

Strategies to Ensure Equitable Programming: Understanding the VOCA Victim Assistance Rule and Funding Opportunities at the State Level

HEATHER WARNKEN: Hello everyone. Welcome to today's webinar entitled Strategies to Ensure Equitable Programming, Understanding the VOCA Victim Assistance Rule and Funding Opportunities at the State Level. My name is Heather Warnken, I'm currently serving as a visiting fellow at the Department of Justice, a role I'll tell you a little bit more about as we get started.

I want to start by sharing a thank you on behalf of the National Resource Center for Reaching Victims, both the NRC, and me in my capacity as a visiting fellow, are supported by grants awarded by the Office of Justice Programs and the Office for Victims of Crime, which has made this possible today.

So now, a little bit more about me as we dive into this content and my role in being able to share and engage with you all today. So again, I am serving as a visiting fellow at DOJ, and I'm working across OVC and the Bureau of Justice Statistics in the first ever position designed to improve the dissemination and translation of research for the victim assistance fields. Really, the bridging the gap between research practice and policy fellowship.

Prior to that, I was at the Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy at UC Berkeley School of Law in a role that really focused on similar goals, doing research for the real world, making sure to connect these often siloed areas of research policy and practice so that the work we do actually can make a difference on the ground, and specifically in the lives of survivors that this field is hoping to serve.

So this role was actually launched by Vision 21 which was a landmark report that was published by OVC that really was the first major assessment of the victims services fields in over 15 years. How far have we come? How far do we still have to go? And Vision 21 issued a series of key findings and recommendations, first among them was really the dearth of research and evidence to inform this work and a corresponding commitment to build up that knowledge base to inform our work.

Relatedly, what Vision 21 also underscored was the need to move beyond these buzz phrases about bridging the gap and put concrete action behind that goal. And so I've been honored, for the past almost five years now, to be serving in that in-house capacity doing just that.

But what I also want to underscore, before we get started, as it really relates to our topic today, is the approach that I've taken to that work since day one. And that really, when many people talk about translation and dissemination, they often talk about the

back-end. How do we take data and research and package it in more accessible formats and venues so that it's actually at the hands of policymakers and practitioners in a way that they can apply in their everyday work, rather than stuck behind paywalls of academic journals or in overly technical reports that are not of any practical use?

And while that is very important, and we should be doing more of that. And I know the NRC has been doing a ton of that, which is so helpful and important for the field. What's equally important, if not more so, is getting the voices of those directly impacted, directly impacted survivors, and frontline service providers at the design and decision-making table of what information we collect and why. So that we actually produce data and research that's asking the relevant questions for this work. And again, both the NRC and all the work that it's done and the work that I've done in this fellowship has really strive to live and work by those values.

So in this role, one of the many hats that I've worn is I have, again, been honored to work with the NRC since its inception. And as many of you know, the Resource Center's goals is to better meet the needs of underserved survivors by increasing the capacity of service providers to effectively identify, reach, and serve underserved survivors in ways that are culturally-appropriate, linguistically-specific, trauma-responsive, accessible, and welcoming, and inclusive. And it has made that possible

through both separate but deeply connected pillars of that work across different categories and populations of underserved survivors throughout the field.

So this has included children, formerly incarcerated, historically underserved, LGBTQ, men of color, older adults, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, which as you can see has been spearheaded by a number of outstanding partners and partnerships by some of the leading voices and organizations on the frontlines of the direct services work shaping the policy and change throughout the field. And within that work, there have been expert working groups across these categories which I've been honored to serve. Three of them as since their inception, including formerly incarcerated, historically underserved, and men of color.

So before we dive in to some of our core content today, I'm going to start by laying some critical context, really getting the lay of the land here. As many of you probably know, the victim assistance field has been going through an unprecedented state of growth and change the past few years. So I want to really start with some of the fundamentals to get everyone on the same page on these critical factors underpinning our topic today. This, I think, will best situate us to grapple with some of what I'm going to be able to share. So I hope to use our time together to weave together some key information across the areas of victim services

funding, policy, and even what the data tells us about how we're doing and how many survivors we're actually reaching. Because each of these brings in a central piece of the puzzle of truly advancing equitable programming in victim services.

