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The Honorable Martin O’Malley
Office of the Governor
State House
100 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Dear Governor O’Malley:

As required under Executive Order 01.01.2012.05, please accept the enclosed report as fulfillment of the Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP) and the Family Violence Council (FVC) requirement to produce an annual report as to the status of family violence in Maryland and recommendations for improvements to the State's activities to prevent family violence (MSAR # 9421).

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the Family Violence Council.

Sincerely,

Tammy Brown
Executive Director

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Thomas V. “Mike” Miller
The Honorable Michael Busch
Per Executive Order 01.01.2012.05 Governor's Family Violence Council, which amended Executive Order 01.01.2008.16, I am pleased to provide you with an Annual Update regarding the efforts of the Family Violence Council to date.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2008, the O’Malley-Brown Administration established 15 strategic goals to improve the quality of life in Maryland. Among these 15 goals was reducing violent crimes committed against women and children by 25% by the end of 2012. The efforts of the Administration surpassed this goal, driving down juvenile and female homicides by 31.7% by the end of 2012. In keeping with its commitment to public safety, the O’Malley-Brown Administration set a new goal of further reducing violent crime against women and children by another 25% by the end of 2018. Governor O’Malley and Lt. Governor Brown have advocated strongly for victims of family violence by establishing and supporting the work of the Governor’s Family Violence Council (FVC). For over 5 years, the FVC, Chaired by Attorney General Douglas F. Gansler, has accomplished a broad range of projects to improve accountability, awareness, and research in statewide family violence policy.

I. 2008 – 2014 Accomplishments Summary

2008

FVC Retreat: The FVC officially began meeting in January 2008. On April 28, 2008 the Council hosted a retreat in Baltimore, a full day meeting including the Honorable Catherine O’Malley as a guest speaker.

New Executive Order: On October 23, 2008, Governor O’Malley implemented a new Executive Order to rename the “Governor’s Council on Family Violence Prevention” to the “Governor’s Family Violence Council.” The new order also created a new FVC mission, which states: “The Governor’s Family Violence Council mission is to provide the Governor with timely and accurate information on family violence with recommendations that will reduce and eliminate abusive behaviors.” The Executive Order also expanded FVC membership to include the Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General, a Maryland State’s Attorneys’ Association representative, and an additional member of the public.

Photography Exhibit: In conjunction with the Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP), the FVC hosted the Office on Violence Against Women’s (OVW) leadership at “A Line in the Sand.” This photographic exhibit honored individuals who were pioneers in the fight against domestic violence.

Legislative Enhancement:

− HB183/SB392: Domestic Violence – Enforcement of Protective Order: Authorizes a judge to order a law enforcement officer to use all reasonable and necessary force to enforce temporary custody provision of a final protective order.

2009

Abuser Intervention Program: The FVC adopted the responsibility of establishing Abuser Intervention Program (AIP) Certification for Maryland agencies and created the Maryland Abuser Intervention Collaborative (MAIC) to lead this endeavor. MAIC is responsible for reviewing applications and creating new guidelines and procedures. In 2009, MAIC reviewed seven applications and certified five. MAIC also revised AIP guidelines, which were finalized by January 2010.

Livescan Project: On April 1, 2009 a check box for domestic violence was added to the drop-down menu in Livescan and the Automated Booking System (ABS) in order to track domestic violence incidents statewide. For consistency purposes, the FVC defined domestic violence as “Any criminal offense where the offender and the victim are, or ever have been married, in an intimate relationship (including dating and same sex
relationships), or have a child together.” In August of 2009, the FVC piloted this project at the Howard County Police Department and recorded 18 Domestically Related Incidents (DRIs) in one month. In October, letters were sent to all law enforcement agencies for additional trainings. In December, FVC disseminated training materials to agency points of contact.

**Domestic Violence Firearm Surrender Task Force:** In September 2009, the FVC and GOCCP held three regional trainings across the state related to recently passed firearm surrender legislation and assembled a task force for these trainings. Additionally, they also focused on changes in Livescan and other domestic violence topics including new federal laws. In total, the group trained over 240 law enforcement officers, advocates, and prosecutors across the state.

**Domestic Violence GPS Taskforce:** In July 2009, House Judiciary Chairman Joseph Vallario asked GOCCP to provide input and recommendations regarding the use of lethality assessments and GPS technology to track criminal defendants in domestic violence cases and possible areas of funding. Accordingly, a taskforce was implemented comprised of Maryland experts in the field of domestic violence and GPS monitoring. The taskforce met twice in the fall of 2009 and submitted a report on November 13, 2009 which detailed recommendations related to GPS technology in Maryland and other states as well as funding and cost considerations and limitations.

**Public Awareness:** On April 23, 2009, the Public Awareness Subcommittee held a Media Day to help representatives of the media appropriately report and address domestic violence incidents. The Lieutenant Governor’s Office also held two press conferences in 2009 with criminal justice stakeholders to raise awareness and the need for education on domestic violence.

**Legislative Enhancements:**
- **HB 296/SB 267: Family Law - Protective Orders - Surrender of Firearms:** Makes it mandatory, rather than discretionary, for the respondent in a final protective order to surrender to law enforcement authorities any firearm in the respondent's possession, and to refrain from possession of any firearm, for the duration of the order.
- **HB 302/SB 268: Family Law – Temporary Protective Orders – Surrender of Firearms:** Authorizes a judge in entering a temporary protective order to order the respondent to surrender to law enforcement authorities any firearms in the respondent's possession for the duration of the order; requiring a law enforcement officer to provide specified information to the respondent and to provide for safe storage of the firearm; making it a misdemeanor to fail to comply with an order to surrender firearms.
- **HB 98/SB 601: Domestic Violence - Temporary Protective Orders - Extension:** Increases the period of time, from 30 days to 6 months, for which a judge is authorized to extend a temporary protective order to effectuate service of the order where necessary to provide protection or for other good cause.

