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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP) retained Strategy and Management Services, Inc. (SAMS) to conduct a Statewide Victim Services Needs Assessment. The report, which follows, presents the results of the study. This study was designed to assess the efficacy of current victim services. Additionally, the report will identify areas GOCCP can give priority attention in its efforts to promote access to victim services, especially for the underserved, while executing the goals of federal grants awarded to Maryland. The project team has assembled this final report, which summarizes our findings, conclusions, and opportunities to improve victim services and optimize the utilization of funds.

ES.1 BACKGROUND

GOCCP is Maryland’s designated state administering agency for the Federal Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant program. Beginning in 2009, GOCCP received Maryland’s VOCA award to fund direct services to victims of crimes. The primary goal of this initiative is to develop a comprehensive approach to funding, strategic planning, crime data analysis, best practices, research, and results-oriented customer service in order to reduce unmet needs and service gaps.

The activities undertaken by SAMS to complete the Maryland Statewide Victim Services Needs Assessment (MD SVSNA) will provide a roadmap for determining the utilization of funding through the VOCA grant program or other grant programs and accounts for the needs of crime victims throughout the State of Maryland and across victim groups and populations.

ES.2 VICTIMS SERVICES IN CONTEXT

Since its establishment in 1995, GOCCP has vigorously sought to improve services for victims of crime. GOCCP’s efforts continue to be consistent with recognizing the need and importance of gaining an understanding of the effects of trauma and victimization. This endeavor seeks to provide resources that would have a viable impact on the victim of crime services in the State of Maryland. Crime can affect victims multi-dimensionally and, therefore, confront victims with a range of challenging and expanding circumstances to overcome (Figure 1).

---

1 State of Maryland will designate other types of programs. List of GOCCP grants and programs can found at https://goccp.maryland.gov/grants/grants-programs.php
ES.3 SCOPE OF STUDY

GOCCP sought assistance in measuring the needs of crime victims, the current services, and victim service providers within the State of Maryland. Additionally, GOCCP sought this review to complement its continued efforts in maintaining the efficacy of appropriate services that:

- Respond to the emotional and physical needs of crime victims.
- Assist primary and secondary victims of crime to stabilize their lives after victimization.
- Assist victims to understand and participate in court proceedings.
- Provide victims of crime with a measure of safety and security appropriate to their victimization.

The primary intent and goal of this assessment is to promote informed decisions for programming funds for services through the VOCA grant program and a variety of other possible funding programs. Additionally, the intent and goal of this assessment is to ensure that programs and services are responsive and equitably meet the needs of crime victims throughout the State of Maryland and across all victim groups and populations.

In order to meet this intent and goal, the assessment, at a minimum, will:

- Identify the types of services crime victims currently receive and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of such services.
- Identify gaps in services, the impediments to providing services, and the characteristics that hinder services that are more effective.

---

2 GOCCP will designate other types of programs. List of GOCCP grants and programs can found at https://goccp.maryland.gov/grants/grants-programs.php
Identify new needs related to changing demographics or populations (human trafficking, LGBTQ, non-English speaking populations, hospital-based violence interventions, ethnic minorities, etc.).

As a result, the assessment also intends to identify the following:

- What types of victim services are provided within the community and how accessible are these services (e.g., hours, location, language capacity, etc.)?
- Are non-traditional service providers and community members familiar with issues being addressed by the State of Maryland? If so, how familiar are they?
- What are some training needs that should occur for service providers in the State of Maryland?
- Which organizations, current and new, are currently working with victims who are also being (or trying to be) helped by the State of Maryland?

The SAMS project team utilized a variety of data collection and analytical techniques to develop an in-depth understanding of the key issues affecting victim services. To evaluate victim service needs, SAMS conducted:

- **Interviews.** The team conducted in-person interviews with directors, program managers, stakeholders, and subject matter experts, which promoted intelligence gathering, data, and immediate feedback from the interviewee. The project team interviewed a variety of VSOs to achieve a broad perspective of feedback from various programs who did and did not receive VOCA funding. The interview questions found in Appendix A, aimed to discern the challenges the VSOs faced, proposed solutions to those challenges, and training, outreach, and technology needs.

- **Focus Group.** The focus group consisted of 11 survivors of homicide and the victims that used and/or required victim services. Included in this focus group were observers and advocates; however, they did not participate. The targeted focus group responded to a set of structured questions aimed to capture victim user-level experience, service barriers, and improvement recommendations. The focus group questions can be found in Appendix B.

- **Electronic Surveys.** The project team sent electronic surveys to 196 service providers and 146 law enforcement officials. The service provider survey aimed to identify gaps in services, victim’s needs, demographics, geographic, and victimology. The law enforcement survey provided a first responders’ perspective of not only victim service needs, but also the challenges law enforcement officials face in providing services to crime victims. The survey questions can be found in Appendix C.

### ES.4 GAP ANALYSIS

The project team conducted a gap analysis based on four components: victim services, trends, training, and technology. The team also rated the effectiveness of each component based on the following criteria:

- **Yes** - Effective strategies are implemented successfully across the agencies.
- **Yes, but** – Good strategies in place, some limitations or some further work needed.
- **No, but** - This area has not yet been effectively addressed, but some significant work is being done across the agencies.
- **No** - Effective strategies not developed.

The below findings highlight notable gaps identified through the assessment:
VICTIM SERVICES: Service providers ensure readily available access to a seamless continuum of evidence-based services and support that will allow victims to begin physical, emotional, and financial recovery. (Yes, but)

- The growth of the immigrant population (documented/undocumented) stresses the ability to provide appropriate victim services because of lack of training, resources, and support.
- There is a need to reprioritize core victim services to contribute to the immediate physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of crime victims. These services include emergency shelters, Safe Houses, emergency financial assistance, and forensic services. There also appears to be some service shortfalls with substance abuse treatment as it relates to sexual assault and human trafficking victims.
- Resources to provide wrap-around legal services—paid and pro bono, are limited.
- Counseling, substance abuse resources, permanent family housing, job skills training, adult education/high school equivalency diploma, and childcare services are needed but are not readily available.
- Transitional housing resources are not sufficient to support the volume of crime victims.
- Responses received via electronic survey and mandated state partners interviews indicate that approximately 38% of case managers carried caseloads of 25 or more victims of crime. Additionally, 62% of respondents stated the need for additional case manager, advocate, and legal assistance skill sets.
- The preponderance of agencies are open Monday - Friday; however, while there appear to be no obvious gaps in accessibility, there is a desire for more robust availability on evenings and weekends in addition to a broader 24/7 live voice crisis hotline.
- Transportation also raised many concerns because it does not sufficiently support the needs of crime victims. Public bus transportation seemed to be the most available mode of transportation; however, it does have service limitations (e.g., hours of operation, routes, and cost, etc.).
- There was no real indication that initial fee requirements were a limiting factor; albeit, secondary and tertiary fee requirements associated with the crime was a topic of concern.
- Interpretative services for English as Second Language (ESL) victims of crime seem to be imperative to mitigating access to victim services.

TRENDS: Service providers ensure an overall understanding of trends in victimization, help-seeking behavior of crime victims, and the efficacy of their programs and practices as it relates to demographic changes. Service providers also ensure collaborative efforts to reduce confusion of differing methodologies present with regard to crime coverage, crime definitions, data, and trends. (Yes, but)

- Victims of sexual assault and domestic violence crimes persistently seem to be the largest group to receive crime victim services. The volume of these clients appears to have a significant impact on service provider resources and their ability to provide services. This volume creates a multitude of challenges with developing, implementing, and sustaining outreach and public awareness initiatives that could address emerging crimes such as the financial exploitation of elders, human trafficking, and cybersex exploitation.
The growth of communities where English is not the primary language exceeds the capability to provide sufficient bilingual services.

There has been an increase in the financial exploitation of elders without dedicated management of state resources to support them.

**TRAINING:** Service providers ensure evidence-based training is offered to provide tools that facilitate increased capacity to provide effective and efficient victim services. (Yes, but)

- VSOs would like access to national-level subject matter experts in specific disciplines (e.g., Trauma-informed care and human trafficking).
- Training is critical to providing effective and efficient services. This high level of concern among survey participants seems to suggest that standardized statewide training would be critical to success and should be available through a variety of mediums. The limiting factors to meeting such needs are, but not limited to, the cost of training, staff to support operational requirements while conducting training, and creating the time to receive evidence-based training from national-level subject matter experts.
- There appears to be a growing desire among victim support organizations to collaborate with each other in addition to allied professionals while maintaining victim confidentiality.
- While there is evidence the State of Maryland ensures familiarity with the issues at the leadership level, it is not clear whether first-line workers are aware of the same issues.

**TECHNOLOGY:** Service providers ensure the best method of integrating data collection systems and confidential communications to leverage broadened access to educational and training tools and technical assistance. Service providers also harness social media to facilitate outreach and awareness to enhance opportunities to develop and implement future policies and procedures. (Yes, but)

- Respondents desire standardized methods of technology for managing in-takes and referrals. There is also a need for hardware and software upgrades.
- Additionally, respondents would like to see social media more up-to-date (both internal and public facing).
- Performance outcome measures do not appear to effectively and efficiently justify funding and resource allocations.
- There is some indication that service providers are exploring innovative methods for outreach, services, and referrals. How robust these initiatives are remain unclear.

**ES.5 OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING VICTIM SERVICES**

The following recommendations highlight some opportunities to improve victim services.

**VICTIM SERVICES**

- Victims experiencing trauma can be overwhelmed and confused by the various entry-points into victim services. Implementing layered methods of educating victims to reinforce awareness of victims’ rights and services would be beneficial to allowing victims of crimes to mentally and emotionally process available resources while in the midst of trauma.
Additional staff and tools to support the growing ESL population is essential.

Explore alternative sources to Safe Houses and shelters or expand current housing capacity. Review and codify substance abuse protocols and procedures to address victims of crimes that may require emergency shelter or transitional housing. Conduct periodic review of Safe Houses and shelters to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disability Act.

Review and codify in-take protocols and procedures for victims of sexual assault and human trafficking to account for substance abuse and secondary or tertiary victimization.