So to start, what is OVC? As many of you probably know, OVC is charged by Congress with administering the Crime Victims Fund. Through formula and discretionary grant programs, including the ones that made the NRC possible, OVC supports a broad array of programs focused on helping survivors in the immediate aftermath of crime and as they rebuild their lives. So the CVF is intended to ensure stable funding for victim services. And by law, amounts not spent or kept in the CVF for victims for future years.

This and some other factors make it different from other appropriations coming out of the office of justice programs. One of the key features of this is that the CVF is not taxpayer dollars. It's actually fines and fees paid by those convicted in the federal criminal justice system. And while it's not our areas of focus today, this is also part of, I think, the important context of our conversation, both regarding issues of stability around the sources of revenue that are actually footing the bill for victim services nationwide as criminal justice reform and other factors have brought dramatic and long overdue change and a deep structural level. But also the ways in which this funding mechanism can have implications for who we see and serve as a

victim of crime in the US and who we do not if, again, the CVF is being literally funded by the fines and fees of those convicted in the criminal justice system.

So there have been some major shifts in recent years which, again, we're going to talk a little bit more about, but these include the significant drop in the current administration in white collar prosecutions, for example, which has really declined the amount of large fines and fees that have entered the fund and really had implications for the balance. This also has implications at the state level. So we'll talk a little bit more in the webinar about the difference between victim assistance and victim compensation. Victim compensation is largely supplemented by CVFs at the state level that are fueled by state criminal justice system fines and fees, which I've also seen in some jurisdictions, some pretty dramatic changes in recent years due to criminal justice reform and other factors. So I wanted to put that note out there, again, in the spirit of us grappling with the big picture and long term trajectory of this work.

So now, turning to a breakdown of what the funding that I'm talking about looks like annually. So since 2000, in response to, again, these large fluctuations that happen with the CVF, Congress actually placed a cap on the amount of money available for annual distribution. And not cap is really intended to maintain the CVF as a consistent source of funds for victim services. But

then in 2015, a sea change. So by lifting the longstanding cap, from 2014 and 2015, Congress effectively quadrupled the amount of money available for crime victim services through VOCA. Jumping from, as you can see, \$745 million in 2014 to \$1.9 billion the following fiscal year, and reaching a high of \$4.4 billion in 2018. And in that year, resulting in awards surpassing every other year in the program's 34-year history.

So even though the funds are currently still in the stratosphere compared to where they used to be, we saw the first decrease in 2019. So that decrease has understandably fed into worries that folks have had across the field since this all began, which is, is this too good to be true? Will this last? And just kind of growing uncertainty around this source of funds in general.

So where are we now? So as of the past fiscal year, this year 2020, you can see \$2.64 billion, including some of the important expenditures that you see there on the screen. So those represented at 21% reduction from FY19, which again, was \$3.5 billion, this is still an enormous pot of resources. And part of what is so important to understand about this is that the lion's share of these funds go to all 56 states and territories, and that all states and territories have a tremendous amount of discretion about what they do with this money-- to set their own priorities, to hopefully innovate, fill gaps in services with the programming that they choose to fund. And again, this is all kind of a critical

foundation for what we'll talk about with the new possibilities for what states can do with these funds.

So I find this visual a really powerful representation of what this huge funding boom has really looked like across the country. You can see here that the quadrupling of victims assistance funding has allowed states to fund more organizations and to provide more sub-grants to those organizations than ever before. Again, really skyrocketing in the past few years. And this includes both an infusion of more funding to programs that have long been underfunded and really struggling to meet their mandate and serve all the victims that they intend to in their community, but also standing up brand new programs that may have been out there doing the work for years, maybe decades, but maybe had never received VOCA before, or to launch brand new innovative programs from the ground up. And you can see in those numbers that really all of the above across the country has taken place.

