



**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 / Victims of Crime Act Meeting**

Friday, October 6, 2006  
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

The Authority's Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee met on October 6, 2006, at the Authority offices to discuss priorities, goals, and objectives for the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) program.

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

Committee Vice Chair Ellen Mandeltort (representing the Office of the Illinois Attorney General) called the meeting to order at 11:17 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  
David Bradford – Chief, Glen Carbon Police Department (via teleconference)  
Barbara Brooks – Illinois Department of Human Services (via teleconference)  
Barbara Engel – Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority  
Judy Erickson (for Cynthia Cobbs) - Administrative Office of Illinois Courts  
Norbert Goetten – Office of the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor (via teleconference)  
Bridget Healy Ryan – Office of the Cook County State's Attorney  
Lou Ann Hollon (for Sheriff Dawson) – Macon County Sheriff's Department (via teleconference)  
Rick Krause (for Roger Walker / Cherri Gass) – Illinois Department of Corrections  
Leslie Landis – Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, City of Chicago  
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 were:

Vernie Boerkrem – Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council

Kim Donahue – Illinois State Police

Lois Moorman – Illinois Department on Aging

Thomas Jurkanin – Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board

Barbara Shaw – Illinois Violence Prevention Authority

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 / VOCA Meeting**

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the purpose of the meeting was not to discuss individual agencies or funds to individual agencies; this meeting will focus on priorities, goals, and objectives for the state as a whole. The committee will discuss the existing goals and objectives and determine if they need to be adjusted or if new ones need to be developed.

### **Executive Director's Comments**

Director Levin said that, unlike the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) program, VOCA does not require that a plan be submitted to the federal government. However, having a plan in place provides guidance for Authority staff in determining funding.

### **Priorities**

Vice Chair Mandeltort, introduced the memo in the meeting materials entitled, "Priority issues created by the Victims of Crime Workgroup in 2000."

Mr. Reichgelt said that anyone who participated in the Victims of Crime Workgroup in 2000 might have been involved in the creation of these priorities. The Victims of Crime Workgroup was an assembly that was held in 2000 with practitioners from around Illinois to develop a criminal justice plan. This plan has been used over the last five years to guide the planning for all programs. The goals and objective that this committee received in the meeting materials were developed in 2001 by the Victim Service Advisory Group and they were developed in keeping with the priorities set forth in the plan. Today, this committee must review these priorities, goals, and objectives. Using the questions from the VOCA 2006 Funding Strategy Recommendations, this committee will work through the priorities and determine if new priorities, different priorities, revised priorities, or the same priorities are needed. All new programs will fall under one or more of these

priorities. As with the VAWA programs, staff will attempt to craft programs that fit as many priorities as possible.

### **Funding Strategy Recommendations**

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that it would be prudent to address the five questions on the VOCA 2006 Funding Strategy Recommendations memo included in the meeting materials as the committee discusses funding strategy.

Ms. Rappaport said that one of the most pressing issues is the severe shortage of domestic violence advocates in the Chicago domestic violence court system. Funding for advocacy has not kept pace with the volume of cases. The Chicago Battered Women's Network and the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence (ICADV) examined this issue last year and determined that approximately 90 percent of the victims going through the system do not have access to an advocate. There are two programs dedicated to that court system full-time and a patchwork of other programs that bring clients into that system. Also, many domestic violence programs are suffering from a combination of decreases in state revenue, VOCA funds, and VAWA funds. There is also a diminishment of the public's awareness of domestic violence that peaked following many high-profile court cases in the 1990's, such as the O.J. Simpson case and, as a result, many foundations in the Chicago area are seeing corporate or private sponsorship wane. The result has been a reduction in basic core services.

Ms. Poskin said that the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault's (ICASA) VOCA funds primarily go to advocacy and counseling. ICASA oversees 34 programs and currently, 29 of those use VOCA funds. It has been several years since any of these programs has seen an increase in funding and five of the programs have no VOCA-funded advocacy or counseling. Any new VOCA funds to ICASA would probably be directed to those five programs. Also, VOCA allows ICASA to fund eight children's services programs in underserved areas. ICASA directs a large portion of its VOCA children's services funds to the City of Chicago. ICASA receives \$70,000 annually for administrative uses, such as monitoring and training, but that has been reduced recently and any funding increases would be used to replenish lost administrative funds.