Distribute additional resources to provide legal and victim/witness advocate services. Seek and build partnerships with university law clinics to increase legal counsel through pro bono services.

Incentivize pro bono services by highlighting attorney/law firm via marketing tools.

Strengthen and develop a more robust network for substance abuse and trauma counseling. Use Memorandums of Understanding to solidify these partnerships and encourage full spectrum wrap-around services.

Create broader peer support groups.

Assess feasibility of modifying mass transportation routes and schedules to facilitate transporting victims to a proximity closer to victim service locations.

Develop affiliates between VSOs, adult education, and literacy services programs in order to enhance self-sufficiency of crime victims.

Collaborate with certified community childcare facilities to reserve scheduled and drop-in spaces for children of crime victims funded through a voucher system.

Maximize workforce and operational capacity resources to sustain daily operations in addition to adapting to the changes in victim needs and services.

Develop and implement standardized in-take, referral, and balanced performance measures scorecards policies, protocols, and procedures.

Review and update policies, protocols, and procedures bi-annually to reflect the most current federal and state guidelines and evidence-based practices.

Ensure some redundancy of 24/7 crisis accessibility resources.

TRENDS

Actively develop and implement various outreach strategies to enhance public awareness.

Aid in the collaboration between victim service providers and allied professionals to develop and conduct public education initiatives.

Utilize Public Service Announcements as a strategic communication tool.

Facilitate the creation of affiliates and collaboration between the community and cultural centers, law enforcement, and victim support agencies, to include faith-based organizations, in order to expand outreach and education opportunities.

Align funding allocations according to demographics and population shifts.
TRAINING

- Increase national-level, subject matter expert education and training opportunities.
- Integrate expert knowledge and best practices to address underserved populations and provide an appropriate level of training consistent with local, state, and national laws, policies, and procedures.
- Develop and implement standardized evidence-based, statewide, education and training that is available through a variety of delivery methods to institutionalize trauma-informed practices.
- Develop and implement confidential communication strategies that allow victim service providers to communicate with each other and allied professionals in a manner that protect the identity and personal information of victims.

TECHNOLOGY

- Provide funding for software and hardware upgrades.
- Develop information technology tools that integrate standardized in-take, referral, and balanced performance measures scorecards.
- Update and standardize websites.
- Develop more robust information technology strategies by expanding social media presence.
- Expand education and training opportunities (e.g., webinars and live streams) to promote and effectively utilize subject matter experts.
- Provide self-paced language training for service providers and incentivize language proficiency for non-native speakers.
1. INTRODUCTION

Each year thousands of Maryland citizens experience a range of crimes including murder, rape, robbery, assault, breaking and entering, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft among others. According to the Maryland 2014 Uniform Crime Report, there were 176,912 total crime incidents reported in Maryland of which 150,375 were property crimes and 26,537 consisted of violent crimes.\(^3\)

Findings provided by the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network (RAINN), indicate sexual assault and domestic violence victims significantly underreport to police, compared to other types of crime, which would contribute to a lower percentage of interpersonal violent crime. An average of 68% of sexual assaults are not reported to the police.\(^4\) In addition to these findings, the following statistics have been identified within the State of Maryland:

- Maryland VOCA recipient service providers reported serving 72,249 crime victims in 2015. In one day, a program can serve more than 1,000 victims and still not have services available for victims.
- Throughout the State of Maryland, 34,729 Protective and Peace Orders were filed for final order hearings in court in 2015.
- It is estimated homicide alone cost Maryland $25,070,987,000, in total lifetime medical and work loss expenses according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention’s Web-based Injuring Statistics Query and Reporting System.
- Baltimore City reported over 300 homicides in 2015.

1.1. ASSESSMENT ROADMAP

The Maryland Statewide Victim Services Needs Assessment identified strengths and weaknesses of services provided by VSOs and the victims need for services through a series of discussions with VSOs and victims. The Assessment will be used to inform readers of the multiple factors that influence the help-seeking decisions for victims, to include:

- **Type of services available**: Victims’ needs vary due to physical, emotional, educational, and financial needs.
- **Accessibility of services**: location, hours of operations, and ADA compliant VSOs.
- **Quality of services rendered**: Victims respond differently and thus, the type of help and support provided by the VSOs can be critical to the current and future needs of victims.

The Assessment included three primary methods for data collection: interviews, focus group, and surveys with VSOs and law enforcement (funded/unfunded by GOCCP). The intent was to gather responses to discern the following:

- Types of services crime victims currently receive and the effectiveness and efficiency of such services.

---


- Gaps in services, the impediments to providing services, and the characteristics that hinder services that are more effective.
- New trends related to changing demographics or populations.

Based on the responses, the Assessment aimed to help the GOCCP identify:

- The types of victim services provided within the community, and the accessibility of the services;
- Whether the service providers and community members are familiar with the issues being addressed by the State of Maryland;
- Service providers’ training needs in the State of Maryland;
- The organizations currently working with victims who are also being helped (or trying to be) by the State of Maryland.

### 1.2. METHODOLOGIES

We used the requirements set forth by the GOCCP to formulate the Assessment and a work breakdown structure that organized the activities to collect qualitative and quantitative data.

The Assessment was guided by a research team that established a protocol and parameters to ensure the data was received and assessed to the recommended standards set by the American National Standards Institute, American Society for Quality (ANSI/ASQ) knowledge body.

The team used a six-step process to manage the collection of data and ensured efficiency, accuracy, and reliability of such.

**STEP 1: Identify population and develop survey-sampling frames**

- Obtain demographic information and develop the sampling frame.
- Obtain maps of the community, including any available GIS maps.
- Collect demographic information from the intervention and control communities, including gender, age, and social-economic data.
- Collect demographic information from the individual settings involved (e.g., workplace, health care, schools), including gender, age, socio-economic data.

**STEP 2: Finalize survey**

- Translate and adapt modules.
- Conduct field tests for all modules.

**STEP 3: Collect data**

- Create and organize questions for interviews, focus group, and surveys.
  - Survey packages for each setting where surveys were administered (police departments, schools, workplaces, health centers).
- Ensure survey modules were correctly labeled and create quality assurance measures to ensure all survey data will be correctly linked with data reported in the MD-SVSNA.
Verify that all surveys collected have signed consent forms (or passive consent for the Youth Module).

STEP 4: Prepare and create data entry strategy and environment
- Create SPSS data entry templates and mapped instruments.
- Set up quality assurance measures to facilitate accurate data entry.
- Train individuals for data entry.

STEP 5: Enter and clean data
- Perform ongoing quality assurance checks of data entered.
- Develop and execute an error check.
- Provide error check and output to Project Manager for review.

STEP 6: Manage and analyze data
- Track data as it comes in.
- Analyze primary variables.
- Discuss preliminary data outcomes.

The research identified the VSOs through the Maryland Community Service Locator’s (MCSL) online database and the GOCCP list of state partners, which were the main sources for crime victim service provider contact information. In addition, multiple coalitions, associations, and federal and state agencies were identified as stakeholders and key participants.

The state partners included:
- Maryland Department of Aging (MDOA)
- Maryland Children’s Alliance
- Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault (MCASA)
- Maryland Crime Victims Resource Center (MCVRC)
- Maryland Human Trafficking Task Force (MHTTF)
- Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence (MNADV)
- Maryland State’s Attorney’s Association (MDSAA)
- The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc.

Various VSOs (e.g., directors, program managers and coordinators, advocates, health practitioners, legal representative, law enforcement, survivors of homicide, state level partners) as well as providers who specifically provide services to underserved population such as children, elderly, the gay and lesbian community, and the Muslim community participated in the data collection and consultation process. Participants also included victims, in particular,

---

Additional crime victim service providers were identified but not contacted due to lack of point of contact information and project time constraints. Data provided by: Maryland Community Services Locator (www.mdcsl.org), CESAR, University of Maryland College Park, 1/8/2016
homicide survivors,\(^6\) as homicide rates increased in several counties throughout the State of Maryland.

Throughout the execution of the Assessment, the participants provided information that was carefully analyzed and integrated into the assessment; however, receiving the information from the various sources in a timely manner contributed to schedule delays. In addition, the lack of a unified/systematic approach to collecting data contributed to misinterpretation in assessing statistical information reported by service providers. Lastly, there were a greater number of victims reported through Maryland’s Uniform Crime Reports and other sources, including reputable newspaper articles, than VSOs, who were providing services.

The research team reviewed and consulted with organizations that produced documents from organizations that were direct award recipients. Those organizations and documents included:

- Office of Victims of Crime (OVC),
- Office of Violence Against Women (OVW),
- National Center for Victims of Crime,
- 2014 Maryland State Police Central Records Division,
- Washington College, Geographic Information Systems (GIS),
- Maryland Community Service Locator,
- Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault,
- Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence,
- 2010-2014 American Community Survey,
- Mid-Shore Council on Family Violence,
- Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention,
- Maryland Statistical Analysis Center,
- The Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence 2015 VOCA Needs Assessment,
- Baltimore County Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team Annual Report 2015,
- Victim/Survivor/Advocate Roundtables 2015 Summary Report and Priorities,
- The Vision 21 Crime Victim Needs Assessment,
- Victims Initiatives from GOCCP,
- Maryland State LGBTQ Domestic Violence Law,
- Certified Abuse Intervention Programs 2015,
- Maryland Safe Harbor Workgroup 2015, and
- Service provider marketing materials, victim related literature, and breaking news reports on violence in Maryland to contextualize the findings and add a holistic point of view to the Assessment.

---

\(^6\) Family and friends of murder victims
2. **KEY FINDINGS**

The Assessment identified gaps in services, needs based on victim’s demographics, geographic, and victimology from VSOs and victims based on seven points of interest to the GOCCP (Appendix E).

1. The types of services crime victims currently receive and the effectiveness and efficiency of the services.
2. The gaps in services, impediments to providing services, and the characteristics that hinder effective service.
3. New needs related to the changing demographics or populations.
4. The type of victim services provided within the community and the accessibility of these services (e.g., hours, location, language capacity, etc.).
5. Service providers and community member’s familiarity with issues being addressed by the State of Maryland.
6. Training needs that should occur for service providers.
7. Organizations currently working with victims who are also being helped (or trying to be) by the State of Maryland.