So again, even though the majority of this money, 90% of these funds are awarded to states and territories each year through these formula grants, there is also much smaller in amount but still significant part of the funds that go toward discretionary programming, that is administered directly at the federal level, that also plays an important role in informing OVC and the nation, including the state administering agencies that make the decisions about the state funds regarding innovation and what's

possible through influencers of the field. And I think a perfect example of this is the National Resource Center. The NRC was one of the biggest such discretionary programs in OVC's history and has been a game-changer across the field, providing technical assistance and resources and support to programs throughout the country, again, based at their led in strong partnership with those partner agencies and a vast network of experts and other service providers who have not only taken a hands-on role but collaborated, I think, in new ways.

So another important note that we're going to kind of touch on before proceeding as an important clarification is really making sure that we understand the difference between VOCA assistance and VOCA victim compensation because, again, there can be widespread confusion and misperceptions out there about how these relate and where the money actually goes. So as you can see here, VOCA victim assistance, this is awarded through the state administering agencies as sub-grants to state agencies, community-based organizations, and other local service providers grants that support direct services for victims. That these agencies, CVOs, others get awarded the funds and then they are out on the frontlines doing the direct service work.

This differs from VOCA victim compensation, which are grants awarded to support reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses that victims may have resulting from being the victim of a crime.

And again, as I mentioned earlier, victim compensation is largely supplemented by crime victims funds at the state and local level, which in addition to criminal justice system fines and fees, may include other revenue sources that literally make possibilities out-of-pocket expense reimbursement payments to victims. Part of why it's so important to understand the difference between these two is that oftentimes there are more explicit prohibitions or requirements related to how victim compensation payments can be made and to whom that don't apply to direct service programs funded through the victim assistance awards.

And part of the problem with misconceptions around that is in ways that victim compensation may be highly restrictive in certain instances, it can be harmful if there's assumptions that the possibilities of what to do with the direct service money from victim assistance formula programs might be similarly constrained. And oftentimes, they're not. And so I really want to draw attention to the fact that these are different before we start getting even further into what some of the new possibilities around the victim assistance side are, to really open our minds in thinking about what's possible, especially when victims and survivors and communities face so many barriers, and among them might be barriers to accessing victim compensation.

Another reason it's important to draw attention to this difference is there's quite a difference in the amount of funds and where the

money actually goes. So you can see that just using the last two fiscal years, how this breaks down. And drawing attention to 2019, that the awards overall totaled more than \$2.39 billion, but only \$139 million of that went to the compensation formula grants, whereas \$2.25 billion went to all states and territories for their victim assistance programs that, again, make the grants for community-based organizations, state agencies, and others to do direct service work.

So further kind of adding and enriching this picture. So I'm going to share a little bit more about what the data tells us, about what's going on across the victim services landscape. And in particular, share with you some key findings about what we know about these questions from a report that I published in 2019 during National Crime Victims Rights Week, Who Experiences Violent Victimization and Who Accesses Services? So this was co-authored with the brilliant professor Janet Lauritsen from the University of Missouri-St. Louis. And our collaboration in bringing this report to life was really seeking to emulate that approach to bridge-building I was talking about earlier.

So here is one of the nation's true data experts on the NCVS combined with my focus on what are the policy and practice implications about what these data tell us, really allowed us to team up to do things with this analysis that in some cases had never been done before. So this included being able to present

widely available findings that you won't find in the annual publications from DOJ and the Bureau of Justice statistics, which tend to focus on singular factors such as crime type, age, race, whereas we really sought to take an intersectional approach and look at multiple factors at once, more reflective of people's lived experiences and perhaps more aligned with the questions that service providers might have in the victim services field.

We also chose to write it for diverse audiences and make it widely available on the Center for Victim Research website sister center to the NRC, again, rather than behind a paywall or stuck in an overly technical, inaccessible journal article where other place that direct service practitioners aren't always looking for their up-to-date information to help inform their work. We are currently working on an update to this report so I'd love to hear from anyone about ways to make that most useful to you and your communities.

So before getting to the specific findings themselves, again, a little bit more background so that we can really help put them in context. So just as important as what the numbers actually say, I was getting very clear at the outset about what the data source is actually reflecting, and what it's not. So the National Crime Victimization Survey is widely cited including as one of the main measurements of the crime rate in the US. And one of the unparalleled strengths of NCVS is that unlike other main sources

of crime data including the FBI's uniform crime reports and other sources of law enforcement data, the NCVS is capable of what we call-- capable of measuring what we call the dark figure of crime, that which goes unreported to police. And that's clearly a critical area and line of inquiry for our work, knowing that such a significant percentage of victimization and survivors in our communities for many reasons do not want to work or choose not to report to law enforcement.

