Thomas Jurkanin – Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board

Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone, Authority Assistant Counsel Steve Bernstein, and other Authority staff.

Director's Remarks

Director Levin announced that the Authority was in receipt of its FFY06 VAWA award of \$4,458,358 as of September 19, 2006. These funds expire on May 31, 2008. Director

Levin reminded the committee that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss general concepts, not specific funding issues.

Authority Assistant Counsel Steve Bernstein, in response to a question raised earlier at the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting on September 18, 2006, said there are currently no plans for the accommodation of the Comprehensive Housing Planning Act as funds had not yet been allocated to the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA). He said that a portion of the governor's affordable housing initiative would include transitional housing.

Research and Analysis Unit Presentation (Continued from September 18, 2006 Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting)

Ms. Hughes noted that an error had occurred in the InfoNet report, contained under Tab 3 in the meeting materials, in the section on gender bias. She provided the committee members in attendance with corrected copies.

Illinois Crime Trends and Gap Analysis

Ms. Hughes delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Illinois Crime Trends and Gap Analysis." A copy of the PowerPoint presentation and other related documents were contained under Tab 3 of the meeting materials.

Needs Assessment Survey

Ms. Hughes delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Illinois Needs Assessment Survey." A copy of the PowerPoint presentation and other related documents were contained under Tab 3 of the meeting materials. She said that Orbis Partners, Inc. conducted the needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment was to supply information that would demonstrate the needs of criminal justice organizations, identify areas that need improvement, and guide decision-making regarding the best allocations of resources. Another purpose of the needs survey was to provide information regarding how the needs of criminal justice organizations have changed over time by comparing the data provided by this study with the results of a needs assessment survey that was conducted in 1996. Major components of the survey include workload demands, training needs, staff retention, information systems, and programming. The survey was released one year ago and data collection ended in November of 2005. The Authority received the final report in July of 2006 and that report is currently under review.

Ms. Poskin said that the survey appeared to have a low response rate and, therefore, it is difficult to generalize conclusions based on the data. Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the survey was just one of many tools available for the committee to use.

Ms. Hughes said that the data provided by the survey is not available by any other means. She said that the committee should not dwell too much on the specific findings of the survey because the survey is intended to provide a general idea of what is happening in the field. If, however, any committee members present have had vastly different experiences in their fields relative to the survey's findings, then such experiences should be addressed at this meeting.

(15-Minute Break)

Legal Issues

Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Legal Issues." A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was contained under Tab 4 of the meeting materials. Mr. Cutrone credited former Authority Assistant Counsel Kristi Kangas for creating the PowerPoint presentation.

S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women In Illinois – A Multi-Year Plan: FFY01 – FFY05

Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt, referring to the FFY01 – FFY05 S.T.O.P. VAWA plan, dated November 2001 and contained under Tab 5 of the meeting materials, said that the new plan will be due to the federal government 120 days after the receipt of the FFY06 VAWA award, which happened to be today (September 19, 2006). The committee must make any adjustments to, or choose not to adjust, the existing plan.

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to a tool created by Authority Staff Member Maureen Brennan that detailed each point that must be addressed in the consideration of the new VAWA plan. Mr. Reichgelt said that it was imperative that this committee agrees upon the new VAWA plan at this meeting.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that a great deal of time and effort went into creating the current multi-year plan and a number of individuals on this committee participated in that process. She said that the committee should review each of the original priorities and goals to determine whether or not, upon implementation, they proved to be successful in terms of services provided. It is important to note that if a specific goal or priority has not been fulfilled, that does not necessarily indicate that the priority or goal was flawed; perhaps it means better strategies need to be implemented to achieve them. The

committee should also consider whether or not any new priorities or goals should be adopted in addition to the existing ones. The overall purpose of this plan would be to provide a framework to direct Authority staff in Budget Committee planning for the designation of VAWA funds.

Ms. Welch said that as the committee discusses priorities, it should identify which part of the larger VAWA equation the priorities satisfy. The committee should not create priorities without also having a plan for utilizing the whole proportion of a particular requirement.

Establishment of Priorities

Adjustments to Existing Priorities

Vice Chair Mandeltort introduced the existing priorities for discussion:

Priority #1 initially read: Training law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence.

In response to a question by Ms. Shaw, Ms. Engel said that the basic idea of VAWA was to promote multi-disciplinary approaches to combating violence against women. This is reflected in the fund allocation structure of VAWA:

Category	Percentage
Law Enforcement	25
Prosecution	25
Service Provider	30
Courts	5
Discretionary	15

Ms. Engel added that it has been generally understood that, for example, if a training session focused on law enforcement, victim service personnel would always be invited despite the fact that the funds employed were not specifically set aside for service providers, but for law enforcement. However, for example, law enforcement funds could not be used for a function exclusive to service providers.

Ms. Poskin said that the committee has not been presented with a definition of what is currently funded within each existing priority. It is difficult for the committee to assess what it is looking at compared with what the committee might wish to do. Ms. Brennan

directed the committee's attention to the list of current VAWA programs on the third page of the planning tool that she had prepared.