**2010 Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Programs:** In late November 2009, Lieutenant Governor Anthony Brown requested a report from the FVC that detailed an overview of Maryland’s efforts compared to similar programs across the country, and a fiscal impact statement. In February, the report was completed and distributed at a press conference at the Prince George’s County Hospital Center. The FVC also agreed to aid in the creation of a new Executive Order that will prioritize state funding for use in the creation and expansion of hospital-based domestic violence programs. On October 20, 2010, the FVC joined Lieutenant Governor Brown at the Prince George’s Hospital Center for a launch of the state’s fifth hospital-based domestic violence center and the release of the new Executive Order.
Abuser Intervention Program Certification: A Technical Assistance Session for interested applicants was held in February 2010 with a submission deadline at the end of May. Twenty-seven applications were received and reviewed in July and twenty-six programs were certified. This update of certified programs was sent to the courts in the beginning of October for inclusion in the latest publication of the Judges’ Benchbook.

LiveScan Project: In March of 2010, GOCCP was informed of a problem regarding DRI data, an initiative launched in April 2009. While all officers were assigning DRIs to crimes that met the Council’s definition, the DRI code was attaching itself to the statement of charges, which was then going to the courts. Court commissioners requested police officers remove this information from the system and GOCCP directed law enforcement to cease DRI reporting. Once the error was corrected, the DRI project was again piloted in Harford County at the end of May, followed by Howard, Anne Arundel, and Carroll in June. No new issues were discovered and law enforcement was asked to comply by October 1.

VINE Protective Order (VPO) Taskforce: Following the passage of HB1196, which mandates the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) to notify a petitioner of service of protective orders on a respondent, a task force was formed. The task force worked diligently to develop training materials for law enforcement training, which took place in June 2010. Approximately 200 Maryland police officers attended and brochures for the courts, law enforcement, and advocates were created and disseminated. In September 2010, screenshots of the new METERS interface were sent to Chiefs, Sheriffs, and training participants. In October, FVC held a statewide advocates’ training in Annapolis. The new VPO system launched in mid-October of 2010. It was piloted for approximately thirty days, then after discovering some outstanding technical issues, the initiative was temporarily suspended while a resolution was sought.

Legislative Enhancements:
− HB 60/SB 618 - Criminal Procedure - Violation of Pretrial or Posttrial Release No Contact Order - Expedited Hearing (“Alexis’s Law”): Authorizes a police officer to arrest a person without a warrant if the police officer has probable cause to believe that the person has violated a condition of pretrial or posttrial release. Also prohibits a person charged with committing a specified sexual crime against a victim who is a minor from contacting, harassing, or abusing the victim or going near or in the victim’s residence or place of employment.
− HB 106/SB 248 - Civil Cases - Maryland Legal Services Corporation Fund – Surcharges: Increases the surcharge on civil cases in the circuit courts from $25 to $50, the surcharge on civil cases in the District Court from $5 to $7 in summary ejectment cases, and from $10 to $15 in all other civil cases.
− HB 534/SB 867 - Domestic Violence - Protective Order – Extension: Authorizes a court to extend the term of a protective order beyond the original expiration date if a judge finds by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent has committed a subsequent act of abuse during the term of the protective order. The court must provide notice to all persons eligible for relief and the respondent in order to hold a hearing to extend the protective order. The protective order may not be extended for more than two years past the original expiration date.
− SB 22/HB 905 – Criminal Law – Prohibitions on Wearing, Carrying, or Transporting Firearms – Exceptions: Establishes an exception to the prohibition against wearing, carrying, or transporting a handgun or other regulated firearm for a person who is carrying a specified court order requiring the surrender of the handgun or other regulated firearm and who has notified a specified law enforcement unit that the handgun or regulated firearm is being transported in accordance with the court order, the handgun or regulated firearm is unloaded, and the person transports the handgun or regulated firearm directly to the law enforcement unit.
− HB 1336 – Washington County - Domestic Violence - GPS Tracking System Pilot Program for Offenders: Requires Washington County to implement a global positioning satellite tracking system pilot program. This program authorizes the court, as a condition of a defendant's pretrial release on a charge of violating a
protective order, to order that the defendant be supervised by electronic monitoring as a condition of bail.

- **HB 1382/SB 554 - Rental Housing - Protection for Victims of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault:** Authorizes a tenant who is a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault to terminate a residential lease after providing written notice to their landlord and is then authorized to vacate the premises within 30 days of providing the notice. A tenant who is the victim of domestic violence or sexual assault may also request in writing to their landlord that their locks be changed by the close of the next business day. Tenants may have their locks changed by a certified locksmith without permission from their landlord, should they choose not to comply in a timely fashion.

2011

**Abuser Intervention Program Certification:** In February of 2011, the Department of Education organized a group of school service providers to audit all 26 newly certified AIP Programs. The Council also certified two additional programs in the summer of 2011.

**Livescan:** Despite best efforts, the DRI project did not progress as expected. Instead, advocates created legislation to accomplish similar results regarding data collection.

**VPO Task Force:** The VPO system was reinstated on April 4, 2011. In May of 2011, the VPO public access site experienced problems which were quickly addressed and corrected in June, 2011. After members of FVC and GOCCP participated in a focus group with Appriss, VPO’s vendor, Appriss agreed to work on changes to the system. The council met its goal to continue its education of the public regarding VPO registration in the upcoming year.

**Comprehensive Domestic Violence Providers Subcommittee:** In January 2011, the Council adopted the Comprehensive Domestic Violence Program Subcommittee. This Subcommittee was comprised of directors of domestic violence programs who, as a result of their work, shared similar challenges. They completed a list of short-term goals and best practices for the upcoming year.

**Public Awareness:** On October 31, 2011, the FVC took part in a Press Conference hosted by Governor Martin O’Malley to honor domestic violence awareness month and announce $2.2 million in awards to over 50 organizations through STOP Violence Against Women’s Act (VAWA). Also in October, for domestic violence awareness month, the FVC and the House of Ruth sponsored the “Silent Witnesses Exhibit” in the State House. The Silent Witnesses Exhibit is a nationwide initiative that showcases the devastating effects of domestic violence using cardboard life-sized cut outs bearing the story and name of a woman who once lived and whose life ended violently at the hands of a husband, ex-husband, partner, or acquaintance.