2.1. **The Types of Services Crime Victims Currently Receive and the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Services.**

**Victim Services Received**

Research of crime victim services and resources in Maryland confirmed that services exist at the national, state, and county levels. Maryland state law\(^7\) allows crime victims to receive a crime victim’s information pamphlet, the immediate transportation to a medical facility for treatment for a victim of sexual assault, the HIV testing of an offender, the assistance with financial compensation filing, and victim rights in the courtroom as well as after offender sentencing. Crime victims currently receive the following types of core services:\(^8\) information, referral, and legal assistance, counseling, and support group resources. Federal and state grant awards dictate the types of victim services funded and are often victimization specific such as child abuse, domestic violence, survivors of homicide, and sexual assault; or population specific such as LGBTQ, immigrant, homeless, veteran, or disabled.

Maryland victims receive services through system-based and non-system based agencies. There are multiple points of entry into victim services through law enforcement, the criminal or civil judicial system, social services, hospitals, mental health facilities, and the education system. Some of these entry points require providers with unique skills or licenses in order to provide specific victim services. Entry through a non-system based VSO (e.g., a non-profit), creates the potential for a holistic\(^9\) approach to victim care. Because victims of crime arrive with

---


\(^8\) Core services are those services that address the immediate emotional, financial and psychological needs of a crime victim.

\(^9\) Holistic approach meets the needs of the whole person from intake to independence and includes services outside of VOCA funding parameters.
a myriad of service needs.\textsuperscript{10} Maryland VSOs create affiliates, memorandums of understanding, and multi-disciplinary teams with allied professionals to meet those additional critical service needs (Table 1).

\textit{Table 1 Services vary among providers and are not exclusive to that organization nor are services all-inclusive.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Services Victims Receive</th>
<th>System based</th>
<th>Non-System based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in Filing Compensation Claims</td>
<td>Office of Attorney General, Social Services, Law enforcement</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Shelter, Online Resource, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises Counseling</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Social Services, Health Department,</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Churches, Shelters, Campus, Hospital, Mental Health Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises Hotline Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Shelters, Hospital, Mental Health Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Legal Advocacy</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Office of Attorney General</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter/Safe House</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Contact</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Health Department</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Religious Organizations, Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Advocacy Centers, Campus Clinic, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Referral</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Office of Attorney General, Social Services</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Religious Organizations, Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Advocacy</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Social Services, Social Services, Hospital</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Religious Organizations, Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Plans (Domestic Violence)</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Social Services</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Shelter, Campus, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Contact</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Office of Attorney General, Social Services</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Religious Organizations, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>Social Services, Health Department, Social Services</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Campus, Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Transportation</td>
<td>Law enforcement, Office of Attorney General</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization, Religious Organizations, Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims’ Rights Legal Service</td>
<td>Office of Attorney General, Law enforcement</td>
<td>Victim Service Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victims of property crime receive victim services primarily from system-based VSOs. While the project team identified two statewide non-profits that provide property crime victim services,\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10} Crime victims average six needs from a list of 23 needs (Safe Horizon study), and an average of four needs from a list of 18 needs (Urban Institute study). (Brickman et al., 2002; Newmark et. al. 2003).

\textsuperscript{11} Maryland Community Services Locator (MCSL) and Maryland Crime Victims Resource Center
there is no clear information that suggests other non-profits offer property crime victim services. Victims receive services such as identity theft counseling, legal advocacy to expedite the return of retained stolen property, arrest notification, and assistance with restitution from the Office of the Attorney General (Table 2).

The research discovered that there is no clear standard or understanding of how service providers categorize crime. There are two non-profit VSOs that list Burglary and Robbery together as well as “non-violent crimes” as a search option; however, how non-violent crimes are categorized/defined or type of services provided is not clear.

Table 2 Services provided are not exclusive to victimization type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Victim Services Providers</th>
<th>Property Crimes</th>
<th>Violent Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Attorney General - Prosecution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Corrections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Judicial System - Court</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Judicial Services – Court</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-System Based Victim Service Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Community Services Locator Online</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency on Aging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Advocacy Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Crisis Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Funding

VOCA funding has been relatively static over the last 9 years (Figure 2). VSOs have consistently indicated that the lack of funding has contributed to limited victim services, provided and received. Additionally, the funding levels has not facilitated the growth of victim service opportunities. VSOs rely on grants to build infrastructure and service capacity, extend assistance to marginalized crime victim populations, and provide services for emerging crimes such as elder financial exploitation, stalking, human trafficking, and cyber-crimes.12 The desire

---

12 Information from law enforcement survey and interviewees
for more economically stable positions and competitive salaries contributes to VSO staff turnover and is a leading barrier to victims receiving services.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{VOCA_Fund_Allocations_2006-2015.png}
\caption{Data from National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators}
\end{figure}

\subsection*{2.1.2. Survey Findings}

\textbf{Victimization Experienced}

According to the 2015 Maryland Statewide Crime Victim Services Needs Assessment results (MD SCVSNA), VSO responded that the greatest number of victim services provided were to victims of sexual assault (83%), dating/domestic violence (79%), intimate/marital/domestic rape (76%), aggravated assault (75%), and stalking or harassment (74%) (Figure 3). Law enforcement indicated that drug related crimes and domestic violence are having the largest impact on limited victim resources. Drug crimes are manifesting as survivors of homicide or overdose, larceny-theft, gang violence, robbery, burglary, and human trafficking. As trauma victims self-medicate, they are more likely to commit crimes to sustain their drug-use habits. Many times, delayed trauma symptoms are misdiagnosed as mental illness.

\textsuperscript{13} Information from electronic survey and interviewees
Survey respondents indicated that the following underserved populations are the most challenging to serve because of the lack of resources, training, and support:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Electronic Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Type of Underserved Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>Immigrants (documented and undocumented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>Human Trafficked Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

Challenging Underserved Populations

Sixty-four percent of the law enforcement respondents indicated that substance abusers are the most challenging underserved population because of the volume of victims and lack of
community resources. Additionally, 40% of the law enforcement respondents indicated the elderly and youth are the most challenging to support (Figure 4)

![Diagram showing Law Enforcement Challenging Underserved Populations](image)

*Figure 4 *Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

**Most Requested and Provided Services**

Sixty-nine percent of the VSOs indicated that court accompaniment was the most provided victim service (Figure 5). One-hundred percent of the Survivors of Homicide focus group participants also stated that court accompaniment was the most important victim service received. Additionally, a 24-Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services survey concluded that 73% of the survey participants viewed emergency shelter service as the most important service provided while 55% viewed court or legal accompaniment/advocacy and therapy/counseling for adults as the most important provided service.  

---

14 2015 Domestic Violence Counts: A 24-Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services
Figure 5 Data from the electronic survey. *Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.
Law enforcement partners with allied professional, builds and utilizes personal relationships, and collaborates with various other networks as a means to overcome many barriers and impediments to victim services. Also noted, is that 68% of the law enforcement respondents desire on-site crisis counseling and 44% desire victim services for children, information and referral services, legal advocacy/accompaniment services, and abuser intervention services (Figure 6).

![Diagram showing Law Enforcement Requested Victim Services]

*Figure 6 Data from the electronic survey *Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

2.1.3. Efficiency and Effectiveness

The project team determined that in order to assess whether a program or service is efficient relative to the investment, or if it is effective relative to predefined victim outcomes at the user-level, more information is needed. Comparing the number of victims seeking a service (input) against the number of victims receiving that service (output) does not solely provide a quantifiable result of the efficiency and effectiveness of that service (outcome). In addition to comparing input, output, and outcome data, assessing the results of those starting and those finishing a service and victim satisfaction results with the service provider’s strategic plan, goals, and objectives could provide a clearer picture of program efficiency and effectiveness.

In 2015, 112 VSOs reported performance measures on a number of victims receiving Victim Information & Notification Everyday (VINE) Protective Order (VPO) assistance (input) and those referred to VINE Protective Order assistance (output). The following table is a comparison between the two performance measures:

---

15 Information from the electronic survey
While 38% of VSOs provided no VPO registration or deferment services in FY 2015, 51% deferred services more often than they provided registration assistance. Eleven percent reported the same number of registration services as deferment services even if that number was as few as 1:1. When comparing FY 2014 reported domestic violence (DV) incidents with FY 2014 Protective Order (PO) reports (Figure 7), there is a disparity between DV crimes reported and VPO filings in many of the counties.

Figure 7 Domestic violence reports from 2011-2014 and protective orders filed in 2014. Data from GOCCP
Furthermore, the electronic survey results reflect additional opportunities to address the effectiveness and efficiency of areas to include, but not limited to, customer satisfaction surveys, the number of repeat victims, and the number of requests that go unmet. Customer satisfaction surveys are also not routinely conducted. VSOs estimated the number of repeat victims and unmet requests because there is no standard method to collect this data.

- In the last 3 years, 81% of the electronic survey respondents had not conducted a customer satisfaction survey or internal victim services needs assessment.
- In the last year, 36% of the electronic survey respondents estimated that 25% or more of their crime victims were repeat victims.
- In the last year, 68% of the electronic survey respondents estimated that less than 5% of victim requests go unmet.
- According to the 2015, 24-Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services, there were 76 unmet requests in 1-day, of which 45% were housing requests\(^\text{16}\).

**Recommendations:**

- Invest in core services by building capacity (infrastructure, staff, affiliates), strengthening effectiveness (expanding services and locations), and focusing efforts (underserved populations).
- Invest in holistic (incident to independence) services in high-need locations.
- Standardize and promote effective and efficiency service and program measures for real-time analytics.

\(^{16}\) 2015 Domestic Violence Counts: A 24-Hour Census of Domestic Violence Shelters and Services
2.2. Identify Gaps in Services, the Impediments to Providing Services, and the Characteristics that Hinder Services that are More Effective

2.2.1. Gaps in Services

To identify the gaps in services victims typically need but did not adequately receive, the participants were asked about the following six categories of services:

- Emergency services
- Legal, advocacy, and financial services*
- Counseling and health services
- Housing services
- Basic or wrap-around services
- Children services

The participants indicated that housing, children services, and basic/wrap-around services were the highest priority needs of the six categories. Table 5 amplifies the specific services that VSOs indicated are the greatest victim needs but are not adequate resources.