Ms. Poskin said that the list of current programs does not make clear any connection between them and the current priorities listed in the tool.

Ms. Brennan said that the programs listed under the Specialized Units Purpose Area, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prosecution, Domestic Violence MDT, Domestic Violence Law Enforcement, Sexual Assault, and MDT, would all fall under Priority #2. She said that the programs under the Victim Services Purpose Area; Services for Underserved Areas or Victim Groups, Services Female Inmates, Transitional Housing Services, Services to Victims of Domestic Violence, and Sexual Assault Medical Advocacy, would fall under Priority #4. InfoNet would fall under Priority #3. Training programs would fall under Priority #1 or Priority #5, depending on the training subject. Ms. Welch said that VAWA is a unique funding source for Priority #1.

The following changes (*italicized*) to Priority #1 were adopted by general consensus:

Training law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, *Stalking, and Elder Abuse.*

Priority #2 initially read: Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.

Ms. Poskin said that part of what drives the establishment of priorities is knowing what funds are available. Adding stalking to Priority #2 is fine, but not at the expense of sexual assault or domestic violence programming.

Ms. Rappaport said that, in her experience, domestic violence programs try to take on issues relating to stalking. She said that the stalking cases are rarely prosecuted and that suggests a need for training for law enforcement and prosecution. Ms. Welch said that stalking had been added to the training priority, but now the question is whether we want to incorporate it into the protocols.

Ms. Landis said that, regarding the issue of protocol, when it was originally developed as a priority it was the MDT programs that were supposed to implement the protocol statewide. Now the question is whether, as a funding priority, it should be limited to jurisdictions that agree to adopt the statewide protocol and implement it with certain

partners assigned to them. We could go forth with this priority of developing new policies and more effective orders and services and not have it wedded to the statewide protocol. The statewide protocol was problematic.

Director Levin said that Cook County received Authority funds for its own separate protocol program. Ms. Landis said that Cook County demanded a protocol that specifically fit Cook County's needs.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested removing the word "protocol" from the priority description since the protocols were essentially established under an earlier plan.

Ms. Poskin said that given that the sexual assault protocol has not been completed it raised the issue of whether the committee would technically create new protocols or merely update existing ones. Ms. Poskin added that discussions with judges and prosecutors have revealed that a need exists for a bench book for judges on sexual assault.

Ms. Engel said that of the nine or ten original MDT units, only four remain. The Authority could continue to fund the programs that are working, but does not have to remake the ones that did not work.

Ms. Poskin said that VAWA does not provide much administrative money. If the committee creates new projects, the committee needs to think about the parties responsible for running them.

Ms. Mandeltort suggested including the term "guidelines" along with "...policies, protocols, orders, and services."

(30-Minute Lunch Break)

Ms. Mandeltort said that if Priority #2 calls for the development of policies and protocols, then the priority calls for a commitment to the creation of new policies and protocols. She suggested wording the priority as such: "...ensure that law enforcement, judges, prosecutors have effective policies, protocols, guidelines, orders, and services for preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence." This way, the Authority's job is to provide agencies with whatever they need so that they have those things that they need as opposed to putting the onus on the Authority to make the protocols and make the grantees follow them. The priority was fine in its original form and the new mission is very similar, but the Authority would need to ensure that the grantees realize that new priorities are in place. One of the hardest things for a statewide agency to do is to create a

protocol and have other organizations implement it, especially if they are not mandated by law to implement it.

Ms. Shaw suggested using the term “support” in place of “ensure” in Priority #2. She said that “ensure” might imply a burden to monitor.

Ms. Landis said that the Authority is the most significant conduit in Illinois to bring together the people outlined in the VAWA federal legislation. The Authority has the history of bringing together the advocates, the officers, the prosecutors, and the courts to create useable projects because all of these different disciplines are involved. Language should be provided that continues to put the authority of the Authority behind those projects. The Authority needs to maintain the priority of developing and providing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence because no other organization is doing that. This is critical to the intent of VAWA. The plan that the Authority submits to the federal government should reflect continued collaboration.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the discussion had circled around to its starting point regarding the initial suggested adjustments.

The following changes (*italicized*) to Priority #2 were adopted by general consensus:

Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, *guidelines*, and services devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.

Priority #3 initially read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems linking police, prosecution, and the courts or for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence, including the protecting of such information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check system.

Ms. Engel said that this priority was created to allow for the funding of InfoNet.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the MDTs were mandated to have an integrated data system that tracked their data from first response to probation. This priority was used in the development of these data systems. However, this priority identifies police, prosecution, and courts as participants in the system, but none of them use InfoNet.

Ms. Rappaport said that there is virtually no good data detailing what happens to victims in the aggregate from the point of the reporting of the offense to arrest, prosecution, and disposition; there is nothing that is reliable that tells us how the system works for victims.

Ms. Poskin said that good data collection would make these projects much more useful and viable.