**Legislative Enhancements:**
- **HB 407/SB 747 - Domestic Violence – Additional Relief – Award of Temporary Possession of Pet:** Authorizes a District Court Commissioner/judge to order the temporary possession of a pet in an interim, temporary, or final protective order.
- **HB 647/SB 317 - Homeowners Insurance – Victims of Crimes of Violence – Discrimination Prohibited:** Prohibits insurers from using information about an individual’s status as a victim of a crime of violence to take certain actions relating to a homeowner’s insurance policy or denying payment to an innocent co-insured person.
- **HB 666/SB 480 - Courts - Peace Orders:** Alters the penalty, for a second or subsequent offense, for a person who fails to comply with the relief granted in an interim, a temporary, or a final peace order.
- **HB 667/SB 342 - Courts - Peace Orders – Penalties:** Allows a judge the discretion to grant an extension of a peace order for an additional six months after a hearing.
HB 1047 – Rental Housing - Tenant Victim of Domestic Violence or Sexual Assault - Lease Payment Obligation: Limits the liability under a residential lease if a tenant victim of domestic violence or sexual assault terminates the lease and vacates the premises; and authorizing the tenant victim to terminate future liability under the lease except for a specified period of time after providing notice of an intent to vacate.

2012

Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Programs: On Monday, January 23, 2012, the Lieutenant Governor announced the Meritus Medical Center in Washington County as the sixth Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Program for Maryland. On November 16, 2012, the Lt. Governor recognized the Greater Baltimore Medical Center as the state’s seventh program. Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Programs provide an opportunity for healthcare professionals to investigate and treat victims of violence and abuse while offering hospitals a significant savings by reducing hospitalizations and related chronic illnesses.

Abuser Intervention Programs: The FVC certified 30 Maryland AIP programs in total by adding two new programs in 2012: SARC in Harford County and My Covenant Place in Prince George’s County. Reviews concluded in November with all existing programs passing successfully.

Lethality Assessment Program: There was statewide support for the Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) and 100% of Maryland law enforcement agencies that respond to calls for service committed to its use. All Maryland agencies, with the exception of the Baltimore Police Department (BPD), use the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence (MNADV) LAP model. As of October 2012, this included 86 police departments who conduct approximately 10,000 lethality assessment screens annually. In addition, the Baltimore City Police Department (BPD) utilizes a slightly different LAP model in conjunction with the House of Ruth. BPD aimed to implement LAP citywide in 2013 and to administer approximately 8,000 screens per year. All 30 police departments in Prince George’s County began administering lethality assessments as of October 23, 2012. GOCCP awarded 18 federal and state grants totaling $1,104,854 for the integration of LAP across the state. In Prince George’s County alone, GOCCP awarded $217,650 in grants designed to implement LAP.

Legislative Enhancements: During the 2012 Legislative Session the Council supported key pieces of legislation that were enacted into law:

- HB 8/SB 175 – Crimes – Electronic Communication – Harassment: Changes the prohibition against using electronic mail with the intent to harass to prohibit engaging in electronic communication with the intent to harass; changing the defined term "electronic mail" to "electronic communication" and altering the definition; and establishing penalties for a second or subsequent violation of the Act.
- HB 1146/SB 647 - Domestically Related Crimes – Reporting: Requires the court, on request of the State's Attorney, to determine whether a crime for which a defendant is convicted or receives a probation before judgment disposition is a domestically related crime; requiring the state to bear the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the crime is a domestically related crime; requiring a finding by the court that a crime is a domestically related crime to become part of the court record for specified purposes and to be noted on the offender’s RAP sheet.
- HB 1160 Family Law - Temporary Peace and Protective Orders – Duration: Extends the duration of a temporary peace order or a temporary protective order under specified circumstances.
- HB 1235 – Public Safety - Emergency Number System - Next Generation 9-1-1: Alters the responsibilities of the Emergency Number Systems Board to include establishing planning guidelines for next generation 9-1-1 system plans and deployment of next generation 9-1-1 service; authorizing the Board to limit a request for reimbursement to counties for the cost of enhancing a 9-1-1 system; and defining "next generation 9-1-1".
SB 291/HB 769 – Unemployment Insurance - Coverage - Victims of Domestic Violence: Prohibits the Secretary of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation from charging specified unemployment insurance benefits against the earned rating record of an employing unit; authorizing the Secretary to find that a cause of voluntarily leaving employment is good cause if it is directly attributable to the individual or individual's immediate family member being a victim of domestic violence and the individual provides specified information; providing that specified information provided to the Secretary is confidential.

2013

Abuser Intervention Programs: In May 2013, the FVC received 32 applications for Abuser Intervention Program certification. This included 29 applications for recertification and 3 applications for first time certification. A review was held on July 17th and 27 programs were certified (25 of the 26 applications for recertification were approved and 1 of the 3 new applications was certified). Additionally, 3 previously certified programs were audited in September and their certification remained in good standing. In 2013, there were 32 certified programs in Maryland.

Lethality Assessment Program (LAP): As of October 2013, there were 104 agencies statewide using the lethality assessments covering 89% of Maryland’s population. There was an additional 5 agencies that have been trained and are prepared to implement LAP, which would bring the total population covered to 90%. BPD uses a different model and has lethality assessments in all 9 police districts. Including BPD’s unique model, 99% of the state’s population is using a form of the lethality assessment. LAP is the only program of its kind in the nation that makes use of a screening tool with an accompanying response and referral protocol.

In furtherance of the goal, to reduce violent crime against women and children, GOCCP made lethality assessments a priority area as part of its funding plan under the VAWA grant program. Additionally, GOCCP funded MNADV to train staff within the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), the Department of Human Resources (DHR), and the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) to strategically implement LAP. This project began in January 2013, and MNADV is drafted policies with each agency. Implementation began in the spring of 2014.

Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Program: Health care providers often overlook domestic violence as a possible underlying cause of health problems. As a result, the health care system spends billions of dollars each year treating the consequences of such exposure, rather than addressing the underlying cause. By utilizing domestic violence screening and assistance programs, Maryland hospitals have seen a significant savings by reducing hospitalizations and related chronic illnesses.