Table 5 Current victim service needs that are NOT readily available. Services vary among providers and are not exclusive to that organization nor are services all-inclusive. *Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Additional Victim Service Needs but Limited Availability</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Financial Assistance</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/Safe-House</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food And Clothing</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Forensic</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Legal Advocate</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal, Advocacy, And Financial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Custody Cases</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Bono Legal Services</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Shelter Financial Aid</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce Cases</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Representation</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling and Health Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling – Substance Abuse</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Group –Sexual Violence</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Housing requirements are reflected in two categories, Emergency Services and Housing Services. Victims reported both as the greatest need. Other services, such as legal services, are defined through advocacy, assistance with restitution filings, and court accompaniment. *Note: Services do not extend to child custody and divorce proceedings, which are amongst highest reported needed legal services.
### Counseling – Spiritual Focus
- 37.9%

### Counseling – Sex Offender
- 36.8%

### Housing Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Family Housing</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Individual Housing</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Family Housing</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Individual Housing</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic and Wrap Around Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Training</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education/High School Equivalency Diploma</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Shelter</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search / Placement</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Children Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Facility</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Activity Program</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care During Support Group</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Programs</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2.2. Impediments to Providing Services**

After analyzing the interview comments and VSO participant responses, the project team concluded that the main impediment to accessing victim services is transportation.

**Transportation**

Improving transportation was the number one recommendation by respondents for improving accessibility to services by crime victims. The primary source of transportation to service provider sites include the bus system (86.6%), taxi (76.1%), and own vehicle or family/friend assistance (74.6%). Respondents overwhelmingly indicated paid transportation or travel vouchers would enhance service accessibility for crime victims. Respondents also indicated transportation issues are also a huge barrier and the greatest reason why crime victims are unable to follow through with services.
The map below illustrates a snapshot of how services are clustered together in rural areas where public transportation is not reliable or abundant.

*Figure 8 Known victim service providers. The Map does not include all VSOs. Mapping provided by Washington College, GIS.*

**Service Providers in Maryland**

#### 2.2.3. Characteristics That Hinder Effective Service

After analyzing the interview comments and VSO participant responses, the project team identified three characteristics that hinder effective housing, staff, and technology.

**Lack of Available Housing**

A barrier for VSOs, identified through the interviews and electronic surveys, centered on the lack of various forms of housing. Over 60% of survey respondents indicated that housing was one of the most needed services for victims. The lack of available and affordable housing forces VSOs to turn away or delay services to victims often forcing the victim back into an at-risk environment. One VSO interviewee stated that of the 900 individuals who requested shelter, only one-third could be accommodated due to space.

Because of the unique needs of certain victims, as in the case of human trafficking, transitional housing or shelters can often cause additional stress to the victims rendering the available resources (transitional housing or shelters) ineffective.
Staff

The interviews indicated several staff challenges because of shortages, turnover, and lack of qualified staff.\(^{18}\) Funding can affect the VSO’s ability to retain and educate employees and ensure staff members obtain the proper certifications or licenses.

The shortage of staff, turnover, and low salaries were echoed in the electronic survey as an impediment to providing complete, effective, and efficient services. Only 11.2% of respondents indicated they have a sufficient number of staff. They identified three types of staff positions that would enhance their ability to provide core victim services:

- case managers and social workers
- attorneys and legal assistants
- advocates (court appointed and victim)

Technology

Technology is the main form of administrative reporting, communication, research, and grant notification. The lack of standardized IT solutions created multiple barriers to receiving validated data and assessing performance measures accordingly.

Recommendations:

Invest in services, staff, training, and technology.

- Collaborate with Mass Transit Authority to explore the feasibility of extending public bus transportation routes and schedules to facilitate transporting victims closer to victim service locations.
- Increase staff specifically around bilingual counselors, case managers, social workers, and victim-witness advocates. Staffing increase will maximize victim service and operational capacity.
- Seek alternative and expansive housing solutions to address shortfalls in housing capacity. Investigate the feasibility of a DC SAFE Program type model as a solution to mitigate housing needs.
- Facilitate collaboration between VSOs and real-estate agencies to identify properties and create MOUs that allow victims to have a place to live while receiving care and transitioning from incident to independence.
- Establish mandated training and certification requirements for service providers.
- Distribute additional resources to provide legal and witness victim advocate services. Seek and build partnerships with university law clinics to increase legal counsel through pro bono services.
- Incentivize pro bono services by highlighting attorney/law firm via marketing tools.
- Upgrade Information Technology infrastructure.

\(^{18}\) Thirty-nine percent of the VSOs responded that they had less than 5 part-time staff and more than 15 volunteers.
- Develop and implement standardized data collection, tracking, reporting software and processes statewide.
- Develop and implement a secure and confidential victim services communication system and protocol for use between VSOs, law enforcement, and allied professionals.
- Expand and update social media presence to provide mobile access to victim services and resources (e.g., support groups, online chatting with VSO, and educational/self-help webinars).

2.3. New Needs Related to the Changing Demographics or Population.

Maryland is comprised of 23 counties and Baltimore City. Characterizing demographic shifts can provide insights into the implications for resources, availability, and accessibility of VSO provided services. Understanding Maryland’s demographics could allow VSOs to identify the needs of particular groups of the population, thus being able to create an environment where crime victims feel more comfortable seeking services. VSOs also need to stay abreast of demographic shifts because these shifts will have an impact on available resources.

International migration was a primary contributor to Maryland’s 4.0% population growth. The Suburban Washington and Baltimore regions account for 82.3% of Maryland’s total population (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Census 2010 Population</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Net Natural Increase</th>
<th>International Migration/2</th>
<th>Domestic Migration/3</th>
<th>Residual/4</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>PCT. CNG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE REGION</td>
<td>2,652,705</td>
<td>35,787</td>
<td>12,516</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>-1,484</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>537,654</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>9,756</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-194</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>109.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>801,953</td>
<td>10,215</td>
<td>7,503</td>
<td>19,265</td>
<td>19,348</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1,466</td>
<td>19,266</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll County</td>
<td>167,138</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>11,663</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>-636</td>
<td>11,031</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>244,862</td>
<td>14,138</td>
<td>6,108</td>
<td>10,030</td>
<td>12,206</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>-2,166</td>
<td>12,206</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County</td>
<td>279,085</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>10,037</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>-2,188</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>421,041</td>
<td>40,581</td>
<td>33,222</td>
<td>13,359</td>
<td>12,299</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>-1,060</td>
<td>12,299</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL/WASHINGTON REGION</td>
<td>2,069,710</td>
<td>145,741</td>
<td>67,050</td>
<td>78,691</td>
<td>89,001</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>-12,310</td>
<td>89,001</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>233,395</td>
<td>14,981</td>
<td>6,157</td>
<td>8,824</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>911,805</td>
<td>81,330</td>
<td>63,950</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>833,519</td>
<td>72,120</td>
<td>68,400</td>
<td>13,720</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>-480</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN MARYLAND REGION</td>
<td>340,439</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>12,224</td>
<td>9,076</td>
<td>9,485</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-410</td>
<td>9,485</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline County</td>
<td>81,727</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td>145,551</td>
<td>9,719</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's County</td>
<td>100,151</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN MARYLAND REGION</td>
<td>261,014</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>14,014</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany County</td>
<td>75,087</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>-1,540</td>
<td>-1,540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,540</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett County</td>
<td>30,097</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>147,430</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>-3,683</td>
<td>-3,683</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3,683</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER EASTERN SHORE REGION</td>
<td>229,951</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>11,914</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline County</td>
<td>33,688</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany County</td>
<td>181,163</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County</td>
<td>20,197</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's County</td>
<td>47,776</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>-718</td>
<td>-718</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-718</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot County</td>
<td>37,782</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER EASTERN SHORE REGION</td>
<td>209,272</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>11,355</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester County</td>
<td>33,618</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>26,476</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico County</td>
<td>58,703</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>-968</td>
<td>-968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-968</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico County</td>
<td>61,851</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>-843</td>
<td>-843</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-843</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1) 2010 Census estimate base which reflects changes to the April 1, 2010 population due to the Current Population Survey (CPS) program.  
| 2) This includes net foreign-born migration, net movement between Puerto Rico, and net Armed Forces movement.  
| 3) Net domestic migration also includes the net change in group quarters population.  
| 4) Residual represents the change in population that cannot be attributed to any specific demographic component.  
| Prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, March 2010.

Table 6 Components of Population Change for Maryland’s Jurisdictions, 2010 - 2015

For the period, July 1, 2014, to July 1, 2015, Howard and St. Mary’s Counties reported the largest positive percentage shifts in their populations; 1.53% (4,709 residents) and 0.96% (1,063 residents) respectively. Notwithstanding, Montgomery, and Prince George’s Counties reported the largest increases in their populations; 9,640 and 6,178 residents respectively. During this same
period, Garrett and Allegany Counties reported the largest negative percentage shifts in their populations; (-0.65%) and (-0.66%) respectively. Baltimore City, however, reported largest decrease in population at (-1,862) residents—the largest decrease of any Maryland’s jurisdictions.

2.3.1. **Age and Gender**

- Women comprise 51.6% of Maryland’s total population with 46.7% of the demographic in the 0–19 and 35–49 year-old age groups.
  - Baltimore County has the highest concentration of female residents of all Maryland jurisdictions with 52.7%.
- Of all of Maryland’s jurisdictions, Talbot County has the highest concentration of residents of 65 years and older with 27%.
- St. Mary’s County has the highest concentration of residents 18 years and younger with 25%.
- Prince George’s County has the highest concentration of residents 5 years and younger with 6.7%.

Maryland’s 541.9 people per square mile of land is 7th in the nation in terms of population density. Montgomery County has experienced the highest population growth in the last 4 years; however, Baltimore City remains the densest of all Maryland jurisdictions.

2.3.2. **Racial and Ethnic Composition**

Maryland is considered among the most diverse states in the nation, where minorities account for 47.4% of the total population (Table 7). The vast majority of Maryland’s population growth is led by the Hispanic population, followed by the non-Hispanic African Americans, Asians, and those that identify as two or more races.