Ms. Welch recommended that Priority #3 simply read: Developing, *improving*, or expanding data collection and communication systems.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, if properly used, InfoNet could provide the desired data. She then suggested that Priority #3 read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence, including the protecting of such information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check system.

Ms. Poskin said that InfoNet only serves domestic violence, sexual assault, and some child advocacy centers.

Vice Chair Mandeltort then suggested that Priority #3 read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence.

Ms. Shaw suggested that Priority #3 read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems *and tracking services*, for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence.

Ms. Landis said that including “tracking” could prove troublesome. 1) Many throughout the criminal justice system have tried and failed to track outcomes relating to convictions across law enforcement, prosecution, and the courts. We are now talking about using limited VAWA funds to get these systems to achieve something within a specific population area (sexual assault and domestic violence). 2) She said that her experience with well-intended systems designed to track data about domestic violence and sexual assault victims leaves her wary of their effectiveness. Care must be taken when talking about computerized tracking systems. If the intent is to have different branches of the criminal justice system talking together better, then the priority should say that. If the

intent is improving InfoNet in a way in which victim service agencies collect and utilize their information around services that they provide, then the priority should reflect that.

Ms. Donahue said that the National Instant Criminal Background Check system referred to in Priority #3 is the national system that mirrors Illinois's Firearm Owners Identification (FOID) system.

Ms. Poskin suggested that Priority #3 read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems *for victim services. In addition, developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems* for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence, including the protecting of such information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check system.

Ms. Engel said many in criminal justice have been looking for this information so that the criminal justice system can evaluate its own abilities. Perhaps a pilot project or two around the state could be funded that would indicate how many people get sorted out in felony review.

Ms. Poskin said that from a sexual assault victim services viewpoint, InfoNet should be continued, regardless of its funding source, but the priority should make the funding source clear. InfoNet concerns internal affairs at victim service providers and they do not want that data tracked or linked to anything in the law enforcement or criminal justice systems. A separate data collection system that tracks offenses, charges, arrests, felony review decisions, prosecutions, and dispositions could be developed. We should not create language that links the gathering and the comparison of the data. However, both sets of data are intrinsically important.

Ms. Welch suggested adding the language pertaining to InfoNet to Priority #4, which is specifically and exclusively about victim services.

Mr. Reichgelt said that InfoNet currently only receives \$30,000 in VAWA funds. Having the proper language in the priorities allows staff to use whatever VAWA funds are available.

Vice Chair Mandeltort reminded the committee that the VAWA category percentages are a different conversation. The committee should discuss theoretical funding priorities regardless of how the funds are ultimately allocated. No percentages are tied to any priorities. Many VAWA-funded programs relate to more than one priority.

Ms. Poskin said that Priority #4, historically, has been about funding domestic violence shelters and sexual assault centers.

Mr. Reichgelt said that, under the VAWA guidelines, the Authority has been able to use prosecution and law enforcement funds for victim advocates.

Ms. Poskin said that that is in keeping with Priority #4. The Authority has been generous, whenever possible, by using funds from other categories to fund domestic violence shelters and sexual assault centers. Funds should not be taken away from domestic violence shelters and sexual assault centers and given to projects related to victim services.

Ms. Shaw suggested that Priority #3 read: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems linking police, prosecution, and the courts or for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, *and including computerized systems tracking services for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence*. She said that this language identifies two separate computer systems.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested: Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems *to better serve victims of violent crime*.

Ms. Rappaport said that we are dealing with two different databases, one for criminal activity and one for victim services. Ms. Engel suggested creating two separate priorities.

The following changes (*italicized*) to Priority #3, including the separation of the priority into two parts, were adopted by general consensus:

- A) Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems linking police, prosecution, and the courts or for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women.
- B) *Developing, installing, or expanding computerized systems tracking services for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence.*

Priority #4 initially read: *Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs; developing or improving the delivery of victims services to underserved populations; providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant*

number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.

In response to questions about adding stalking to Priority #4, Ms. Welch said that nobody would seek services specifically for stalking who didn't seek services relating to another existing category.

Ms. Poskin said that in FFY06, her agency handled seven new stalking victims and three on-going stalking victims for whom stalking was the primary presenting issue. Stalking is a primary presenting issue at rape crisis centers where services are provided for stalking victims. The existing services are probably best prepared to respond to the crime of stalking. Perhaps stalking should be moved up in the priorities to include training.

Ms. Poskin said that victim age is tracked along with other data at rape crisis centers. This would help determine if a particular age group, such as seniors, is underserved.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that if priority #4 reads, "Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs, elder abuse, and stalking..." grantees are not necessarily required to create programs geared toward all of those victim populations just because they are enumerated in the priority, but the priority needs to ensure that individuals who are victims of those crimes can receive the assistance that they need.

Ms. Welch said that stalking is more of a tactic than an actual crime. Vice Chair Mandeltort said that in some instances stalking results in little more than psychological trauma. In many cases, the perpetrators are simply obsessive strangers. Ms. Welch said that this is the problem with stalking; if no physical or sexual assault occurs, then what VAWA-funded program could a stalking victim turn to? The victim doesn't belong in either a sexual assault or domestic violence program. Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the thing to do is to inform existing domestic violence and sexual assault service providers that there is this other victim population that needs attention even if the nature of their victimization doesn't fit common definitions.