Hospital-Based domestic violence programs are a priority for the O'Malley-Brown Administration. Since 2010, the Administration supported the opening of 4 new hospital-based domestic violence programs. Including the newest domestic violence based program at Howard County General Hospital, announced in October 2013, there were 8 programs statewide, all of which are supported by the Administration.

These hospitals provide care for victims of intimate partner violence by providing screening and documentation of abuse, mandated reporting, crisis intervention, safety planning, emotional support, dangerous assessments, and referrals to resources in the community, such as shelters and counseling. These programs also assist hospitals in training their medical staff on recognizing domestic violence and proper screening procedures. Since 2006, GOCCP has provided over $2 million in grant funding to domestic violence initiatives at hospitals; and in 2013 alone GOCCP funded over $500,000 to these programs which served over 1,200 victims.

VINE Protective Order (VPO): VPO trainings were held on May 15 and May 16, 2013. Approximately 150 people attended the training including law enforcement, parole and probation agents and victim advocates. Additional trainings have been held at various victim service agencies. As a result of the trainings, the usage of
VPO has increased over the past year from 3% to 8%. (See additional information about VPO under “FY 2012 Areas of Study” and “Program Updates” subheadings).

Legislative Enhancements: During the 2013 Legislative Session, the Council supported key pieces of legislation that were enacted into law:

- **HB 294/SB 281 – Firearm Safety Act of 2013**: Alters the authorization for a person to wear, carry, or transport a handgun to be within certain limitations; designates certain firearms as assault weapons, and prohibits, with certain exceptions, a person from transporting and assault weapon into the State or possessing, selling, offering to sell, transferring, purchasing, or receiving an assault weapon.

- **HB 838/SB 640 – Civil Cases – Maryland Legal Services Fund – Surcharges – Repeal of Termination**: Repeals the termination date of certain provisions of law altering certain surcharges on certain fees, charges, and costs in certain civil cases and requiring a certain informational budget to be prepared for the Maryland Legal Services Corporation and submitted to the General Assembly; and generally relating to the Maryland Legal Services Corporation Fund.

- **HB 1303/SB 809 – Maryland Legal Services Corporation Funding – Abandoned Property Funds**: Requires the Comptroller to distribute specified abandoned property funds each year to the Maryland Legal Services Corporation Fund and increases the amount of funds that the Comptroller is required to contribute from $500,000 to $3,000,000.

- **SB 1001 – Family Law – Protective Orders – Notification of Service – Sunset Extension**: Extends the termination date of certain provisions of law that provide for notice of the service on a respondent of certain protective orders; and generally relating to notification of the service of a protective order.

2014

**Abuser Intervention Programs**: In May 2014, the FVC received 8 applications for Abuser Intervention Program certification. This includes 3 applications for recertification and 5 applications for first time certification. A review was held on June 19th and 5 programs were certified (all 3 of the applications for recertification were approved and 2 of the 5 new applications were certified). There are now 34 certified programs in Maryland.

**Lethality Assessment Program (LAP)**: As of October 2014, there were 109 law enforcement agencies statewide using the lethality assessments. There were an additional 2 agencies that have been trained and began implementation of LAP. BPD uses a different model and has lethality assessments in all 9 police districts. Including BPD’s unique model, 99% of the state’s population is using a form of the lethality assessment. LAP is the only program of its kind in the nation that makes use of a screening tool with an accompanying response and referral protocol.

Additionally, during the spring of 2014 new policies were put in place and training began for the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), the Department of Human Resources (DHR), and the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) to implement LAP.

**Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Program**: On March 31, 2014, the Lt. Governor recognized the MedStar St. Mary’s Hospital (MSMH) as the state’s ninth Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Program. MSMH received nearly $40,000 in State funds through GOCCP to support its program. On Monday, August 11, 2014, the Lieutenant Governor announced the University of Maryland Medical Center (UMMC) - Shock Trauma as Maryland’s tenth Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Program for Maryland. UMMC - Shock Trauma’s program was funded in part by a $50,000 grant from GOCCP.

In the past four years, the Administration has doubled the number of Hospital-Based Domestic Violence Programs in the state. The Hospital-Based Domestic Violence programs are available at:
VINE Protective Order (VPO): VPO trainings were held at various victim service and law enforcement agencies throughout the year. Three VPO Webinars were held and another is scheduled to take place on December 4, 2014. A statewide training was held on October 14 and 15, 2014. Approximately 450 people including law enforcement, parole and probation agents and victim advocates have been trained during this calendar year. As a result of the trainings, the usage of VPO has increased over the past year from 8% to 12%.

Legislative Enhancements: During the 2014 Legislative Session, the Council supported key pieces of legislation that were enacted into law:

- **HB 397 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Consent Orders - Shielding**: authorizes a respondent who consents to the entry of a peace or protective order to file a written request to shield court records relating to the peace order or protective order proceeding under specified circumstances; requires the court, under specified circumstances, to order the shielding of all court records relating to a peace or protective order proceeding if the respondent consent to the entry of the order.

- **SB 333/HB 307 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Burden of Proof**: Alters the standard of proof by which a judge in certain peace order hearings must make certain findings before a judge may issue a final peace order or mutual peace orders; alters the standard of proof by which a judge in certain protective order hearings must make certain findings before the judge may grant a final protective order or mutual protective order or extend the term of a protective order; and generally relates to the standard of proof in certain peace order and protective order hearings.

- **SB 334/HB 309 – Family Law – Domestic Violence – Permanent Protective Orders**: Requires the court to issue a permanent final protective order against an individual who is sentenced to serve at least five years and has served at least 12 months of the sentence, instead of who served and expands the number of victims eligible for a final permanent protective order by adding the crime of assault in the second degree to the list of crimes, the commission of which subjects an individual to the issuance of a permanent final protective order against the individual under certain circumstances.

- **SB 337/HB 306 – Crimes – Committing a Crime of Violence in the Presence of a Minor – Penalties**: Prohibits a person from committing a certain crime of violence when the person knows or reasonably should know that a minor of a certain age is present in a residence and establishes a certain enhanced penalty for a violation of this Act.