Another strength includes its large sample size and participation rates, but there are also some important limitations to note. One, it's what I'm going to share with you, is for those aged 12 and older. It also does not include homicide, which is an important topic, of course, for the field. Also, as a household survey conducted by the Census Bureau or in partnership with the Bureau of Justice statistics, it does not include the voices of many of our most vulnerable victims, including those who are homeless, transient, in and out of the justice system, and other institutional settings. And part of why it's so important to highlight that is that this might reflect what is the tip of the iceberg in some cases. That, again, if what I'm sharing is a household survey, that doesn't include some of those vulnerable categories. The true access issues and takeaways might go much deeper.

So with that, we'll dive in to some of those key findings. So you can see that according to the NCVS, only 9.6% of victims of serious violence overall report access to services in the most recent period that we analyzed. And that this really hadn't moved much at all since these questions were added to the NCVS in 1993. Now, that's a pretty staggering finding that only less than 10% of victims are reporting getting the help that we intend for them. And the fact that after decades of growth and change and expansion and an infusion of a huge amount of money to standing up these services, no one really asks some deep and hard questions of the fields about how far we still have to go and why such significant barriers remain.

Part of what has taken place in the decades since the passage of VOCA in 1984, since the Victims of Crime Act, there have been a proliferation of approximately 32,000 laws and policies, commitments made to victims on paper of guaranteeing the rights and the services that we hope that in the aftermath of their harm that they have access to. And yet, the findings do not align with those promises. You can see also that for some of the higher risk categories, including youth victims, that the numbers vary a little bit and are even lower than that overall average for those age 18 to 34 who experience some of the highest rates of violence. You can also see that 42% of victims of serious violence overall choose not to report that serious violent victimization to the police.

Also important to make sure we're on the same page with is that this is not all victims of crime. Again, this is specifically analyzing victims of serious violence to find in NCVS as victimization that include attempted and completed rape, and sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, which in the NCVS is assault involving a weapon or resulting in serious bodily injury. So furthering our discussion of key findings, who is most likely to become a victim based on race and ethnicity differences? So as you can see, blacks' risk for serious violence have remained 1.5 to two times greater than whites. And again, it's important to note that homicide is not included in the NCVS. And that black people in the US accounted for 13% of the population, yet 51% of all homicides. And for young black men, homicide is the first leading cause of death causing more deaths than the entire other top nine causes combined. So again, I want us to really read and grapple with these findings in a way that puts them in context and sometimes doesn't even see just the full, picture, and sometimes might even be the tip of the iceberg.

Non-Hispanic American Indians, 2.4 times 140% greater than whites. And part of why this is so significant is that, again, these are not always findings that you can see in the annual released reports of these data. And part of the reason why is that similar trends aren't produced individually for certain race and ethnicity categories when the sample sizes are deemed small and therefore less reliable. However, by combining multiple years of the data,

these challenges are greatly minimized and the findings can be produced. And when you do, again, the results are critically important for understanding disparities in our work.

Persons who report multiple race backgrounds, 4.1 times or 310% greater than risk of whites. This, again, is a powerful example of how data can make whole populations invisible or can play a role in shedding light on issues and groups too often forgotten or other eyes, that it's only been possible to do this last piece of analysis on multiracial groups more recently, since this option allowing people to choose to report more than one category that they self-identify as race in the year 2000 when that question, that possibility was added in the census. And again, from that analysis, from 2000 moving forward, it revealed some of the highest risks by far.