Ms. Argentino said that often the victim's primary reason for seeking services is for sexual assault or domestic violence, but stalking may have played a role at an earlier point in the victim's history of contact with the abuser. Ms. Poskin added that the data does not reflect secondary presenting issues.

Ms. Landis said that Priority #4 must be read with the punctuation in mind, "Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs; developing or improving the delivery of victims

services to underserved populations...” The use of a semicolon between “programs” and “developing” creates a distinction between “developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs and “developing or improving the delivery of victims services to underserved populations...”

Ms. Shaw said that none of the current priorities mention Coordinated Community Response (CCR) programs.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the concept of multi-disciplinary collaboration is something that the committee must discuss to determine whether it should be a priority or a program. If one of our primary concerns is that various entities around the state work together, then perhaps one of our funding priorities should be to let people know that we are looking for multi-disciplinary collaborative efforts that support improved response to victims of violent crime. Ms. Landis said that multi-disciplinary efforts are an intrinsic part of VAWA.

Ms. Shaw said that the multi-disciplinary aspect of VAWA is not clearly stated. The issue of CCR has come up in the past, but it has been put aside. The priorities should make clear that CCR and multi-system collaborative efforts are supported with VAWA funds. Nothing in the five existing priorities speaks to the eligibility of supporting CCR in multi-system collaborations.

Ms. Landis said that some flexibility is needed in the definition of CCR. Traditionally, CCR has been the coordination between victim service agencies and criminal justice entities.

Ms. Shaw said that the development of CCR is included in the encouraged activities on Page 7 of the Legal Issues PowerPoint presentation that was contained under Tab 4 in the meeting materials.

Vice Chair Mandeltort, referring to Page 2 of the Legal Issues Appendix A handed out to committee members earlier that morning, quoted the following VAWA purpose area, contained at the second bullet point: “Supporting formal and informal statewide, multidisciplinary efforts, to the extent not supported by state funds, to coordinate the response of state law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, victim service agencies, and other state agencies and departments to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence.” She said that this purpose area is the basis for the VAWA program.

Mr. Reichgelt said that priorities might differ from purpose areas. All programs must fall under at least one of the purpose areas, but the Authority might not necessarily fund

something in every purpose area. By making the purpose area a priority, we would then have to fund something under it.

Ms. Shaw said that by including the purpose area in a priority, we make it possible to fund those things. The purpose area is not currently stated as part of the priorities.

Ms. Poskin said that perhaps a legal interpretation was necessary. The committee needs to be cautious about the underlying intent of VAWA, which is the development of partnerships between the criminal justice system and advocacy groups for adult female victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. The committee should get a clear interpretation as to whether the Authority can fund coordinating councils.

Ms. Shaw quoted the Legal Issues PowerPoint presentation that was contained under Tab 4 in the meeting materials, “development of coordinated community responses.” Family violence coordinating councils are organized to create coordinated community responses to domestic violence against women.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the Authority has funded a coordinator for the 13th Judicial Circuit, but the funding is really limited to dealing with very specific crimes.

Ms. Shaw said that the majority of the work done by family violence coordinating councils is directed at domestic violence. Judges convene these councils, so the role of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement is very strong in these efforts. The committee needs to make it clear, somewhere in the VAWA priorities, that CCR is a legitimate use of funds.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the Authority has brought such organizations into the MDT programs. They are unfunded partners, but they are participants, along with judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement.

Ms. Poskin said that because of VAWA’s heavy emphasis on criminal justice, most orders of protection that family violence coordinating councils deal with are civil and there has always been pressure to not use VAWA to develop more civil remedies for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Ms. Welch requested that “community coordinated response” be added to Priority #2 as such: “Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, *guidelines, community coordinated response*, and services devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.” She said it would still be up to the Authority to ensure that whomever they fund follows the VAWA rules. She suggested that perhaps some sort of CCR could be applied and funded by the Authority.

Vice Chair Mandeltort concurred and said that the Office for Violence Against Women encourages states to develop such projects. The CCRs would include MDT programs.

Ms. Welch said that the committee still has not discussed whether it wants this strategy to be in addition to the other five.

Ms. Landis said that, while she is sympathetic to the ideas promoted by Ms. Shaw and Ms. Welch, she comes from a community in which opportunities for input in how domestic violence is being responded to are precluded by the interests of other segments of the community because they domestic violence issues are not naturally identified components of CCR within the community. The community has a sense that the focus of the criminal justice system precludes bringing law enforcement to the table for something other than the criminal justice response.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the concept of multi-disciplinary collaboration incorporates CCR. If CCR is a “black letter” term of art, perhaps a different phrase should be used to identify the program. Ms. Landis said that she was simply being responsive to comments that she has received from her community.