Ms. Rappaport said that, historically, children's programs were funded at a small level until three or four years ago. ICADV had spread about \$5,000 to 50 programs across the state to support children's programs. When the last plan was developed, children's needs were established as a strong goal. ICADV then received \$650,000 for children's programming that went to 18 different programs. Those funds targeted children identified as being highest-risk and most in need of services. If the ICADV were to receive more funds, children's programs would be the likely recipients. The ICADV uses

approximately \$63,500 to fund the administration of 194 grants and that administrative funding amount has remained stagnant for ten years. That amount has been reduced, creating great stress on the agency.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, in terms of the overall mission, that mission does not change over time. What changes is the amount of resources that allow agencies to achieve their missions. There might not be a great deal of change needed regarding the priorities, because they were good priorities to begin with. The issue is figuring out how to fund those priorities and if components of those priorities need to be better served than they have been.

Ms. Engel said that of today's social issues that intersect with violence, immigration is a very salient issue. This raises an open question; are immigrant women's needs being met adequately?

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the immigrant issue was a concern in the development of the current plan, but for different reasons than it is today. Immigrants are faced with new problems now, relative to when the plan was created five years ago.

Ms. Poskin said that clearly, there are neighborhoods and counties that are unserved. Especially in Chicago, immigration and language barriers are big issues.

Ms. Rappaport said that the VAWA grants assist with these issues to some degree.

Ms. Saleh said that the Arab-American Family Services agency is seeing women come in who do not know where to begin in terms of escaping domestic violence because their husbands hold their immigration status over their heads. Often, the women's children are legal citizens, but despite being married for eight or ten years, their husbands have not gotten green cards for them. These women are afraid to talk for fear of reprisals by their husbands or out of fear that the government might punish them for their illegal immigration statuses.

Ms. Romero said that since these communities have historically been disenfranchised, many of the agencies need to make better outreach efforts. Many immigrants do not take advantage of available services because they are not aware that they exist.

Ms. Landis said that pressing needs can be identified, but needs are presently met that are not necessarily pressing because they are being addressed. Unmet needs should be identified within the context of what exists presently at or above capacity levels. Available funds will not increase along with the identification of new needs. If funds were shifted from one need to another, then there would still be an unmet need. When it comes to underserved populations, particularly within the immigrant communities,

strategy is as important as funding. For example, we have boxes of posters in many languages promoting general awareness and the Domestic Violence Help Line. When the posters are up, we receive calls in many languages from monolingual victims, but as soon as the posters come down, the calls stop. Capacities do not exist within the victim services community to deal with monolingual victims who speak a language other than English or Spanish. Many of these individuals do not want to avail themselves of the opportunities that exist within the current contingency of VOCA-funded services. More useful planning with regard to these issues would render related funding better spent.

Referring to the memo entitled, "Goals and Objectives of Victims of Crime Workgroup," in the meeting materials, Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, given what Ms. Landis said above, Goal #5 would not change. Goal #5 read, "Strengthen and expand existing services, as well as develop additional services for special populations."

Ms. Landis said that one pressing need is reaching out to victims who do not enter the criminal justice system. There is a subtle shift taking place as some victims within the immigrant communities move away from the criminal justice system to other systems.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that perhaps Goal #5 needed an additional objective calling for adequate service for victims who never come into contact with the criminal justice system.

Ms. Engel said that VOCA funds are not exclusively for agencies that are tied into the criminal justice system. Rape crisis centers see lots of clients who will never file police reports. The larger point is that many victims are not going to law enforcement or service providers. We need to determine what, if any, larger responsibility we have to find those victims, figure out what they need, and then offer it to them. Many victims of battery, rape, or incest have never told anyone.