- **SB 369/HB 352 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Penalties – Second or Subsequent Offense**: Makes violations for failing to comply with an interim, a temporary, or a final protective order a prior offense for the purpose of determining penalties for a second or subsequent offense for failing to comply with an interim, a temporary, or a final peace order.

- **SB 434/HB647 – Peace Orders and Protective orders – Extension**: Requires the court, if a motion to extend the term of a final peace order or a final protective order is filed during the term of the order, to hold a hearing within 30 days after the motion is filed; and requires the court, if the hearing is scheduled after the original expiration date of the order, to extend the order and keep the terms of the order in full force and effect until the hearing.
II. **FVC Structure and Goals**

A. **Summary of Executive Order Goals**

1. Advise the Governor through the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention on matters related to family violence.
2. Identify and analyze State policies and programs relating to family violence, including but not limited to:
   a. Collecting data from State agencies relating to the prevention and reduction of domestic violence and related family violence;
   b. Identifying resources available to reduce and prevent family violence through a statewide coordinated effort.
   c. Identifying opportunities for collaboration between governmental units.
3. Examine, or cause to be examined, the relationship between family violence and other societal problems, including but not limited to juvenile delinquency, alcohol and substance abuse, truancy, and future criminal activity.
4. Identify best practices, research and information pertaining to abuser intervention and related programs.
5. Propose to the Governor, through the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention, legislative, regulatory, and policy changes to reduce and prevent the incidence of domestic violence and related family violence, to protect victims and to punish perpetrators.

B. **Reorganization**

In 2012, the FVC members established a new structure to continue progress and provide recommendations to the Governor annually as a body. Members agreed upon a framework whereby 2 – 3 key areas of family violence policy would be selected by a majority vote and championed by one member and a working committee of members for one year. At the culmination of study, each working group would deliver expert research, recommendations, and resources for the Governor and criminal justice partners statewide.

C. **FY 2014 Areas of Study**

1. **Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child Workgroup**

**Problem Statement/Initiative**

In light of the overwhelming evidence regarding the costs of childhood exposure to domestic violence, and in response to the Attorney General’s National Task Force’s recommendation that government officials in all states develop protocols and policy responses to address the issue of Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child, the FVC established the Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child Work Group in FY 2012. Due to the magnitude of the problem, the FVC voted to continue this work for FY 2013 and FY 2014. This year, legislation (SB 337/HB 306 – Crimes – Committing a Crime of Violence in the Presence of a Minor – Penalties) was passed which enhances the penalty for a defendant convicted of a crime of violence committed in
a residence when the defendant reasonably should have known that a minor was within sight or hearing of the crime.

**History of Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child**

Children who witness domestic violence are a major national concern. According to the National Center for Children Exposed to Violence (2006), an estimated 3 to 10 million children are exposed to domestic violence every year. Extensive research over the past three decades indicates that these children are at a greatly enhanced risk for a host of social, behavioral and emotional problems. Childhood exposure to domestic violence has been linked to increased aggression, poor social skills, nightmares, symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), anxiety, depression, lowered academic and intellectual functioning, substance abuse, greater acceptance and approval of violence as a means of resolving disputes, and overrepresentation in the Juvenile Justice and Criminal Justice systems. According to the American Psychological Association, Presidential Task Force on Violence and the Family, “a child exposed to the father abusing the mother is at the highest risk for transmitting violent behavior from one generation to the next.” The Attorney General’s National Task Force on Children Exposed to Violence describes the financial costs of childhood exposure to domestic violence as “astronomical,” pointing out that the “financial burden on other public systems, including child welfare, social services, law enforcement, juvenile justice, and in particular, education, is staggering when combined with the loss of productivity over children’s lifetimes.”

**Workgroup Structure**

The FVC’s Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child was charged with researching existing policies, and developing recommendations (“best practices”) for a coordinated community response designed to mitigate the negative effects of childhood exposure. The goals of the workgroup were to (1) develop a systematic approach for identifying victims of childhood exposure, (2) design protocols and procedures which would decrease the trauma associated with the process of identification, and (3) aid in the identification and development of therapeutic resources for exposed children who are most in need of treatment. After meetings, the workgroup realized the magnitude of the task ahead, and decided in the interests of time and efficiency to divide into specialized subgroups. One subgroup focused on developing the portion of the protocol involving children who were identified through the operation of the criminal justice system. The other subgroup focused on children identified in the school system. In early 2014, the subgroups merged and developed a coordinated protocol.

**Law Enforcement Subgroup**

The Law Enforcement Subgroup of the Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child Workgroup focused on the development of a child focused, evidence based protocol which would be implemented when children are present at the scene of a domestic violence call for service. Currently there is no evidence based assessment tool which can be utilized to screen for child trauma at a domestic violence crime scene. Accordingly, after much deliberation, the subgroup developed a classification and response strategy based on the collective experience of the members. The classification system consists of three (3) tiers, which reflect the subgroup’s assessment of the seriousness of the crime and the likelihood of significant or repeated trauma. Recognizing that resources are limited, the subgroup developed graduated responses based on the tier level. See chart on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony cases</td>
<td>Lethality assessment conducted with screen in</td>
<td>Any other domestic violence case with a child living in the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is eyewitness to assault with injury</td>
<td>Repeat calls (2 or more prior domestic violence calls)</td>
<td>repeat calls (2 or more prior domestic violence calls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangulation</td>
<td>Assault with injury not witnessed by child</td>
<td>Gut check for child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate team approach</td>
<td>Police referral to social worker/victim advocate</td>
<td>Brochure and Referral List</td>
<td>Brochure and Referral List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Interview within 24 hours</td>
<td>Follow-up by social worker/victim advocate as soon as possible but within 48 hours</td>
<td>Trained police response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma assessment and referral</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure and Referral List</td>
<td>Brochure and Referral List</td>
<td>Brochure and Referral List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained police response</td>
<td>Trained police response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A number of the phrases which appear in the chart require further explanation.