---

19 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census.
20 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census. Census 2010 Summary File 1, Geographic Header Record G001.
The concentration of Garrett County’s population is 96.6% White, while Prince George’s County’s population concentration is 74.9% Black or African American. Montgomery County has the largest concentration of the Hispanic population with 34.6%, while Montgomery and Howard Counties have the largest concentration of the Asian population with 18% and 17.9% respectively. Additionally, Charles County has the highest concentration of those that identify with two-or-more races with 3.5% (Table 8 and Figure 9).
## Table 8

### Non-Hispanic Population by Race for Maryland’s Jurisdictions, July 1, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White Alone</th>
<th>Black or African American Alone</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native Alone</th>
<th>Asian Alone</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5,419,036</td>
<td>3,144,704</td>
<td>1,749,444</td>
<td>14,506</td>
<td>373,555</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>133,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Region</td>
<td>2,590,811</td>
<td>1,578,927</td>
<td>795,417</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>148,068</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>60,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>520,037</td>
<td>393,386</td>
<td>89,341</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>21,146</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>14,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>705,518</td>
<td>493,185</td>
<td>224,627</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>48,081</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>17,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>162,793</td>
<td>151,394</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>239,581</td>
<td>193,688</td>
<td>32,128</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>7,452</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>5,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>289,537</td>
<td>171,406</td>
<td>55,578</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>32,110</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>9,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>593,345</td>
<td>175,679</td>
<td>388,000</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>16,459</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Washington Region</td>
<td>1,812,606</td>
<td>786,857</td>
<td>764,659</td>
<td>4,433</td>
<td>205,640</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>49,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>223,166</td>
<td>184,497</td>
<td>21,439</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>10,699</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>837,570</td>
<td>474,126</td>
<td>180,177</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>154,674</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>26,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>751,870</td>
<td>128,234</td>
<td>563,083</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>40,267</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>17,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maryland Region</td>
<td>339,235</td>
<td>223,632</td>
<td>93,613</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>9,497</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>10,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>87,435</td>
<td>71,609</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>146,663</td>
<td>66,904</td>
<td>66,339</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>105,237</td>
<td>83,119</td>
<td>15,543</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Maryland Region</td>
<td>244,338</td>
<td>213,057</td>
<td>21,851</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>71,757</td>
<td>63,779</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>29,382</td>
<td>28,659</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>143,199</td>
<td>121,219</td>
<td>15,626</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eastern Shore Region</td>
<td>229,964</td>
<td>200,388</td>
<td>22,042</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>30,449</td>
<td>25,050</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>98,150</td>
<td>87,961</td>
<td>6,588</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>18,973</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>47,133</td>
<td>42,423</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>35,269</td>
<td>29,404</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore Region</td>
<td>202,082</td>
<td>141,243</td>
<td>51,822</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>31,075</td>
<td>21,026</td>
<td>9,001</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>24,912</td>
<td>13,185</td>
<td>10,902</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>96,233</td>
<td>65,801</td>
<td>24,944</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>49,862</td>
<td>41,231</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Race data has been modified by the U.S. Census Bureau to distribute to designated race groups responses originally reported as "other race."

Prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, from the Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, June 25, 2015.
Minority Population Share for Maryland's Jurisdictions - 2014


Maryland's minority share is 47.4 percent.

Figure 9
2.3.3. Reported Changes in Racial Demographics

The Hispanic population increased by 86,729 residents and 58.8% of this increase was in Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties (Figures 10).

![Chart 1B. Population Change by Non-Hispanic Race & Hispanics for Maryland, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014](chart)

**Figure 10**

2.3.4. Effect Demographic Changes Have on Available Resources

The changing demographics of Maryland has created emerging needs for VSOs to adapt to, as well as, be able to provide effective services and resources. As such, the continuous growth of the documented and undocumented population and the VSOs capacity to effectively provide services and resources has reached critical mass. Currently, support offered specifically for this population is limited, and 44.9% of the service providers indicated that the immigrant/undocumented immigrant population is the largest group they serve and that there is a great need for interpreters and Spanish speaking counselors and advocate (Table 9). The growth of communities where English is not the primary language seems to exceed the capability to provide sufficient bilingual services. The inability to support these groups effectively hinders the capability of VSOs to identify crime victims or discover new/emerging victim of crimes needs. These challenges limit outreach and public awareness opportunities to address such emerging crimes.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Electronic Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Type of Underserved Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>Immigrants (documented and undocumented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>Human Trafficked Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>Substance Abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>Prostituted Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>Prostituted Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>Sex Offenders, Runaways, and Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

Recommendations:

Identify New/Emerging Victim’s Needs

- Conduct a statewide/localized victim of crime needs assessment at least biennially to develop and implement better strategic approaches to reaching victims of crimes in order to provide the most appropriate and effective services and resources.

- Promote VSO, law enforcement, and allied professional training around the unique requirements and approaches to culturally diverse and underserved populations. Specifically, immigrants, the homeless, human trafficked persons, the mentally ill, the disabled, and LGBTQ with focus on the elder community.

- Identify best practices and evidence-based programs to service specific populations that align with results of an annual localized assessment.

- Facilitate the expansion of new services and programs into high need communities to sponsorship and satellites.

2.4. The Type of Victim Services that are Provided within the Community and the Accessibility of these Services (e.g., hours, location, language capacity, etc.).

Location

Victim services located in the community in which they serve, allow for effective outreach and education, improved relationships through trust, as well as the ability to access follow-up services. Responding VSO service areas were somewhat evenly represented in the survey between suburban (33%), urban (32%), and rural (36%). Law enforcement participants represented predominantly the suburban service area with 52%, followed by urban (28%), and rural (20%) service areas. Forty-one percent of VSO programs are within a private non-profit, 30% are within locations not listed and 18% are within attorney’s offices (Figure 11). Forty-eight percent of law enforcement respondents indicated they do not have a crime victim services representative or program, but feel that skill set would improve crime victim services. Law enforcement officials have concerns with the accessibility of victim services and resources as indicated by the following comments.
“Resources are more than 30 miles away”
“I would love to have additional services in-county”
“We use the services of Prince George’s County Police, when available, but rank down the list in terms of priority”

**Figure 11** Victim service organization program locations. Data from electronic survey

The map below gives a snapshot of the domestic violence incident locations in relation to known service provider locations indicated by the star icons. The larger the circles, the farther away from the provider. In this example, many of the domestic violence incidents are as far away as 9 miles. Mapping crime by type and prevalence can be an excellent method to assist providers with outreach, education, and service focus (Figure 12).
Law enforcement participants indicated they foster community relationships through established organizations such as other first responders (84%), schools (76%), community-based organizations (72%), and faith-based organizations (64%) (Figure 13). These outreach efforts promote not only crime awareness but also victim awareness.
**Transportation**

Transportation is a huge accessibility barrier with VSOs. The Eastern Shore is predominately rural and the transportation system is primarily highway. Southern Maryland has a lot of agricultural land with green space between widely spaced towns. Transportation is primarily automobile with a limited system of fixed bus routes. The Washington-Baltimore metro area has a larger variety of transportation options but also has the added strain of population growth and density.²¹

Victims often require assistance getting to and from the court, follow-up appointments, medical and mental health appointments, and a variety of dispersed victim services. Approximately 1/3 of VSOs responded that the bus was available to and from their service location; however that leaves approximately 2/3 without public transportation service accessibly unless they are the 8% where public rail is located (Figure 14). VSOs transportation solutions fell predominantly along three channels:

- Provide paid crime victim transportation
- Expand bus routes to victim service locations and communities
- Expand bus schedule to weekends and evenings for crime victim service locations and communities

---

²¹ [2035 Maryland Transportation Plan, Moving Maryland Forward](https://www.maryland.gov/), (January 2014)
The days and hours victim service locations are open did not seem to be a critical barrier to providing victim services (Figures 15 and 16). However, VSOs emphasized additional evening and weekend hours as being important in meeting the service needs of school-aged children and working adults. Those VSOs that have 24/7 coverage are predominately hospital-based and have 24/7 hospital emergency services or have crises hotline services and resources.
Payment

Ninety-three percent of VSOs indicated that the ability to pay for crime victim services is not an obstacle. Crime victim grant recipients are required to provide victim services free of charge. However, the 93% reflect those services allowed by the grant and do not include services such as divorce, child-custody, or substance abuse treatment. Thirteen percent of VSOs use a sliding scale to determine payment for some services such as types of extended counseling services. Ten percent accept some other form of payment, such as credit card or private insurance.

Language and Culture

Both law enforcement and VSOs found that language and culture were barriers to some victims seeking and receiving appropriate services. There are not enough Spanish-speaking officers, counselors, or therapist. While the language assistance phone service is available, it is “expensive and can be awkward” according to one law enforcement official. Perceived cultural barriers, not understanding the law, and fears of being deported or losing children inhibit some non-English speakers from seeking services.

Facilities

A few VSO suggested that victim facilities need periodic inspections to ensure American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance.

Recommendations:

1. Invest in services and staff
   - Increase numbers of bilingual counselors and therapist statewide as well as bilingual VSO representatives at police stations.
   - Institutionalize trauma-informed practices with an emphasis on local cultures and ethnicities.
- Expand core services and programs, in particular, crises counseling to police stations and restorative justice facilitation to locations in high schools, high gang, and homicide areas, and “safe” locations such as faith-based organizations.
- Invest in a relationship with local Mass Transit Authority to develop and implement transportation solutions to maximize victim access to services (e.g., paid voucher system, weekend, evening, and extended route services, and identify and mark public transportation that accesses police stations and victim service organizations).
- Check for ADA compliance in Safe House, shelters, and VSOs as a requirement for VOCA grant awards.