Ms. Engel said that the VOCA goals that were agreed upon at the last VOCA planning meeting were in no particular order. However, criminal justice accountability was an issue because it was next to impossible to find out when something was recorded and what ended up happening down the line. How victims were precluded from being involved in the criminal justice system was difficult to determine. The committee wanted to know why felony convictions for sexual assault and domestic violence were hard to achieve. What the committee wanted was an evaluation of the response of the criminal justice system to victims' needs. If there is a considerable narrowing between who wants to use the criminal justice system and who actually ends up with a disposition in court, then that should be a cause for concern. If there is no way to evaluate criminal justice response, then any progress in expanding services will be limited. Hence the inclusion, under Goal #1, which read, "Increase the accountability of the criminal justice system to

ensure that the system meets its responsibilities to victims and the community,” of these two items:

- Collect data related to decisions made at both the law enforcement and prosecution levels.
- Develop a system of recourse for victims who feel their rights have been violated.

Ms. Rappaport said that one proposal to address the issues outlined in Goal #1 was to create an ombudsman system.

Ms. Poskin said that in FY06, ICASA saw 6,380 new victims. In some of those cases, the rapes occurred long ago. Of the 6,380, 1,510 filed a police report. A patrol officer interviewed 1,323 of those victims and a detective interviewed 727. A total of 169 charges were filed. This suggests that either victims are not getting the message that help is available, or those of us whose jobs are to provide that help are not providing an adequate system or structure to communicate that help is available.

Ms. Romero said that in many communities, victims are not looking for legal remedies. Many victims in impoverished, minority, and immigrant communities have developed a fear of retribution. In these cases, community-based interventions might be the best course of action. Some local groups are trying to find alternatives to the criminal justice system in dealing with domestic violence by utilizing existing assets within the communities.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that InfoNet was expanded as a result of the adoption of Goal #1 and its objectives.

Ms. Engel said that community-based strategies might be the best way to deal with the victims that are not entering the criminal justice system. Goal #1 was focused on providing a measure of accountability for the criminal justice system as a reaction to a perceived lack of transparency.

Ms. Welch said that the lack of information had been encountered at past meetings. There is no statewide data collection on how the criminal/legal system is responding to victims. Such data is critical if committees such as this one are to adequately perform the tasks required of them. Ms. Engel suggested that perhaps data collection efforts need to be improved.

Ms. Rappaport said that at the last meeting there was much discussion about VAWA funds designated to protocol sites that were intended to address the same issues that we are seeing here. The point of the protocol sites was to bring different entities in the

community to the table to look at how the community was fulfilling its responsibilities and how the criminal justice system was working.

Ms. Poskin noted that not all of the 6,380 sexual assault victims are “recent” victims. In some cases, the assault took place five, ten, or more years ago. These victims have no interest in going to the police. Vice Chair Mandeltort said that it would be valuable to know how many of these crimes have occurred within the statute of limitations and how many would still be eligible for prosecution. Director Goetten said that the figures that are most alarming are the 1,510 reported cases of sexual assault that resulted in only 169 prosecutions.

Ms. Poskin said that in the past a “10 percent rule” was used: 10 percent of reports resulted in charges, 10 percent of charges would be accepted for a jury trial, and 10 percent of those trials would have favorable outcomes. She said that given the sexual assault figures reported above, this 10 percent rule hasn’t changed much. Ms. Welch said that this is consistent with national statistics.

Chief Bradford said that advocacy within the context of sexual assault or domestic violence means that someone is advocating on the victims’ behalf within the criminal justice system with regard to the components of the criminal justice system. The advocate is not just a general advocate for social services. The committee should limit its discussions to those within the scope of the committee’s authority and mandate under the criminal justice system and the Authority. Regarding the 1,510 police reports filed for sexual assault crimes, it is important to look at how many were actually charged, how many were done away with in a plea-bargain, how many resulted in convictions, etc. It is also important to look at how many were brought to police or the state’s attorney’s office and presented for prosecution and were then turned away.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that regarding Goal #4, which read, “Increase collaboration among criminal justice personnel and other professionals who work with victims,” she was curious as to how that has been accomplished. She said that years ago, when a victim showed up in a courtroom with an advocate, the advocate and the state’s attorney would begin with the premise that they were on opposite sides of the case. Advocacy services were not always welcome. The prosecutors were mainly concerned with getting convictions; the advocates were mainly concerned that the victims received necessary services from the criminal justice system.