And as we talked about earlier, looking at singular categories really only takes us that so far. So an intersectional approach is really critical to understanding the meaning of these patterns and more reflective of the many facets affecting people's lives. And when we look at risk on a continuum, from highest to lowest across the categories, we see that black males under the age of 35 who live in urban households with incomes under 25,000 have a risk for serious violent victimization nearly 15 times greater than that of females age 55 or older living in non-urban households with incomes of 75,000 or more. And notwithstanding

a reality like this, which again doesn't even include the experience of many of the most vulnerable survivors who are not eligible to participate in NCVS, we can then take a comparative look, for example, at our VOCA expenditures. And we can see from a high level, for instance, that the vocal performance measurement data on this formula grants we've been talking about show that over 71% of assistance dollars go toward serving females, the majority to whites, and by a wide margin to the 29 to 59 age group, the category determined by OVC.

So this breaks down with a little more nuance who's most likely to use services. And you can see there's some significant differences, both across males and females. Currently, we don't have the same findings available as sexual orientation. Gender identity questions were only added much more recently in 2016. But also, some significant differences across different crime types that are worth noting and grappling with for the way we approach services across the field.

So again, kind of returning to one of the core strengths of NCVS that it's actually capable of looking at victimization not on the radar of the criminal justice system, not reported to police, you can see that there's also some significant differences about the connection between reporting and access to services. So theoretically, we see that it's good news that there is a correlation that a higher percentage of victims get access to

services when they engage in reporting. And I think that gets more attention when it comes to this result. But there's a lesser discussed, but kind of equally important takeaway here, which is what happened to the 87% of victims who report their victimization and did not get access to services? What happens to the huge percentage of victims who choose not to report who face lower rates of getting the help that they need?

Again, this is important jumping off point for so many related questions that we have across the field. Similarly, the NCVS allows us to look at the connection between medical care and access to victim services. You can see that 36% of victims of serious violence suffered bodily injury and that 56% of those victims report receiving medical care for those injuries. So again, it's theoretically good news that victims were more likely to access services when they received medical care. However, even in those instances, it's only 16%.

So with that rich background and kind of deep foundation that I hope is helpful for launching into the new victim services rule, I'm going to talk more about the significant policy change that took place in 2016. So the VOCA rule change allows states more flexibility with what they do with that funding we've been discussing, to innovate and tailor programming. It is set up to really expand the types of services that states can fund with their VOCA victim assistance dollars. Provides states the opportunity to

address gaps in services such as those identified in the Vision 21 report I talked about at the opening of the webinar today.

So some highlights of what this actually made possible. Again, this was released in 2016 which even though we've got a few years under our belts in policy timelines from understanding and getting the word out across the country from the state agencies themselves and the stakeholders in their communities, we still call this the new rule because we're still very much on that process of education and having this take hold. So highlights, much greater flexibility around some key areas for serving victims, including mental health counseling and care, transitional housing, relocation, substance use treatment, civil legal aid, forensic interviews. And then perhaps one of the biggest sea changes of all, the 2016 rule change removed a decades-long prohibition in VOCA in using the money to serve victims who were incarcerated.

So even though the fine print only opened the door for serving incarcerated survivors, I think the implications of this just run so much deeper, given the fact that that dichotomy had been drawn within the initial VOCA of 1984, that really creating that kind of false dichotomy between who are victims and survivors and who are those in the criminal justice system, and whether or not they were incarcerated, and the way that that has created perceptions about which programs states choose to fund and focus on in this

work. So again, I can't underscore enough the fact that removing this prohibition created not only huge possibilities in what kind of programs and services get funded moving forward, but really in shifting the narrative in who we're talking about and bringing a much more holistic trauma informed lens.

Similarly, created greater flexibility on using the funds for restorative justice, multi-system inter-agency, multidisciplinary response. Now, these have been around as buzz phrases since the '90s but to do victim assistance work in survivor informed collaborative ways across systems, across disciplines, actually takes funds and coordination and planning. And so the rule change making clear that VOCA dollars can be used to support those sorts of activities is huge.

Exposure to violence as a direct form of victimization, again just aligning much more with the research and the way that our understanding of trauma and victimization has evolved in the decades since VOCA was passed. Technology and innovation, greater flexibility around evaluation of sub-recipient programs and more. Those are really just highlights, and I've included in the resources for this webinar the link so you can really dig deeper including a side-by-side comparison chart that really walks through these changes compared to the former guidelines so you can really get into the fine print and see for yourselves

what the relevance and possibilities of some of these changes really are.