No changes to Priority #4 were made and it remained as follows by general consensus:

Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs; developing or improving the delivery of victims services to underserved populations; providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.

Priority #5 initially read: Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, and analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault.

Ms. Argentino suggested adding domestic violence forensic medical personnel examiners to those eligible for training.

The following changes (*italicized*) to Priority #5 were adopted by general consensus:

Training of sexual assault and *domestic violence* forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault and *domestic violence*.

(15-Minute Break)

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, of the five original priorities, Priority #4 has not yet been modified. Regarding the last bullet point on Page 1 of the Appendix A document, she said that by inserting stalking into the other priorities, that purpose area has been addressed.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the following purpose areas (per the Appendix A) are not specifically articulated in the existing priorities:

- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs that address the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes dealing with violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence.
- Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and others to address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of sexual assault or domestic violence, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such assault or violence and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to such older and disabled individuals.
- Providing assistance to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in immigration matters.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested that in order for the priorities to cover every purpose area within the scope of VAWA, Priority #4 should read: “Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs; *developing or improving the delivery of victim services to underserved populations including older, disabled, native American, or immigrant women*; providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.”

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that there is a significant Native American population on the north side of Chicago. Director Levin added that there is a statewide push toward dealing with native tribes directly.

Ms. Engel said that perhaps highlighting the priority to address such specific victim groups is not wise given the relatively small amount of funds available for programming.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the new language that she proposed was intended to more clearly define “underserved populations.” Ensuing discussion revealed a consensus on the part of the committee to continue to use the phrase “underserved populations.”

A consensus was reached that no changes should be made to Priority #4 and it remained as follows:

Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs; developing or improving the delivery of victims services to underserved populations; providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving crimes against women, including sexual assault and domestic violence.

New Priorities

No new priorities were proposed.

Programs

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that all of the committee members assembled at this meeting represent specific victim populations or organizations that they serve. She said that working in the attorney general’s office, she views these issues from a statewide perspective. The mission here is not to protect women in any particular area of the state, but to examine violence against women throughout the state as a whole and to examine female victims of crime as a whole, regardless of the particular crimes or the particular agencies that serve them. This committee is not assembled here to represent the interests of any single agency or service provider; rather we are here to do a service for all women of Illinois.

Multi-Disciplinary Team Response

Ms. Shaw said that, with regard to Priority #2, CCR and MDTs should be added to the list of program types. Either CCR should be a separate program type or it should be added to the MDT program type.

Ms. Poskin said there is a provision on Page 2 of the Appendix A that reads, “Supporting formal and informal statewide, multidisciplinary efforts, to the extent not supported by state funds...”

Mr. Reichgelt said that since the priorities were expanded to include CCR, the program types should be expanded as well. The MDT program type would need to include CCR. The CCRs have been developed along with the funded MDT programs to the extent possible, as opposed to having the CCRs be stand-alone programs.

Ms. Shaw said that such a policy is inconsistent with the revised priorities. The revised priorities recognize that CCR is an encouraged program / approach. To only support CCRs by bringing them into a funded MDT program excludes the possibility of CCR in the many communities that do not have MDTs.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that when statewide multi-disciplinary efforts are supported, community-based responses that are incorporated into other entities become components of the MDTs. The CCR in these situations is used as a resource for the other agencies.

Ms. Shaw said that currently only four MDTs receive funds. We could integrate a CCR program into those MDTs, but that doesn't allow for a CCR program in communities not served by one of those four MDTs. Relegating CCR to being just a part of the MDTs really limits the potential for CCR programs.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff funding for CCRs would be considered because it is the most effective use of limited funds.

Director Levin said that the old VAWA plan addresses past plans, but not future ones. This committee is actually covering new ground as it drafts the new plan when committee members talk about the future with respect to program types.

Ms. Shaw said that CCR efforts should not be tied to MDT programs. They should be their own specific program type.

Ms. Rappaport said that it is not safe to assume that the term MDT must apply to what is currently being funded. It is a broad phrase that could include CCR or currently funded MDTs. It is really about multi-disciplinary collaboration.

Ms. Perez said that a data report for every VAWA-funded program is mandated by VAWA. Within the report is a page where every grant that receives federal funds must show some kind of CCR. It is already a part of VAWA reporting. The reporting instructions say that, "the agency or organization that provides victim / survivors with referrals to, receives victim / survivor referrals from, engaged in consultation with, provided technical assistance to, and / or attended meetings with during the reporting period." The programs that supply data to the report include batterer intervention, law enforcement, prosecution, and include governmental agencies such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Social Security, and Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy

Families. These different programs find resources on their own and in the report they display how often they receive assistance, give assistance, have consultations, and have meetings. This information is already being captured because the programs are required to show some kind of activity.

Ms. Welch said that an example of a CCR separate from an MDT program would be a team that meets monthly to discuss stalking issues within a community to ensure that law enforcement officers communicate with each other and that prosecutors can determine whether stalking cases can be brought to trial. Such would be a special project, independent of an MDT that a local jurisdiction would employ to pursue a specific issue. Programs like the one in this example are what the new CCR program type is intended to support.