Chief Bradford said that, from a law enforcement standpoint, there has not been much improvement in the relationships between prosecutors and advocates in the rural counties. Often, law enforcement personnel view advocates as obstacles in investigations. This may play a role in the quality of the cases presented to the state’s attorneys and this may influence the state’s attorneys’ decisions as to whether or not to file charges.

Ms. Poskin said that there is a reason why external advocates have had to exist over the last 35 years. The victims' needs must be at the center of some piece of the criminal justice system's work. This is the role of the rape crisis centers. An advocate's job is to facilitate and support the victim's reporting, recovery, and legal process, but it is not to direct the prosecution or to provide information to police or prosecution. At times, the relationship between advocates and law enforcement or prosecution can be adversarial, but at other times it can be stunningly cooperative. There may not have been 1,510 reports to law enforcement without the help of the advocates. The tension in the system may have actually done some good.

Chief Bradford said that the focus should be on improving the relationships between advocates and law enforcement. Criminal justice professionals should all work together to fulfill their individual mandates.

Ms. Poskin said that any efforts toward better improving the outcomes of domestic violence and/or sexual assault should be at the trial level. There should be more positive outcomes per cases slated for trial. The nature of the criminal justice system is such that it does not allow for easy prosecution of the crime of rape. There isn't much likelihood of change in the current system. She also said that, as with the Representative Mark Foley scandal, if people don't start to see the connection between those who have information about a crime, but do not do anything with that information, and the those who perpetrate abuse and continue to get away with it, then a very large piece of what needs to be addressed is being missed. This is tantamount to not believing the victims. Beyond law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges, the general public has created a culture that does not want to face up to what it would take to change the culture regarding the perpetration of sexual abuse. Until that happens, the "ten percent rule" figures will continue to apply.

Ms. Rappaport said that, to summarize, the people who want, need, and might benefit from the criminal justice system are getting some advocacy, but not nearly enough. Also, those for whom the legal system is not the answer are not getting the advocacy that they need either. These problems are compounded by the fact that there are so few resources to go around. If there is any increase in available funds, those funds must go to current programs because their funding has not kept up. The funds don't exist to take on all of these problems.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the lack of resources is the reality, therefore, it is important that the proper priorities be set for the use of those resources. Since the Authority can't do everything, this committee must decide what issues will take priority over others.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that this conversation happens nationwide. She said that she teaches for the National Institute on the Prosecution of Domestic Violence and for the National



Institute on the Prosecution of Sexual Violence and at every training session that she conducts, she hears that prosecutors, judges, and others don't understand the problem. The National Institute on the Prosecution of Sexual Violence focused their training for prosecutors on voluntarily intoxicated victims. Such cases probably make up the bulk of the 1,510 reported earlier. It is very easy to try rape cases involving strangers; in these situations, the victim is not blamed. All of the other cases, including intimate partner sexual assault, voluntarily intoxication, and date rape, are generally misunderstood. There needs to be a better campaign to explain that it doesn't matter what the victim did, the focus must be on the offender. There needs to be a massive statewide summit involving judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement. Prosecutors are not filing cases that they don't think they can win.

Ms. Welch said that perhaps it would be worthwhile to dedicate some funds to prosecutor sexual assault training. Any training that seeks to lessen the blame on victims will seep into all disciplines. A training session on sexual assault would also have an affect on how those trainees approach domestic violence.

Director Goetten said that he agreed with Ms. Healy Ryan in her analysis of the problem. He agreed that training for judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement would be very valuable.

Ms. Beasley Pomahac said that part of such training should focus on children and children's disclosures. She said that a major problem with children's disclosures is the often-poor quality of the interviews. She suggested training on child-sensitive forensic interviewing.

Director Levin said that VOCA requires one percent of the state's awards to be set aside for training. If this committee chooses to make training a goal, then the Authority's staff would act accordingly. However, training for child victims would be different because it would be a totally different focus.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that Ms. Healy Ryan's suggestion is a continuation of Goal #2, "Improve and expand training to all professionals working with victims." However, many smaller state's attorney's offices might not be able to send someone away for a training that lasts for the better part of a week, even if all expenses are paid. Any training should be done in parts.