The “immediate team approach” referred to in Tier 1 will necessarily differ from one jurisdiction to another. Maryland is a very diverse state, with small densely populated areas, such as Baltimore City, as well as large, rural, sparsely populated regions. An approach which is feasible and cost-effective in one jurisdiction, may not be so in another. Ideally this response would involve a multi-disciplinary team of law enforcement officers and specially trained victim advocates, who would respond to the crime scene in all Tier 1 cases. While the law enforcement officers conduct their investigation, the victim advocate would provide immediate services to the adult and child victims, including crisis counseling, safety planning and resource identification. In those jurisdictions in which a victim advocate may not be available to accompany the law enforcement officer, an immediate telephone contact with a victim advocate may be an acceptable substitute.

A “forensic interview” for children at least five years old is necessary because a child witness is likely to be summoned to testify in a criminal prosecution of the case. The sooner the forensic interview is conducted, the
less likely the child’s memory will fade or be tainted by outside influence. This interview should be conducted by a forensic practitioner trained in administering a recognized and evidence based forensic protocol.

There are currently at least four recognized “trauma assessment” tools in use across the country; however none deals directly with exposure to domestic violence. In the absence of a standardized tool for these cases, the subgroup strongly recommends that criteria be developed for therapists who receive referrals through this protocol. While there are at least three recognized treatment approaches for traumatized children, each requires a therapist who has completed a significant amount of training and supervision in the treatment modality.

The “brochure” which would be given to all victims in all three tiers has undergone a great deal of revision. A clinical subgroup was enlisted to provide a working draft. The draft, entitled “Fighting in the Home: Is Your Child Being Affected?” was submitted to two focus groups composed of victims of domestic violence. The focus groups were asked the following questions:

- What was your overall reaction to the brochure?
- What was most helpful about the brochure?
- Is there anything that you would change about the brochure?
  - What about the wording?
  - What about the pictures?
  - What about the title?
- Would you have any concerns if others in your household saw this brochure and read it?
- How would you feel if your children read this brochure?
- If your partner saw this brochure, would it put you in danger?
- Would you use this brochure if you and your children needed help?

While both groups found the information helpful, they were less enthusiastic about the presentation. With their comments in mind, the workgroup intends to (1) develop a small card with important contact information which can be left in place of the brochure, and easily hidden by the victim, and (2) convene a group of clinicians and victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) to develop a brochure which may be disseminated in a variety of locations, such as doctors’ offices, pediatric offices, social service agencies, and libraries. The workgroup also recommends that funding be identified for the distribution of the brochure.

Finally, the workgroup recognized that the presence of law enforcement officers in the home, and the process of a criminal investigation and arrest, could be very scary for the children at the crime scene. In an effort to avoid retraumatizing children who may already be traumatized due to the abusive incident, an attempt was made to develop an acceptable “trained police response.” Members of the workgroup reviewed a number of reports and manuals published by various organizations nationwide, but found only generalized suggestions. The workgroup wanted an instruction curriculum which could be incorporated into a training video, with specific situations acted out for the viewer. Fortunately members of the workgroup were able to locate a study currently underway at the Yale Child Study Institute at Yale University in Connecticut. The researchers involved in the study are attempting to develop an evidence based best practice approach to reduce additional trauma for children involved in police investigations. After several discussions with the Yale researchers, it was agreed that Maryland would be a promising site for a pilot study of their proposal, once completed, and at that time the completed proposal would be shared with us. Members of the workgroup consulted with staff from the Maryland Police Academy, who agreed to assist with the implementation of the curriculum once it is developed.
School Subgroup

The Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child School Subgroup has focused on the identification of resources for children that have witnessed domestic violence, and on the possibility of law enforcement notifying the school system when a child has witnessed domestic violence. Through research completed by the workgroup, it was found that no policy or regulations exist pertaining to the sharing of information by law enforcement with the school system when a child witnesses domestic violence. It was noted that School Resource Officers (SROs) are the connection between the school system and law enforcement. As such, it is the recommendation of the subgroup that the GOCCP work with the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence (MNADV) to strengthen training on the topic of the effects of domestic violence on children and sensitivity training to school personnel including SROs. Additionally, the workgroup recommends that training on the effects of domestic violence be included at the following conferences:

- The Annual Child Abuse Suicide Prevention Conference; and
- The Director’s of Student Services, Coordinators and Supervisors of Pupil Personnel, and School Counselors Training.

The Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child Workgroup School Subgroup has also focused on identifying resources for children that have witnessed domestic violence. Through research completed by the workgroup, it was noted that no directory exists on where to refer children to for services. It is the recommendation of the workgroup that GOCCP work with the Maryland Statistical Analysis Center (MSAC) to develop a survey on the services that are available to children that witness domestic violence, and be circulated by members of the FVC. From the responses received from the survey, it is recommended that a directory of the services available to children be made available on the GOCCP website, and be provided to the FVC members for future dissemination.

2. Abusers Not Meeting the Conditions of Court Orders

The Abusers Not Meeting the Conditions of Court Orders Workgroup's initial focus was to determine what happens to abusers when they fail to satisfy the condition(s) of a court order. After significant discussion, the workgroup determined that it must first determine what the consequences are when an abuser fails to satisfy the term(s) of a court order. Subsequently, the workgroup concluded that to determine what is happening to offenders, it must gather data pertaining to violation of probation. As a result, this task was identified as a data project. The workgroup identified the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Community Supervision (DPSCS) as the agency tasked with collecting data for analysis. The workgroup met with staff of DPSCS and reviewed their Offender Case Management System (OCMS) in which Community Supervision Agents track case information on offenders. The workgroup identified data fields that they requested to be added to the OCMS system to capture information related to the outcomes of abusers that have conditions imposed as a result of a court order. The data fields and related notes that were requested by the workgroup include the following:

I. **Warrant or Summons Requested**

   a. Warrant or summons requested (check one) *(make all fields below mandatory if agent checks that a warrant or summons is requested)*

   b. Date of request *(already captured)*
c. Technical or new offense (already captured)

d. If technical, nature of violation

i. Need DPSCS to create a list for a drop-down menu here, something that is comprehensive but not overwhelming e.g. “failed to meet with PO;” “failed drug test;” “failed to attend AIP;” “failed to attend drug treatment;”

ii. Need ability to select more than one option. Also want a “check all” option for absentee cases. Need to find out how selection of multiple options would appear in report.

e. If new offense, offense type (already captured)

f. Same victim Y/N?