2.5. Service Providers and Community Member’s Familiarity of Issues Being Addressed by the State of Maryland

2.5.1. Issues Being Addressed by the State of Maryland

To determine the key issues addressed by the State of Maryland, the project team went to the GOCCP website and used the resources listed below to determine the key issues being addressed by the State of Maryland:

- Interviews and Discussions with GOCCP Leadership
- GOCCP Website
- FY2014 Maryland State Board of Victim Services Annual Report
- 2013 GOCCP Annual Report
- Pamphlets:
  - CRIME VICTIMS AND WITNESSES: Your Rights and Services
  - Your Rights as a Victim in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Process

After using the resources listed above, the project team determined that the State of Maryland is interested in assessing whether service provider and community members’ are familiar with the key issues addressed by the State of Maryland.

2.5.2. Service Providers Familiarity of Issues

After collecting data from service providers in the form of interviews and electronic surveys, the project team found that the service provider leadership appears to be very familiar with the key issues addressed by the State of Maryland. On the other hand, according to the leaderships’ responses on the survey, 53.1% of first-line workers are somewhat familiar with these issues, while 32% are familiar, and 14% are not familiar with key issues addressed by the State of Maryland.
**Recommendations:**

- Reinforce awareness of victims’ rights and services to allow victims of crimes to mentally and emotionally process available resources while in the midst of trauma.
- Strengthen and develop a more robust network for substance abuse and trauma counseling.
- Review and codify substance abuse protocols and procedures to address victims of crimes that may require emergency shelter or transitional housing.
- Directors of safe houses conduct periodic review of Americans with Disability Act to ensure compliance.
- Review and codify in-take protocols and procedures for victims of sexual assault and human trafficking to account for substance abuse and secondary or tertiary victimization.
- Distribute additional resources to provide legal and victim/witness advocate services.
- Actively develop and implement various outreach strategies to enhance public awareness. Increase partnerships between victim service providers and allied professionals to conduct public education initiatives.

2.6. **Training Needs that Should Occur for Service Providers in the State of Maryland**

Crime trends are the result of many contributing factors; therefore, the needs of victims of crime will inevitably evolve as well. Because effective training is considered a key factor for improved performance, it can be critical to solving many of the challenges that contribute to the ineffective and inefficient provision of victim services and resources. There are numerous methods to reduce performance and sustainability shortcomings and training is one that can mitigate duplication of effort. Albeit, training is both a short- and long-term investment that takes time, a sustainable workforce, and financial resources.

According to 69.5% of the respondents, the greatest perceived impediments to training are costs, availability, and time commitment. VSOs suggest that location and availability of training make it cost prohibitive to attend quality, national expert-level training. Additionally, VSOs contend that they do not have a sufficient workforce to sustain daily operations in order to allow staff members to attend or conduct training.

Some VSOs reported needing more clarification on:

- How the law defines mandated reporter.
- What the minimum training requirements are for their field of specialty.
- What agency certifies or accredits training.

The Assessment survey results indicated that 91% of VSOs provide services and resources to crime victims under the auspices of formal procedures and protocols. Despite the fact VSOs reported that certifications or accreditations were amongst their highest needs, when asked about what certification or accreditation requirements their facility or agency participates in, overwhelmingly the response was none, not applicable, no requirements, or not sure. Furthermore, many VSOs offered additional suggestions to improve the quality, continuity, and performance measures of services and programs despite the high performance-responses:
- A “universal” in-take form that could be used and understood by most service providers and would alleviate the recounting of information by crime victims.
- Develop standards, protocols and compliance checks for shelters. Respondents acknowledged that “the heart and the passion” are there but evidence-based practices and safety measures should be instituted in shelters for the victim’s safety and healing.
- Define victim services performance success criteria.
- Standardize terminology used as it relates to victim services.
- Standardize the Statewide Victim Needs Assessment and produce an annual report of performance metrics.

The project team asked training questions that pertained to professional requirements and certifications with the following findings:

- Fifty-five percent indicated that there are annual and minimum training requirements for service providers that have direct contact with victims.
- Sixty-four percent indicated that continuing education units, certification of completion, and diplomas are associated with training.
- Sixty-nine percent responded that there is a formally trained child abuse or child sexual assault mandated reporter on the premises.

The project team also asked VSOs to select from a list of staff and volunteer training opportunities that would improve services to crime victims. Based on the identified results, the project team found that expert guest lecturers to be the most preferred type of training service (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type of Training Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>Expert Guest Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>Trauma-Informed Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>Issues Unique To A Specific Underserved Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>Cross-Training –Legal/First Responders/law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>Self-Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>Understanding Victim’s Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>Issues Unique To Elder Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents could select multiple choices. As a result, total percentages do not add up to 100%.

**Table 11** Types of staff and volunteer training considered most beneficial for crime victims services. Received from electronic survey.

Recommendations:

Develop standards in two areas:

- Require a set of minimum standards, certifications, or accreditations for funding victim services programs.
- Encourage allied professionals, paid and volunteers, to receive certain levels of training or education, and continuing education programs.
o Promote the development of a standardized baseline knowledge factsheet of current laws, trauma care, at-risk identification, etc., and facilitate the coordination of training for all service providers from the volunteer to the director.

o Coordinate certified subject matter expert training around evidence-based and proven best practices in the most in-demand knowledge areas (primary and secondary homicide survivors, human trafficking, sexual assault, and trauma-informed care).

o Coordinate with an educational institution to provide Continuing Education Units and certificates of completion, to increase the professional development of service providers.

o Utilize technology to present live and pre-recorded streaming videos/webinars.

2.7. Organizations that are Currently Working with Victims Who are Seeking Assistance from the State of Maryland.

VSOs and law enforcement recognize the importance of allied collaboration and communication in order to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of victims. In a year’s time, more than 75% of VSO respondents estimated that they provided services to a victim who was also receiving services from another state agency. VSOs do not track services provided by other agencies or have the ability to project victims’ needs from those agencies. This creates duplication of services and resources, and errors in legal processes such as when a victim invokes marital privilege at one location but forgets to invoke the privilege at another location.

Law enforcement collaborates across multiple agencies to provide victim services. Law enforcement agencies rely heavily on their social services network to provide victim services; however, their greatest number of collaborative efforts are with other law enforcement agencies (Figure 21).

Similarly, VSOs greatest number of collaborative efforts are with law enforcement agencies, but while VSOs depend on social service agencies, they also partner with a variety of other victim service agencies (Figure 22).
The project team asked VSOs how victims learn about their victim services. Of the respondents, 69% indicated victims are referred from other allied professionals such as hospitals, law enforcement, and legal service providers while 61% indicated they receive victims by word of mouth.

Victims may receive state services other than those associated with being a crime victim such as Temporary Cash Assistance, Food Stamps, Medical Assistance, Purchase of Care, Child Nutrition Program, Women Infant and Children, Housing Assistance, and In-home aid for elderly and disabled, to name a few. Services can overlap with types of victim services such as emergency food assistance or substance abuse treatment resources.
Recommendations:

Invest in technology (efficiency) and policy, procedures, and protocol standardization.

- Facilitate the standardization of statewide victim intake, referral forms, and associated protocols.
- Create VSO dashboard for data entry and real-time statistics/analytics.
- Expand and standardize data collection to reflect Maryland’s current population identities and state agencies (e.g., gender, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families recipient, Housing and Urban Development participant, reentry program, undocumented, etc.) to provide real-time analytics.
- Facilitate VSO development of 5-year strategy, mission, goals and objectives and align with national, state, and agency VSO goals and objectives as it pertains to victim services and grant requirements.
- Software and hardware upgrades
  - Integrate and standardize data collection systems across victim service providers and appropriate allied professional
  - Facilitate a confidential communication system to allow for information sharing, holistic incident-to-independence victim support, without duplicative services and resources.
- Update and standardize websites
  - Include and improve VSO/law enforcement community resources directory
  - Expand and improve VSOs’ web presence for cost-effective, expansive, and real-time victim service awareness. (e.g., live stream training, telepsychology, 211 Maryland, Maryland Community Services Locator, law enforcement community resources application, bus schedule links, community awareness campaigns and events, etc.)
Appendix A

Interview Questions: Directors, Program Coordinators, and Managers

1. What are your or your provider’s greatest challenges or barriers to providing victim services? (Underserved populations, new laws, location, financial constraints, language/culture, staff turnover, training, staff)

2. What do your providers need to add value or make your services more effective and efficient?

3. What innovative ideas and best practices do your providers exercise or would like to implement?

4. What type of training do your providers receive and what type would add value to their ability to provide services that are more effective? Do they get self-care training?

5. Are there crime victim accessibility issues? (Days, hours opened, transportation, ADA compliant, etc.)

6. What issues or gaps with technology do you experience? (Reporting procedures, tracking services, system integration with other services, intake continuity, knowledgeable staff)

7. What has been the most effective way to reach victims?

8. Are your providers aware of the initiatives that the State of Maryland is addressing? (Victims of Crimes Act, State Board of Victim Services, Survivors of Homicide Grant, Prison Rape Elimination Act, campus sexual assault, child advocacy centers, Family Violence Council, human trafficking, Safe Harbor Youth Victims of Human Trafficking Workgroup)

9. What questions do you have that would add value to the services you provide or that your providers provide?

10. Whom do you recommend we survey or conduct a focus group with? Can you provide the contact information?
Appendix B
Homicide Survivor Focus Group Questions

Awareness
1. How did you know where to seek victim services?

Accessibility
2. What problems did you experience when trying to access or receive services?
   (Answering the phone, transportation, hours opened, days opened, not handicap accessible, language, etc.).

Service Needs
3. Once you started receiving services, what type of services did you receive?
4. Were they the services that you needed or expected? Please explain.
5. What was your greatest barrier or limitation that you experienced in receiving services?
6. What recommendations would you make to a service provider to improve their service program?
7. What do you feel were effective in helping you?
8. What type of continuing support services did you receive?
9. What services from the state of Maryland are you receiving?

Basic question to help with categorizing service requirements
10. Have you sought victim services in the past?

Personnel
11. What was your experience as it relates to the staff? (New on the job, did not speak your language, was not familiar with current laws, where to refer you to, in-take protocol, etc.).
12. Was the criminal justice system explained to you?

First Responders
13. What are your thoughts about your experiences with first responders?
14. What question are you surprised that I did not ask that you feel is important for me to know?