Ms. Rappaport said that it would help to know what kinds of prosecutor training are currently funded and where those funds are coming from. It is difficult to make big decisions in a vacuum. In any event, training should not be funded if funds for services have to be sacrificed. Services must take priority over training.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that victims often receive services outside the criminal justice system, but the criminal justice system does not serve them when nothing happens to their cases.

Ms. Landis said that in the domestic violence arena the training that is being done now on legal advocacy is quite good. Training should be based on accountability and responsiveness to victims' needs as those needs are articulated today, not how they were articulated in 2000. Training should be inclusive of any changes in how advocates need to approach victims today as opposed to in the year 2000.

Ms. Poskin said that there's a good chance that many of the people who attended trainings back in 2000 are no longer in the business of prosecuting sexual assault cases. She said that it would be worthwhile to explore new ways to respond to sexual assault. Perhaps instead of a formal training, there should be a summit dedicated to creatively thinking about solving these issues. She said that cases revolving around consent are immensely difficult to prosecute. Judges are often reluctant to allow expert witnesses. If we expect to dramatically increase positive outcomes of sexual assault cases, then we need to start thinking "outside the box" about how to approach them.

Ms. Romero said many legal advocates do not feel that they have all of the know-how needed to be as effective as possible. Also, many legal advocates do not stay in those positions for very long.

Ms. Rappaport said that it is nearly impossible for one to master the role of advocate, particularly in Chicago, if one does not perform advocacy tasks daily. Thousands of victims enter domestic violence court without any type of advocacy. There simply aren't enough advocates. There are advocates dedicated to providing services at courts and those advocates see victims every day. Those advocates are experts who understand the politics and other details of the system. Even with excellent training, advocates will not be very effective if they are not doing advocacy work on a daily basis.

## **Establishment of Goals and Objectives**

### Goal #1

***Goal #1** initially read: Increase the accountability of the criminal justice system to ensure that the system meets its responsibilities to victims and the community.*

Ms. Landis said the way to achieve Goal #1 would be to increase the level and quality of legal advocacy services available to victims in the context of the community. She suggested that this become a new objective under Goal #1. In the past, efforts to improve

accountability centered on improving data collection and information sharing. Data collection is better now than it ever has been, but there will never be a data collection system that reveals why bad decisions are being made with regard to whether or not to prosecute certain cases. The problem being articulated here is one of philosophic understanding, training issues, and basic core competency. Even so, the criminal justice system's response to victims had improved significantly since 2000. The best way to make the system more accountable would be to have more advocates assisting victims.

Ms. Engel said that what the committee is really talking about is giving advocates the tools to be more adversarial when necessary. Advocates need to feel that they can confront a state's attorney and demand that proper charges be filed in a case.

Vice Chair Mandeltort asked if, "Increase the level and quality of legal advocacy services available to victims in the context of the community," should be a goal unto itself.

Ms. Poskin suggested that it would be best to insert it under Goal #4. This would leave the intent of Goal #1 intact. Goal #1 was created specifically to address data collection. "Accountability" is the hopeful outcome of the data collection.

Ms. Landis said that the intent of the suggested change is to promote the use of service provider-based legal advocacy as a tool to create greater accountability in the criminal justice system.

Ms. Poskin suggested improving Goal #4 by adding (*italicized text*), "Increase collaboration among criminal justice personnel, *advocates*, and other professionals..." Superintendent Argentino said that one of the things that has been working well in Chicago is the collaboration between the different entities. When police officers and detectives work with advocates, the outcomes are usually more positive. Goal #1 should be left intact and the language of accountability should not be diluted.

Ms. Rappaport suggested, as an added objective under Goal #4, "Strengthen advocacy as a tool to improve court accountability."

Ms. Poskin suggested, "Strengthen court advocates as a tool to improve court accountability."