Ms. Landis said that perhaps the committee should let go of the idea that, as defined in prior years, MDTs assume the implementation of a statewide protocol. The phrase “domestic violence multi-disciplinary response” could include programs like the one Ms. Welch described above.

Ms. Welch requested that the language of future grants indicate that this committee is implementing an expansion of the definition of MDT. Ms. Landis added that MDT was never defined, other than in the prior year plan.

Ms. Engel said that the staff and our history have defined this particular thing as a piece and this committee sounds like it is coming to a consensus that a tight definition of MDT is undesirable. Whether we call the new programs CCR or whether we keep the MDT name, we need to expand our understanding of what is admissible so that we have a broader term that doesn't have to do with institutionalizing our particular domestic violence protocols in the manner that we have done in the past.

Ms. Poskin said that in the culture of working against violence against women, whether it is domestic violence or sexual assault, “multi-disciplinary team response” is a cultural term. When we talk about MDTs, we know what we're talking about; we're talking about a combination of advocates, law enforcement, prosecution, courts, etc. We don't usually refer to it as CCR. To create a new program title like that would introduce a shift in how the programs are viewed within the culture.

Ms. Shaw said that the committee should either keep the narrow definition and add CCR to the list of program types eligible for funding under the stated priorities, or the committee should broaden the definition.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the concept of multi-disciplinary team response is what it is; specialists in different disciplines come together for a common purpose. What has

become specialized here is the concept of MDT. There is a domestic violence MDT program that has a unique purpose and function as a result of what this committee did in 2001. An MDT is one thing, but the concept of multi-disciplinary team response is separate and unrelated. The term “multi-disciplinary” provides a larger umbrella, akin to a statewide program, whereas CCR would be a local multi-disciplinary response, like a subgroup of an MDT. MDT is now a term of art, “multi-disciplinary” is not something that we can reserve for ourselves.

Ms. Rappaport suggested using the term “multi-disciplinary collaborations.” Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested “statewide or local multi-disciplinary collaborative efforts.”

Ms. Poskin said that she opposed the alteration or expansion of the definition of MDT. VAWA’s whole purpose revolves around MDTs. We don’t want to lose MDTs with regard to our reports to the federal government.

Ms. Rappaport said that the second bullet point on Page 2 of the Appendix A shows that it looks like VAWA really is intended to bring together the criminal justice system with victim services and that is central to the purpose here.

Ms. Poskin said that she was open to an interpretation for the Department of Justice (DOJ). Ms. Shaw said that the DOJ itself has added CCR to its encouraged functions. This committee today agreed to add CCR as one of the elements of the Authority’s VAWA priorities. It makes no sense, now that we are discussing program types and titles, to back up and express discomfort with the concept of CCR.

Ms. Brooks said that her organization has implemented community coordinating councils following a directive from the DOJ to the Illinois Department of Corrections’s (IDOC) Sheridan project. The IDOC has implemented these councils at the local level to assist individuals as they come out of the criminal justice system and re-enter the community.

Ms. Poskin said that it is best to keep the parameters on the program’s original intent, not expanding the parameters to something that the Authority does not currently fund, as there are fewer funds to go around.

Ms. Landis said that CCR can be funded, but it would be up to local governments to take broad program types and apply for funding. Within certain parameters, decisions would be made. Domestic violence multi-disciplinary team response would be acceptable with the caveat that they not be limited to teams formed around a specific statewide protocol. If we give up the statewide protocol, which is the integral part of the MDTs as formulated under the prior plan, and we leave domestic violence multi-disciplinary team response in, enough flexibility would be created to attract communities to enter into and apply the CCR model and apply for funds. This would allow for a scenario such as

described earlier by Ms. Welch. This would also allow jurisdictions that were formerly funded as MDTs to reapply.

Director Levin said that perhaps Ms. Landis's assertions are incorrect. There was an instance when an applicant did not have a protocol, statewide or local, in place. The Authority demanded that a protocol be created that was specific to the county.

Ms. Landis agreed that programs could develop their own protocols, but with the caveat that the model was offered as guidance. Inherent in the model was an infrastructure that called for an MDT. Certain partners had to integrate within the protocol.

Mr. Reichgelt said that these CCR programs would be very small that it might be better to leave them under the larger MDT umbrella.

Ms. Saleh said that to avoid confusing the two, the responses should go under the MDTs, but the MDTs became a product of the first definition, which was a broader definition, of multi-disciplinary teams. Perhaps we should remove the phrase "team response" and replace it with "coordinated response." This would provide an umbrella for both MDTs and CCRs.

Ms. Engel said that there is no intent to fund anything other than the MDTs.

Ms. Saleh said that when funding is discussed, CCR would now be an option. The program title "Multi-Disciplinary Coordinated Response" would allow the Authority to choose either a CCR or and MDT when it comes time to discuss designations.

Mr. Reichgelt said that by creating the broader umbrella we leave the door open for a specific project or program outside of the existing collaborative efforts.