Additional Responses by observing staff member
Appendix C
Victim Service Organizations Electronic Survey

Service Provider
1. What is your position/title? Multiple choice
2. Which county or counties does your facility/agency service? Select all that apply
3. What is your service area considered? Multiple choice
4. Who is your primary victim client base? Multiple choice

Staff
5. How many full-time paid staff does your facility/agency employ? Multiple choice
6. How many of the staff are part-time? Multiple choice
7. How many volunteers does your facility/agency have? Multiple choice
8. How many crime victims does each case manager carry on average? Multiple choice
9. Does your facility have a formally trained child abuse or child sexual assault mandated reporter when the facility is open? Multiple choice
10. What staff position would add value to your ability to provide core crime victim services? Multiple choice

Policies, Procedures, and Protocols
11. Has your facility/agency done a Crime Victim Needs Assessment in the last 3 years? Multiple choice
12. Does your facility/agency have formal procedures and protocols in place that guide the treatment and services of victims of crimes? Multiple choice
13. What certification or accreditation requirements does your facility/agency participate in? Long Paragraph
14. What changes, as it pertains to policy/procedures/protocols or standards would improve your ability to provide effective and efficient crime victim services? Long Paragraph
15. Does your facility/agency have formal guidelines that govern the operation of the agency/ facility? Multiple choice

Operations/Capacity
16. In your opinion, the average length of services received by crime victims at your facility/agency is: Multiple choice
17. In your estimate, how many crime victims a year do you provide services to, who are also seeking or receiving state services? Multiple choice
18. In your estimate, how many crime victim requests in a year go unmet at your facility/agency? Multiple choice
19. In your estimate, how many crime victims, in the last year, are repeat victims at your facility/agency? Multiple choice
20. In your opinion, what implementation(s) would improve the operational effectiveness and efficiency in services to crime victim? Long Paragraph

**Accessibility**

21. What types of transportation are available to and from your location? Select all that apply
22. What days are your facility/agency open? Select all that apply
23. What hours are your facility/agency open? Select all that apply
24. What service accessibility changes would improve services to crime victims? (e.g., longer hours, more days open, paid transportation, ADA compliant, additional location, etc.) Long paragraph
25. What types of payment do you require? Select all that apply

**Services**

26. What types of crimes do your clients experience? Select all that apply
27. What type of crime is having the most impact on your ability to provide service? Why? Long paragraph
28. From the list below, what types of services do you provide to victims of crime? Select all that apply
29. What types of emergency services are typically needed by your client but you do NOT provide Select all that apply
30. What types of Legal, Advocacy, and Financial Services are typically needed by your client but you do NOT provide Select all that apply
31. What types of Counseling and Health Services does your client typically need but you do NOT provide? Select all that apply
32. What types of Housing Services does your client typically need but you do NOT provide? Select all that apply
33. What types of Basic and Wrap-around Support Services does your client typically need but you do NOT provide? Select all that apply
34. What types of Children Services does your client typically need but you do NOT provide? Select all that apply
35. In your experience, what are the most common reasons why some crime victims do not follow through with services? Long Paragraph
36. What change(s) would enable you to improve upon the services that you provide to crime victims? This can include innovative ideas, solutions, removal of barriers, as well as program and staff adjustments. Long paragraph

**Populations’ Served**

37. Which underserved populations at your facility/agency, do you find to be the most challenging due to lack of resources, training, and support? Select all that apply
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**Formal Training**

38. What types of staff and volunteer training would be beneficial to you in helping your crime victims? *Select all that apply*

39. Are there initial and annual minimum training requirements for crime victim direct contact providers? *Multiple Choice*

40. Are CEUS, certification of completion, or diplomas associated with training? *Multiple Choice*

41. What obstacles or impediments to training do you perceive and how might they be eliminated? *Long paragraph*

42. What types of innovative training does your organization provide for its staff and volunteers? What makes it successful? *Long paragraph*

**Technology**

43. Does your facility/agency have a data collection system that tracks the services that you provide to crime victims? *Multiple choice*

44. If your facility/agency has a data collection system, please describe it. *Long Paragraph*

45. What types of data does your facility/agency capture? *Select all that apply*

46. What type of technological capability would improve your ability to provide effective and efficient victim services? *Long Paragraph*

47. What types of victim services do you provide through technology? *Long Paragraph*

48. Is your facility registered as a victim services provider on the Maryland Community Services Locator website? *Multiple choice*

**Awareness**

49. How did your crime victim learn of the services your agency provides? *Select all that apply*

50. What other agencies or organization do you collaborate with to optimize outreach efforts? *Short Paragraph*

51. How familiar are the staff and volunteers with the issues being addressed by the Governor’s Office of Crime Control and Prevention? *Multiple choice*

**Collaboration and Partnerships**

52. What partnerships would provide benefit to your ability to provide victim services? *Long Paragraph*

53. Where is your program based? *Multiple Choice*

**Innovation**

54. What innovative or creative problem solving ideas are you practicing or hope to in the near future? How might they help other service providers across the state meet the needs of crime victims? *Long paragraph*
Appendix D
Law Enforcement Electronic Survey

1. What is your position/title?
- Sheriff
- Police Officer
- Criminal Investigator
- Other

2. Which county does your department provide services?
- Allegany
- Anne Arundel
- Baltimore
- Baltimore City
- Calvert
- Caroline
- Carroll
- Cecil
- Charles
- Dorchester
- Frederick
- Garrett
- Harford
- Howard
- Kent
- Montgomery
- Prince George’s
- Queen Anne’s
- St. Mary’s
- Washington
- Wicomico
- Worcester
- State Somerset
- Talbot
- Other

3. What is your service area considered?
- Mostly Suburban
- Mostly Urban
- Mostly Rural
- Other

Staff
4. What additional skill-set(s) would improve or enhance your ability to better serve victims of crime? Select all that apply
- Police Officers
- Bilingual Officers/Staff
- Clergy
- Trauma Counselors
- Community Relations Coordinators
- Crime Victim Services Program
- Victim/Witness Assistance Personnel
- Community Conferencing Center Facilitator
- Other

Services
5. Does your location have a Crime Victim Services Program/Representative?
- Yes
- No

6. From the crime victim services listed below, which service(s) would your location/organization benefit as it relates to the needs of crime victims? Select all that apply
- Crises Counseling
- Abuser Intervention
- Information and Referrals
- Emergency/Safe Accommodations
- Emergency Transportation
- Assistance with Crime Victim Compensation filing
- Hospital Accompaniment
- 24/7 hotline
- Legal Advocacy/Accompaniment
- Emergency Financial Assistance
- Personal Advocacy
- Child Crime Victim Services
- Assistance with VINE Protective Order
- None
- Other

7. What barriers or impediments to providing effective crime victim assistance do you most often face? Why?

8. How do you address those barriers or impediments?
Outreach
9. Does your location/organization have a community relations coordinator?
   - Yes
   - No

10. What other programs/organizations do you collaborate for community relations activities? *Select all that apply*
   - Victim Service Organizations
   - Faith-Based Organizations
   - Community-Based Organizations
   - Businesses, Business Associations, Chamber of Commerce
   - Schools
   - First Responders (police, fire, rescue)
   - Entertainment industry (music, sports, movie)
   - Media (Radio, Newspaper, TV, Social media, Website)
   - None
   - Other

11. What type(s) of community relations outreach activities does your organization provide?
12. What targeted outreach activities are used in the hard to penetrate communities? (Culturally, linguistically, demographically, economically challenging communities)

Crime Trends
12. What emerging crime(s) or crime trends are causing the most impact on resources and services?
13. Why are they having the most impact?
14. What action or service would help with addressing the victims of these emerging crime(s) or crime trends?

Populations Served
15. Which underserved population(s) is having the most impact on your ability to provide victim assistance? *Select all that apply*
   - LGBTQ
   - Disabled (deaf, developmentally, etc.)
   - Elder
   - Ex-offender
   - Sex-offender
   - Substance Abusers
   - Immigrant/undocumented immigrant
   - Homeless
   - Runaways
   - Veterans
   - Human Trafficked Adult
   - Human Trafficked Child
   - Labor Trafficked
   - Survivors of Homicide
   - Youth
   - Other

16. Why are they having an impact?

Training
17. What types of training would enhance your ability to provide victim assistance? *Select all that apply*
- Trauma-informed Practices
- Self-care Techniques
- Stress Management
- Cultural Awareness and Sensitivity Training
- Human Trafficking Sensitivity Approaches
- Community Crime Victim Resources
- Vicarious Trauma
- Elder Abuse Signs and Services
- Other

18. What obstacles or impediments to training do you perceive and how might they be?

19. Do you participate on a regular basis with Victim Service Organizations for training?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Other

**Technology**

20. How do you use technology to provide outreach services?

21. How do you use technology to provide crime victim assistance?

22. How do you use technology to provide training?

23. What technological improvements would improve your ability to effectively and efficiently assist victims?

**Collaborations and Partnerships**

24. What agencies and providers do you partner/collaborate with to provide services to crime victims? *Select all that apply*
   - Law Enforcement
   - Domestic Violence Shelters
   - US Attorney's Office
   - Social Workers
   - Victim/Witness Programs
   - Faith-Based Organizations
   - Child Protective Services
   - Adult Protective Services
   - Advocacy Groups
   - Rape Crises Centers
   - Health Services
   - Homeless Shelters
   - Hospital/Emergency Medical
   - Victim Advocates
   - Substance Abuse Agencies
   - Housing Services Human Trafficking Organizations
   - Probation Officers
   - Family Crises Centers
   - Center for Missing and Exploited Children
   - Other

25. What partnerships would provide benefit to your ability to provide victim assistance?

**Additional Comments:**
Appendix E
Recommendations Outline

1. **Invest in core services to increase service capacity and effectiveness**
   
   a. **Increase Staff**
      
      i. Bilingual counselors in high-need locations
      
      ii. Case managers across the state to actively provide victim-centered continuity of services
      
      iii. Legal/Victim-Witness advocates across the state to ensure each victim has criminal justice system support
      
      iv. Victim Service Representative within police stations and faith-based organizations in high-need locations

   b. **Expand Core Services (effectiveness)**
      
      i. Crises counseling in police stations
      
      ii. Emergency shelter/Safe House beds and alternatives
      
      iii. Emergency/in-shelter financial assistance
      
      iv. Trauma-informed counseling in schools, high-homicide locations, and health departments
      
      v. Restorative Justice Facilitation in high schools, high gang, and homicide locations, through faith-based organizations and community safe locations.
         