II. Response to Warrant or Summons Request

a. Response from court received? Check if yes. (Make next two fields mandatory if this box is checked.)

i. Date of court response

ii. Check one: Warrant Issued / Summons Issued / No action taken

b. Warrant or Summons resolved w/o VOP hearing. Check if yes. (Next questions mandatory if checked.)

i. Check one: Warrant quashed (if checked, prompt to add date quashed)/ Case consolidated (if checked, prompt to add case number and court)/ Other (if checked, prompt agent to record reason in their notes)

III. VOP Hearing Date

a. Original Hearing date: enter MM/DD/YYYY (this is already recorded but needs to be changed so the system saves this and it does not get overwritten by subsequent postponements).

b. For the hearing outcomes page, it should appear to the agent as a menu with hearing dates. The agent can then click on the date and select EITHER: Postponed and Rescheduled OR Hearing Held.
i. If the agent selects postponed and rescheduled, prompt to enter a new hearing date. That date will then appear on the menu of dates, and agent can later select that date and choose Hearing Held or Postponed and Rescheduled.

ii. *In reports, we want to be able to query, for each case “how many postponements” and also “original set date” and “actual trial date.”*

c. If the agent chooses hearing held, above, next mandatory question is Violation Found? Yes or No
d. Add a query for Name of Judge.

IV. **VOP Hearing Outcome: No Violation Found**

If court finds NO VIOLATION, go to fields below, make all mandatory

a. CHECK ONE: Probation continued or case closed

b. Any conditions removed? Y or N

i. If Y checked above, what conditions? Should call up a list of conditions that apply to that case, with a check box next to each, and instructions CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

c. Any conditions added?

i. If Y, drop-down menu of conditions.

V. **VOP Hearing Outcome: Violation Found**

If court finds there was a VIOLATION, go to fields below, make all mandatory

a. FINDINGS

i. Did the court find a technical violation? Y/N

1. If Y, drop down menu of technical violations, check all that apply. This list should include the option of “failure to attend an Abuser Intervention Program” *(as distinct from other types of programs like anger management).*

ii. Did the court find a new charge or conviction (from here forth referred to as a rule 4 violation)? Y/N

1. If Y, did the Rule 4 violation involved the same victim? Y/N

a. If Y, drop down menu of rule 4 violations; this list should include violation of a protective order.
b. SENTENCING

i. Choose one: Case Closed – Unsatisfactory / Continued (no incarceration) / Revoked
   (incarceration or split sentence)

ii. If Probation continued:
   1. Probation term extended? Y / N
   2. If Y to above, credit for time served? Y / N
   3. New probation term end date MM/DD/YYYY

iii. If Probation revoked
   1. Choose one: Incarceration only OR Split Sentence
      *(Incarceration with probation to follow)*
   2. Incarceration term (Years XX Months XX)
   3. Credit for time served (Years XX Months XX)
   4. Suspended (Years XX Months XX)
      a. Suspended sentence extended? Y/N
      b. If yes to above, credit for time served? Y/N *(not sure if this is needed here as it is captured under V. b.2)*
      c. Was the length of the suspended sentence extended as a result of the VOP?
      d. Was either the period of probation OR the length of the suspended sentence shortened at the VOP sentencing?
   5. End of new probation term (MM/DD/YYYY or N/A)

C. CONDITIONS MODIFIED

i. Any conditions of probation removed? Y/N
   1. If Y, check all that apply *(pull up list of conditions that apply to the case)*

ii. Any conditions of probation added? Y/N
   1. If Y, check all that apply *(list of possible conditions)*
After the requested data fields were provided to DPSCS, the agency committed to making some of the requested changes to the OCMS. DPSCS developed a timeline in which the requested changes to the OCMS would be completed. The changes to the OCMS will not occur until after the enhancements to the OCMS are completed, after July 1, 2014. Once completed, DPSCS will make adoptions and updates to the OCMS for the data fields. The workgroup recommends that GOCCP continue to work with DPSCS on this matter and that the workgroup meet quarterly until the requested changes are completed. Once this is completed, it is the recommendation of the workgroup that the FVC track the data in OCMS as they relate to the outcomes of offenders that have been imposed conditions on a court order, and identify any trends as they relate to the offenders who do not meet the conditions of court orders. In addition based on the results of the data tracked, it is recommended that the FVC identify any potential reforms that justify changes to Abuser Intervention Programs (AIP). It is further recommended that the data on abusers who do not meet the conditions of court orders be consistently captured in the OCMS.

D. FY 2014 Areas of Study

Council members presented topics for the upcoming year at the July 2014 FVC meeting. For FY 2014, the following topics were suggested and voted on:
- Best Practices for Family Justice Centers;
- Abuser Intervention Programs Certification and Audit Process Review;
- Teen Dating Violence;

After a Council vote, Best Practices for Family Justice Center and Abuser Intervention Programs Certification and Audit Process Review were chosen as the focus topics.

E. Best Practices for Family Justice Center

The purpose of this workgroup is to establish recommendations for Best Practices and Alternatives for Family Justice Centers Statewide and to promote the development of Family Justice Centers in Maryland. The goal is to develop a comprehensive plan that, if implemented, will aid counties throughout Maryland in developing Family Justice Centers that make victims safer, hold offenders accountable and provide wrap around services, which includes mental health and long-term support for victims and their families through collaboration and coordinated services. Currently, Montgomery and Harford counties have Family Justice Centers in operation, and Prince George’s county is in the process of developing one.

E. Abuser Intervention Programs Certification and Audit Process Review

The purpose of this workgroup is to identify barriers that hinder abuser intervention programs from meeting the Operational Guidelines for Abuser Intervention Programs as set forth by the Governor’s Family Violence Council. The goal is to ensure that certified abuser intervention programs meet the Guidelines in practice and to develop a protocol for certified programs that are not in compliance with the Guidelines.
III. **PROGRAM UPDATES**

A. **VINE Protective Order**

In an effort to increase the usage of VPO, the FVC Coordinator conducted several trainings at various domestic violence agencies and coordinated a statewide VPO training. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) added VPO information to Petitions for Protective Orders and Interim, Temporary, and Final Protective Orders. Additionally, effective January 2014, a special condition and performance measure to promote the usage of VPO was added to grants funded through GOCCP to victim service providers and law enforcement agencies.