Ms. Engel said that the reason this is so problematic is that we are changing some things that we have already done and we are introducing new things. Whether or not the term "response" is kept is important. These issues are not just mere semantics; they have real implications in terms of funding.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested, "Domestic Violence / Sexual Assault Multi-Disciplinary Collaborative Response." This would be the general program description. The Authority wouldn't necessarily fund every program that falls under this description.

Ms. Welch said that, in this case, what we want is any multi-disciplinary group that is working toward a solution to some facet of violence against women.

Domestic Violence / Sexual Assault Multi-Disciplinary Collaborative Response Teams was adopted as a new program type by general consensus.

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prosecution

Ms. Brennan said that the committee must address how the new plan will build upon the old one, since that will need to be detailed in a report to the federal government. Two things must be considered:

- 1) With regard to the MDTs, the Authority has supported these programs in their second iteration over the last three years and staff feels that the model has been refined. Staff learned some lessons as they pared the number of MDT programs from nine to four. Do we want to report that we like that model and that we want to expand on that model? Or, do we want to set that model aside and say that we want to do other types of programs involving multiple agencies? Do we want to go forward with the MDT model, remove the MDT model, or revise the MDT model?
- 2) Are there other collaborative efforts that we want to pursue?

Director Levin said that, despite issues at a particular site, the MDT program on the whole has been good and the model is fine.

Mr. Reichgelt, in response to a question by Ms. Landis, said that the Peoria MDT performed very well, despite consisting of agencies that had previously performed poorly as individual protocol sites. The Peoria MDT brought in a strong coordinator, who helped facilitate the program's success. With another few years of funding, the MDTs would probably be strong enough that the counties would pick up their funding.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that when a grantee accepts these grant funds, the plan is that the grantee will continue the program's mission when the grant funds run out.

Ms. Poskin said that if a grant-funded position were removed from a county program, the progress or success of that program would be diminished.

Ms. Rappaport said that the issue is where to implement a strategy to enable the counties to secure the funding that they need to continue these programs. They might need the weight or support of another agency to assist them. If we want to move in the direction of replication, so that we can leave these communities and move on to new ones, then such a strategy is necessary.

Ms. Engel said that right now, the Authority's staff is at an all-time low in terms of personnel. The Authority does not have the staff right now to provide the tremendous amount of technical assistance that would be needed by new upstart MDT programs. At this time, it makes much more sense to strengthen and support the existing programs.

Mr. Reichgelt said that one of the reasons that the data system was implemented was to illustrate the program's successes to the counties themselves. Right now, the data is only starting to come in. Our plan is to work with the grantees to keep the programs going and to help find ways to wean them off of federal funding.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the consensus is that the four MDTs that currently exist should continue to be funded.

Ms. Donahue said that if one of the goals is to transition the MDTs from federal funds to local funds, we should tell them that such is the plan up front and that they have X number of years of federal funds before they are expected to secure their own funding.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that another current program type is Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prosecution. The only grantee currently under that program is the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, she said.

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prosecution was retained as a program title by general consensus.

Domestic Violence Law Enforcement

Domestic Violence Law Enforcement was retained by general consensus:

Services for Underserved Areas or Victim Groups

Ms. Rappaport said that the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence provided funds to 17 agencies for 20 projects that served underserved populations, including geographically, linguistically, or culturally isolated victim groups as well as disabled victim groups.

Ms. Poskin said that the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault uses VAWA funds to operate 15 satellite offices throughout Illinois offering counseling and / or advocacy.

Services for Underserved Areas or Victim Groups was retained by general consensus.

Services to Female Inmates

Mr. Krause said that the IDOC has a post-traumatic stress disorder counseling and treatment program for female inmates. The program provides training for correctional staff and counselors and funds a coordinator to implement the program at three facilities. A high percentage of female inmates are themselves victims of domestic violence or sexual assault.

Ms. Brennan suggested renaming “Services to Female Inmates” as “Services to Female Offenders.” This program title was a product of the Criminal Justice Assembly when it was determined that a high percentage of female offenders had been victims themselves. Director Levin added that studies have shown that approximately 60 percent of female offenders have been victims of sexual assault or domestic violence.

Ms. Poskin said that “Services to Female Inmates” is more accurate since there are offenders who are not inmates. Others suggested, “Services to Incarcerated Women.”

No definitive consensus was reached on the renaming of *Services to Female Inmates*. *Services to Female Inmates* was retained as a program title by general consensus.

Transitional Housing Services

Ms. Brennan said that there are 10 transitional housing programs for which VAWA pays housing costs. Illinois was one of the first states to make an investment in transitional housing. The programs provide a means for women who have been abused their entire lives to become independent. Director Levin added that roughly a third of these programs deal with immigrant women.

Ms. Landis said that there are a lot of questions surrounding the issue of the sustainability of the transitional housing programs over the long term. As with the MDTs, long-term funding streams need to be identified. She suggested using Housing and Urban Development funds as an alternate funding source. She said that the individual in the housing unit is supposed to assume the lease. Transitional housing providers are moving the housing stock, not the people. Long-term funding for these kinds of projects will not be available, at least in Chicago. The model that will no longer receive funds is the one in which residents are replaced as they move out on their own; a model in which the residents come and go from the property.