         1. Exploitation Services around financial exploitation of Elders and cyber-sexual exploitation of children and teens
         
         2. VSO Programs and Services to Hospitals, Colleges, Universities, Community-Based Reentry Programs, and Police Stations

   c. **Population Emphasis**
      
      i. Human Sex Trafficked
      
      ii. Immigrant
      
      iii. Homeless
      
      iv. Mentally Ill
      
      v. LGBTQ Elders

2. **Invest in holistic/wrap around/incident-to-independence services**
   
   a. Housing solutions (Transitional for human trafficked, residential programs)
   
   b. Post-crises & pro bono legal support
   
   c. Transportation solutions
   
   d. Substance abuse resources and solutions
   
   e. Sexual violence support group
   
   f. Child daycare resources
   
   g. Teen-focused activities
h. Job skills training
   i. Adult education/high school equivalency diploma
   j. Financial literacy/Consumer law – Economic Empowerment solution

3. **Invest in awareness and outreach**
   a. Property crime resources
   b. Buses/taxis that go by police stations or VSOs
   c. Safe buildings in the community
   d. Targeted community education and awareness campaign on victim rights and resources.
   e. Resource awareness and safety questions (e.g., driver's license exam and health department intake)

4. **Invest in training**
   a. Institutionalize trauma-informed practices for all first responders and VSOs
   b. Train bus drivers and OBGYN practitioners on trauma symptoms and victim resources
   c. Evidenced-based LAP and cultural sensitivity for all first responders
   d. Nationally acclaimed and accredited experts from the most in-demand knowledge areas (primary and secondary homicide survivors, human trafficking, hate crimes, and trauma-informed care). Provide widest exposure to training through mobile conferences and live web streams.

5. **Invest in technology and efficiency**
   a. Software and hardware upgrades
      i. Integrate and standardize data collection systems.
      ii. Facilitate confidential communication systems to allow for information sharing and holistic victim support services.
   b. Update website
      i. Include VSO/law enforcement community resources directory
      ii. Expand VSOs web presence for cost effective, expansive, and real-time victim services.
   c. Facilitate the standardization of statewide victim intake, referral forms, and associated protocols.
   d. Facilitate the standardization of statewide balanced performance measure scorecard and successful outcomes.
   e. Create VSO dashboard for data entry and real-time analytics.

6. **Invest in policy, procedure and protocol standardization**
   a. Check for ADA compliance in Safe House, shelters, and VSOs
   b. Expand and standardize data collection to reflect Maryland’s current population identities (gender, TANF recipient, HUD participant, reentry program, undocumented, etc.) and provide real-time analytics.

59
c. Facilitate VSO development of 5-year strategy, mission, goals, and objectives and align with state/national VSO goals and objectives.

d. Expand Maryland Community Services Locator crime victim resources. Create first responder application for ease of use. Add victim services to Maryland 211 online site.

7. **Invest in evidence-based and cost effective innovation**

   a. Telepsychology
   
   b. Pet Therapy
   
   c. Economic Empowerment
   
   d. Restorative Justice
   
   e. Lethality Assessment Program
Appendix F
State Partners and Stakeholders

Maryland Department of Aging (MDOA)
Phoenix Woody
Guardianship and Legal Services Program Manager

Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault (MCASA) / Sexual Assault Legal Institute
Lisa C. Jordan, Esq.
Executive Director & Counsel

Maryland Crime Victims Resource Center (MCVRC)
Russell Butler
Executive Director

Maryland Human Trafficking Task Force (MHTTF)
Melissa A. Snow
National Center for Missing & Exploited Children Program Specialist, Child Sex Trafficking

U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Maryland
Steven J. Hess
Law enforcement Coordinator

Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence (MNADV)
Michaele Cohen
Executive Director

Maryland State Attorney's Association (MDSAA)
Steven Kroll

The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc.
Michael Marcus
Program Director, Older Adults

Additional Stakeholders

Community Conferencing Center
Dr. Lauren Abramson
Founder & Executive Director

Mid-Shore Council on Family Violence
Jeanne Yeager
Executive Director
Appendix G
Legislation Passed In 2015

TITLE: HB224/SB315 Domestic Violence 2 Year Protective Orders
SUMMARY: This bill provides that, under specific circumstances, and by consent of the respondent, a court may issue a protective order for a period not to exceed 2 years. The WLC supported this bill because it is really just a technical fix to clarify the intent behind the existing law of two year orders of protection. WLC Position: Support
DATE PASSED: 2015

TITLE: HB225/SB269 Domestic Violence Additional Relief
SUMMARY: This bill expands the relief that may be awarded in a final protective order to include any other relief that a judge determines is necessary to protect a person eligible for relief from abuse. The WLC supported this bill as it would allow judges, when it is deemed necessary by the judge, to order something in addition to the currently enumerated forms of relief. WLC Position: Support
DATE PASSED: 2015

TITLE: HB390/SB270 Protective Order and Peace Order Petitions Maryland Residents
SUMMARY: This bill authorizes the filing of a protective order petition if the abuse is alleged to have occurred in the State, or if the person eligible for relief is a resident of the State; and similarly authorizes the filing of a peace order petition if a specified act is alleged to have occurred in the State or if the petitioner is a resident of the State. The WLC supported this bill because it recognizes that domestic violence knows no borders and victims of domestic violence need to be able to seek the protection of the court, regardless of where it occurred, in order to be safe. WLC Position: Support
DATE PASSED: 2015

TITLE: HB606/SB477 Domestic Violence Persons Eligible for Relief
SUMMARY: This bill alters the definition of “person eligible for relief” for a protective order to include an individual who has had a sexual relationship with the respondent within the past year. The WLC supported this bill as an effort to afford more protections for victims who have had a sexual relationship with the respondent or are in a dating relationship. WLC Position: Support
DATE PASSED: 2015

TITLE: HB382 Sexual Assault Survivors’ Right to Know Act
SUMMARY: This bill requires health care providers provide sexual assault victims with information relating to the results of their sexual assault forensic exam kits, so long as providing the information would not interfere with ongoing investigations.
DATE PASSED: 2015
## Appendix H
### Violent Crime Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Forcible Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Aggravated Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>9,651</td>
<td>15,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>4,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 Crime in Maryland Uniform Crime Report*
## Appendix I
### Property Crimes Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Breaking / Entering</th>
<th>Larceny-Theft</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle Theft</th>
<th>Arson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>28,175</td>
<td>109,218</td>
<td>13,146</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>17,584</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>18,419</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>4,629</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>13,542</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>17,498</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 Crime in Maryland, Uniform Crime Report*
Appendix J
Domestic Violence Crime Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>DV 2012</th>
<th>DV 2013</th>
<th>DV 2014</th>
<th>P.O. issued 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>17615</td>
<td>27782</td>
<td>27,242</td>
<td>12,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>3287</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>2,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>3593</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>1,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three statewide agencies reported offenses but do not identify county of occurrence. *Note: The Maryland Uniform Crime Reporting Program expanded the definition of domestic violence to include ten additional relationships in 2013. This change in Maryland law explains the increase in total number of Domestically Related Crimes reported and listed in this appendix.*
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## Appendix K
### Profile of Victim Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Services</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in filing compensation claims</td>
<td>Making victims aware of the availability of crime victim compensation, helping victims complete required forms, and gathering needed documentation. May also include follow-up contact with the victim compensation agency on behalf of the victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim compensation</td>
<td>Payment or reparations made to a crime victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency financial assistance</td>
<td>Cash outlays for [victims of crime] for transportation, food, clothing, emergency housing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and referral (in-person)</td>
<td>In-person contact with crime victim to identify available services and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and referral (telephone)</td>
<td>Telephone contact with crime victim to identify available services and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up contact</td>
<td>In-person contacts, telephone contacts, and written communications with victims to offer emotional support, provide empathetic listening, and check on a victim's progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal advocacy</td>
<td>Assisting victims in securing rights, remedies, and services from other agencies; locating emergency financial assistance; intervening with employers, creditors, and others on behalf of the victim; assisting in filing for losses covered by public and private insurance programs including worker's compensation, unemployment benefits, welfare, etc.; accompanying the victim to the hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Transport service either to or from a victim service agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, referring to services provided</td>
<td>Other services and activities allowed under the 1984 Victims of Crime Act (VOCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Victim Advocacy                                        | Support, assistance, and advocacy provided to victims at any stage of the criminal justice process, including post sentencing services and support.                                                          |
| Criminal justice support/advocacy                      | Filing of temporary restraining orders, injunctions, and other protective orders, elder abuse petitions, and child abuse petitions. Does not include criminal prosecution or the employment of attorneys for such nonemergency purposes as custody disputes and civil suits. |

<p>| Crisis Response/Intervention                           | In-person crisis intervention, emotional support, and guidance and counseling provided by advocates, counselors, mental health professionals, or peers. Such counseling may occur at the scene of a crime or immediately after a crime or be provided on an ongoing basis. |
| Crisis hotline counseling                              | Operation of a 24-hour telephone service, 7 days a week, which provides counseling, guidance, emotional support, and information and referral.                                                                 |
| Shelter/safe house                                     | Short- and long-term housing and related support services for victims and families following a victimization.                                                                                             |
| Safety plan                                            | Guidelines for stalking victims that, if implemented, may reduce the odds of physical or emotional harm from a stalker.                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Supervised visitation</strong></th>
<th>Contact between a noncustodial party and one or more children in the presence of a third person, either paid or unpaid, who is responsible for observing and, to the greatest extent possible, providing a safe environment for those involved.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group treatment</strong></td>
<td>Coordination and provision of supportive group activities, which include self-help, peer, and social support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapy</strong></td>
<td>Intensive professional, psychological, psychiatric, or other counseling-related treatment for individuals, couples, and family members to provide emotional support in crisis rising from the occurrence of crime. Includes the evaluation of mental health needs and the delivery of psychotherapy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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