Ms. Landis said that, regarding the domestic violence protocol that has been developed by the Authority, there is no subsection for advocacy. It addresses law enforcement, prosecution, the judiciary, and safety planning, but there is nothing about advocacy in the protocol. The protocol creates a subtle shift; advocacy was not treated as a component as essential as the others.

Goal #1 remained unchanged by general consensus:

Increase the accountability of the criminal justice system to ensure that the system meets its responsibilities to victims and the community.

One objective under Goal #1 was changed by general consensus and one objective was added under Goal #1 by general consensus (changes/additions *italicized*):

- *Improve data collection* related to decisions made at both the law enforcement and prosecution levels.
- Develop a strategy to ensure victims are informed of their rights and of the services available to them.
- Develop a system of recourse for victims who feel their rights have been violated.
- Educate the public and criminal justice professionals about victims' rights and victim services available.
- *Increase the level and quality of legal advocacy to victims.*

## Goal #2

**Goal #2** initially read: *Improve and expand training to all professionals working with victims.*

Goal #2 remained unchanged by general consensus:

Improve and expand training to all professionals working with victims.

The objectives under Goal #2 remained unchanged by general consensus:

- Develop or revise training for criminal justice professionals to include a victim perspective.
- Develop multidisciplinary training for criminal justice professionals to help them understand each other's roles and responsibilities as they pertain to victims.
- Develop training tailored to the context of the community and its populations.
- Develop training programs for new professionals as well as experienced professionals.

### Goal #3

**Goal #3** initially read: *Improve data collection efforts to better target needs throughout the state.*

Goal #3 was entirely reworded by general consensus:

*Maintain and strengthen InfoNet statewide.*

All objectives relating to Goal #3 were eliminated by general consensus:

- ~~Improve utility of Uniform Crime Report data.~~
- ~~Conduct a victimization survey in Illinois.~~
- ~~Increase data accessibility while maintaining confidentiality.~~
- ~~Identify data collection strategies.~~

### Goal #4

**Goal #4** initially read: *Increase collaboration among criminal justice personnel and other professionals who work with victims.*

Ms. Landis said that legal advocacy has increased in civil cases. Victims are availing themselves of civil legal advocacy in increasing numbers in Chicago. Therefore, Goal #4 should not be limited to criminal justice. The goal should be expanded to include civil justice.

The text of Goal #4 was changed (changes/additions *italicized*) as follows by general consensus:

Increase collaboration among *law enforcement*, criminal justice personnel, *civil legal personnel, advocates*, and other professionals who work with victims.

One objective was added (addition *italicized*) and one objective was removed (removal in ~~strike through~~) by general consensus:

- Develop training on how to effectively collaborate
- Identify ways for all victim professionals to gain an increased understanding of other agencies' goals and perspectives.
- Develop policies of institutionalized collaboration among all levels of personnel within agencies.
- ~~Promote commitment and collaboration from top-level agency employees.~~

- *Increase the level and quality of legal advocacy to victims.*

#### Goal #5

*Goal #5 initially read: Strengthen and expand existing services, as well as develop additional services for special populations.*

Per previous discussion, Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested that Goal #5 should read, “Strengthen and expand existing services, as well as develop additional services for special populations in the context of community.”

Ms. Welch said that in earlier discussions the committee had talked about adding increased outreach to victims who do not access the criminal legal system. She suggested that Goal #5 be modified to read, “Increase services to victims who do not access the criminal legal system.”

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested that Goal #5 be modified to read, “Identify additional non-traditional resources to augment existing services.”

Authority staff member Maureen Brennan said that at the beginning of the meeting, the committee agreed that the basic core of the VOCA/VAWA strategy was good and that the emphasis should be on maintaining services by ensuring adequate funding.

Ms. Rappaport said that addressing and strengthening existing services must be the top priority. Most of these programs have had no increase for four years or more and they are struggling.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested, “Expand services to underserved populations” as an objective under Goal #5.

Ms. Rappaport suggested that Goal #5 should read, “Strengthen and support existing services.” Ms. Poskin suggested that Goal #5 should read, “Maintain and strengthen existing services.”

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested, “Expand services to underserved populations and communities,” as an objective under Goal #5. She then suggested that instead of that being an objective under #5, perhaps it should be a separate Goal #6.