B. **Abuser Intervention Program:**

This past May, the FVC received 8 applications for Abuser Intervention Program certification. This included 3 applications for recertification and 5 applications for first time certification. A review was held on June 19th and 5 programs were certified (all 3 of the applications for recertification were approved and 2 of the 5 new applications were certified). There are now 34 certified programs in Maryland. No programs were audited this year; however, the FVC voted to amend the audit process. The new audit process requires that certified programs be audited within a three year time span from the date the program was certified. Additionally, a Complaint Report form was developed. After an investigation, a complaint could potentially bring about an audit of a certified program.

C. **Legislative Subcommittee**

The Legislative Subcommittee is responsible for helping to draft and present bills for legislation. Bills must obtain a majority vote within the FVC before being presented for legislation.

*During the 2014 Session the Council supported several key pieces of legislation that were enacted into law:*

- **SB 333/HB 307 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Burden of Proof:** Alters the standard of proof by which a judge in certain peace order hearings must make certain findings before a judge may issue a final peace order or mutual peace orders; alters the standard of proof by which a judge in certain protective order hearings must make certain findings before the judge may grant a final protective order or mutual protective order or extend the term of a protective order; and generally relates to the standard of proof in certain peace order and protective order hearings.

- **SB 334/HB 309 – Family Law – Domestic Violence – Permanent Protective Orders:** Requires the court to issue a permanent final protective order against an individual who is sentenced to serve at least five years and has served at least 12 months of the sentence, instead of who served and expands the number of victims eligible for a final permanent protective order by adding the crime of assault in the second degree to the list of crimes, the commission of which subjects an individual to the issuance of a permanent final protective order against the individual under certain circumstances.

- **SB 337/HB 306 – Crimes – Committing a Crime of Violence in the Presence of a Minor – Penalties:** Prohibits a person from committing a certain crime of violence when the person knows or reasonably should know that a minor of a certain age is present in a residence and establishes a certain enhanced penalty for a violation of this Act.

- **SB 369/HB 352 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Penalties – Second or Subsequent Offense:**
Makes violations for failing to comply with an interim, a temporary, or a final protective order a prior offense for the purpose of determining penalties for a second or subsequent offense for failing to comply with an interim, a temporary, or a final peace order.

- **SB 434/HB647 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Extension:** Requires the court, if a motion to extend the term of a final peace order or a final protective order is filed during the term of the order, to hold a hearing within 30 days after the motion is filed; and requires the court, if the hearing is scheduled after the original expiration date of the order, to extend the order and keep the terms of the order in full force and effect until the hearing.

- **SB 790 – Health Insurance – Communications Between Carriers and Enrollees - Conformity with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA):** Increases privacy and confidentiality for domestic violence victims by requiring the Maryland Insurance Commissioner to develop and make available a specified form for enrollees to use to request confidential communications from health insurance carriers.

**During the 2014 Session the Council supported several key pieces of legislation that subsequently died:**

- **SB 41/HB 775  – Domestic Violence – Persons Eligible for Relief:** This bill would have moved dating violence and sexual assault out of the peace order statute and into the protective order statute. It would add to persons eligible for relief “an individual who has had a consensual or nonconsensual sexual relationship with the respondent.” Dating violence and sexual assault are volatile cases that need the special attention and more comprehensive relief found in the protective order statute. Over 41 other states currently include dating violence in their protective order statutes. Passed in Senate, No action in House

- **HB 1182 – Family Law – Protective Orders – Additional Relief:** This bill would have authorized a judge in a final protective order to order the respondent to remain a specified distance away from the residence, place of employment, school, or temporary residence of a person eligible for relief. Passed in House, No action in Senate

**The Council opposed the following domestic violence bills which passed after it was heavily amended to provide more protections for domestic violence victims:**

- **HB 397 – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Consent Orders - Shielding:** authorizes a respondent who consents to the entry of a peace or protective order to file a written request to shield court records relating to the peace order or protective order proceeding under specified circumstances; requires the court, under specified circumstances, to order the shielding of all court records relating to a peace or protective order proceeding if the respondent consent to the entry of the order.

**The Council opposed the following domestic violence bills which did not pass:**

- **HB 282 – Family Law – Peace Orders and Protective Orders – Shielding:** This bill would have required a court, if a peace or protective order petition was dismissed or denied, to order the shielding of all court records related to the proceeding within five business days of the denial or dismissal.

**IV. LOOKING AHEAD: GOALS FOR 2015**

In 2015, the FVC will pursue the following goals:

- Deliver work group recommendations for Best Practices – Family Justice Centers
- Deliver work group recommendations for Abuser Intervention Programs Certification and Audit Process Review
• Deliver final work group recommendations for Abusers Not Meeting Conditions of Court Order.
• Deliver final work group recommendations for Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child.
• Increase usage of VPO by providing more training and outreach.
• Expand Maryland hospital-based domestic violence programs.
• Build capacity of Maryland domestic violence organizations.
• Advocate for key legislation: The Council is committed to developing the momentum and awareness necessary for a successful legislative session in 2015 and has already begun this process by meeting as a full council and discussing potential legislation. There are several pieces of legislation expected for the upcoming session, including:
  – *Strangulation* – Making strangulation either a separate crime or an extended penalty. Previous legislation to advance this concept has died in various forms.
  – *Additional Relief for a Protective Order* – Allowing additional relief to be added to the protective order, including ordering that the respondent remain a certain distance away from the petitioner.
  – *Protective Orders* – Allowing victims of dating violence and sexual assault to be eligible for protective orders, rather than peace orders.
  – *VINE Protective Order Sunset*
• Complete certification and review of Abuser Intervention Programs.
• Identify and appoint additional members to council.
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