Ms. Brennan suggested that, to continue transitional housing, the Authority could issue a request for proposals and have the current providers compete for the funds. This would also open the door for potential new providers.

Ms. Engel said that the agency that receives the VAWA funds has a mandate to be in the business of finding, renovating, or otherwise securing housing for their residents.

Ms. Romero said that there was a big crisis in the domestic violence community recently when one of the largest shelters shut down, eliminating roughly one third of the 200-plus beds. Many funding providers are changing the way that they allocate funds. Many in the domestic violence / transitional housing community would like to remove the shelters, however, victims, especially those in disenfranchised communities, still need a place to

go. The current trend seems to be to close down these opportunities. This is not a panacea. Some of the shelters have been considered transitional housing because guests can stay for up to six months.

Ms. Welch recommended continued support for transitional housing, but, as with the MDTs, the pursuit of alternate funding should be encouraged.

Ms. Romero said that one approach to solving the crisis is to use assets already in the domestic violence community. The community needs to develop models that provide more self-sustenance.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the question is whether to expand the funding into shorter term or emergency shelter programs.

Ms. Welch said that the VAWA funds are insufficient to support more housing.

Transitional Housing Services was retained as a program title by general consensus.

Services to Victims of Domestic Violence

Services to Victims of Domestic Violence was retained as a program title by general consensus.

Sexual Assault Medical Advocacy

Ms. Poskin said that she supported giving funds to the AGO and to the CCSAO for sexual assault medical advocacy. This is critical in supporting the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner program. Quality physical evidence is a critical component in most trials.

Ms. Kramer suggested renaming the program type, "Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Medical Advocacy."

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Medical Advocacy was adopted by general consensus.

InfoNet Upgrade

InfoNet Upgrade was retained as a program title by general consensus.

Training

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that training needs to remain a high priority, especially with regard to law enforcement, prosecution, and the courts. Director Levin said that training was also important in properly implementing the new protocols.

Training was created as a program title by general consensus.

Emerging Issues

Ms. Poskin suggested creating alternative structures for the prosecution of sexual assault, such as creating a special sexual assault prosecutor's office. Rape crisis centers see thousands of victims every year, but only a fraction of those ever see trial.

Director Levin said that it might be possible to issue a request for proposals under the auspices of the Authority that would create a sexual assault prosecution program.

Mr. Reichgelt suggested incorporating the concept of a sexual assault prosecutor into a limited priority so that it remains at the forefront of new ideas even if it does not get funded.

In response to a question by Ms. Landis, Vice Chair Mandeltort said that issues relating to orders of protection would fall under Priority #2.

Ms. Landis said that if a goal is to improve service of process with regard to court orders or orders of protection we need to determine what priority that would fit under. We need to determine if the law enforcement officers receive the correct information and if they do not, is it the fault of a particular agency?

Ms. Hollon said that at least 50 percent of orders do not get served because some individuals relocate often. However, the short order forms have been a great help.

Ms. Welch said that the short order form is just one solution to the problem of service challenges. Poor information about the offender and officers' inability or unwillingness to persist contributes to the problem.

Ms. Hollon said that it wasn't an issue of willingness; it was an issue of staffing. Many downstate communities simply do not have the resources to serve the orders.

Ms. Argentino asked if there has been any discussion of funding a domestic violence fatality review team, which might be similar to a child fatality review team that Cook County currently has. Approximately 80 percent of such reviews in Chicago did not

involve a report to the police. If no police report was ever made, there is little or no anecdotal history or other information that might help a case.

Ms. Landis said that no VOCA or VAWA funds have contributed toward those efforts. There was a legislative push many years ago to make a domestic violence fatality review team a statewide entity, but the measure failed.

Ms. Argentino said that the absence of a police report does not mean that a victim did not want or need services. Vice Chair Mandeltort said that this is an outreach issue for the victim service agencies to consider; victims need to know where to turn for help. Ms. Landis said that a given homicide victim might be a client of a given victim service agency and the law enforcement officers would have no way of knowing.

Ms. Brennan suggested creating a think-tank series or a committee program type that would address emerging issues and new initiatives. Ms. Landis said that if law enforcement, prosecution, and courts could be involved, then it could fall under multi-disciplinary team response. Ms. Argentino added that individual cases probably could not be discussed until after prosecution.

The committee, by general consensus, created a new program type called *Emerging Issues*.

Other Discussion

Mr. Reichgelt defined “needs-based” as reviewing data to determine gaps in service. Staff travels to the communities or counties where the needs are identified to discuss whether programming is necessary or feasible. By contrast, an RFP is sent out statewide and the submitted proposals are reviewed, rated, and then the best-rated ones are selected for funding.

Ms. Brennan said that all federal funds must be open to competition to the maximum extent practicable.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned by general consensus at 3:57 p.m.