Ms. Landis said that she is in favor of keeping basic services intact. Regarding Vice Chair Mandeltort’s suggested objective (Expand services to underserved populations and communities.), she said that there is a huge assumption that this is just about underserved populations. However, this is about an entirely different kind of basic service.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested, "Ensure that services are received by underserved populations," as Goal #6.

Ms. Engel said, in response to Ms. Landis's statement regarding keeping basic services intact, that we may not know what victims actually want and what we consider basic services may not be what those victims are looking for.

Ms. Poskin suggested, "Encourage and support the development of services that are specific to a special or underserved populations," as Goal #6.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff understands that the committee wants to make innovative services available if new opportunities present themselves.

Chief Bradford said that, keeping in mind the Authority's mandate and goals regarding the VOCA plan, going beyond the criminal justice system components is perhaps beyond the scope of things that VOCA funds should be used for. He said that he would object to any language that would infer, or leave room to infer, that the Authority would expand into areas beyond the criminal justice system.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the original goal had read, "...as well as develop additional services for special populations." She said that it sounded like some of the committee members wanted to expand on that concept.

Director Levin said that funding for civil legal advocacy is allowable under VOCA. She said that Ms. Landis wanted to create a condition that would allow for the funding of an unforeseen, but worthwhile program. However, this does not mean that the Authority would do so at the expense of its core mission.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested, "Encourage and support the level of services to special or underserved populations," as Goal #6.

Ms. Poskin suggested, "Encourage the development of services that are unique to previously underserved populations," as Goal #6.

Ms. Landis said that the focus should not only be on underserved populations. Basic services are definitionally prescriptive.

Ms. Welch suggested, "Identify additional non-traditional services to augment existing services," as Goal #6.

Ms. Poskin suggested, "Encourage and support the development of services that are responsive to the victim group requesting services," as Goal #6.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, “Identify additional non-traditional services to augment existing services,” as Goal #6 would cover all of the issues at hand.

Mr. Reichgelt suggested, “Identify additional non-traditional services and resources to augment existing services,” as Goal #6.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested that instead of creating a proposed Goal #6, the following be created as an objective under Goal #5, “Encourage and support the development of services that are unique to a specialized or underserved population or community.”

Ms. Welch suggested making Goal #5 simply, “Maintain and strengthen services.” This would allow for the adoption of programs that do not currently exist. She then suggested that the first objective under Goal #5 should read, “Identify the most effective *existing* services and strengthen them.”

In response to a question by Ms. Landis regarding whether or not programs serving children of domestic violence victims would be eligible for VOCA funds, Director Levin said that the Authority has provided funding for such programs in the past as available funds have permitted.

Goal #5 was revised accordingly (additions *italicized* and deletions in ~~striketrough~~) by general consensus:

*Maintain and strengthen and expand existing services and develop new victim services.* ~~as well as develop additional services for special populations.~~

New text was added (additions *italicized*) to two objectives, a new objective was added, and one objective was removed (deletions in ~~striketrough~~) by general consensus:

- ~~• Define what is meant by basic services.~~
- Identify the most effective *existing* services and strengthen them.
- Develop priorities for specialized services after basic services are fully sufficient.
- Identify additional nontraditional resources *and services* to augment existing ones.
- Encourage funding agencies to work together to identify any duplication of efforts and gaps in services, and also to use the funds in ways that compliment each other.



- *Encourage and support the development of services that are unique to a specialized or underserved population or community.*

### **Further Discussion**

Ms. Engel said that regarding maintaining and strengthening victim services, one long-term issue is that service providers often pay staff so poorly that it is difficult to maintain a staff of qualified personnel. She suggested that some funds be used to increase salaries.

Director Levin said that if funds become available, it might be possible to generate funding to accommodate salary increases.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the last time salaries were brought up as an issue, it was determined that salary increases would fall under the general goal of strengthening and maintaining services.

Director Levin agreed that salary increases would be covered by the goal of strengthening and maintaining services. She said that funds for salary increases would depend on the outcomes of more pressing matters.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 1:55 p.m.