So again, it's important to stress before we move on that this rule change was permissive, not mandatory. So in other words, it didn't require states moving forward to do these things with their annual funds. It created an invitation, an opportunity to do these things, to think more holistically about services, to fund programs across these areas that they may be never funded before. And as we've seen, since the rule change was released in 2016 to date, there really has been a justice by geography and really some significant differences across the 56 states and territories what they've done with that invitation and how they've done it.

It's been fully within the state's purview to keep doing things as they've always done, and fund the same programs that they've funded for years, sometimes decades. Some have taken a mix, some have done needs assessments and really tried to pause and pump the brakes to understand what's going on in their state, in their communities before deciding to do new things with their funds. And so this has been an ongoing dialogue, happening in real time, and that's part of why this webinar and other efforts are really intending to make sure that not just the agencies that make the decisions around the funding, but those in the communities most impacted by those decisions, that those service providers with frontline expertise to inform what these

possibilities mean for filling gaps actually have a seat at the table and can actually hold the decision makers with these new tools in their hands accountable to really realizing the intended benefits and possibilities of the rule change.

So a quick note before we move on again on kind of the background and further tools to inform this dialogue about what we do with the possibilities I've talked about today, this first ever victim services statistical research program. So we talked a lot about the NCVS, that's the data that we have directly speaking to the experiences of victims. What we've never had in the US, certainly not at the level, are data directly from the perspective of providers on the frontlines trying to meet their needs. And so the Victim Services Statistical Research Program launched on the same timeline as much of what we've talked about today were efforts to do just that. And they started with the first ever national census and survey of victim service providers which even in its initial phases have really demonstrated some compelling things about the current state of the field and the direction that it may be moving in in the years to come.

So this first ever publication using the national census of victim service providers data, which came out in, as you can see, November of 2019, also included the release of the raw data underlying this report, which means that anyone out there, researchers or otherwise, have the ability to do deeper analysis

for themselves looking at segments of their community and their state about what this research thus far has found. And the National Census of Victim Service Providers included in its frame approximately 12,000 providers nationwide. And with this new data, is the ability to analyze what the makeup of the field looks like in your individual state and community.

And as you can see, even though this first step of this long-term work is incredibly high level, already some strong takeaways about what we're currently funding and supporting as victims services work, and what the possibilities are to greater diversify those services. So as you can see, most are based in nonprofits and government entities, which is unsurprising. Although, you can see heavily focused in the criminal justice system. You can also see for example that only 2.9% of these approximately 12,000 providers nationwide were self-reporting to be based in hospitals, medical, or emergency facilities. So again, I think some important food for thought about partnerships in the public health sphere, about shifting narratives around even the terms we used around victim and survivor, and what does it mean to respond to harm, and who are the relevant partners and entities that we need to be considering and funding as part of that work.

So I'm going to end by shifting, again, taking it local to some state strategies and takeaways for us to think about moving forward. So I hope what's been clear from this conversation is the

importance of relationship building with these decision-makers, with the VOCA administrators in all 56 states and territories. This is really critical for fostering collaboration, transparency, and access to these significant funding opportunities that have only gotten far more significant as the funds have skyrocketed in recent years.

I hope I've rounded out the picture by really asking some hard questions given what we know from the data and otherwise what are the needed policy practice and funding changes so that we're actually reaching and supporting all victims, especially those who have traditionally been most harmed, least helped. And again, the importance of holding the state administering agencies accountable in utilizing these new tools. The rule change, the funds, and doing so in a way that's truly collaborative. That through the strategic planning, and the funding decisions they make, that hopefully are striving to be equitable to reaching all victims and survivors in their communities, that we're only going to get there if we honor the expertise of frontline service providers, community members, and directly-impacted survivors at the decision-making tables of not only the funding but the data we collect to inform those decisions and ultimately what service programs we pursue. That we do all of this in a way that establishes durable frameworks for assessing need and identifying who are underserved that's not subject to the changing funding and policy winds of the day.

And from the data that I've shared, the findings, the rule change, the funding, much of what we've talked about is just scratching the surface. Especially on the range of factors impacting people's lives and the various forms of violence and harm, that people endure and that they endure disproportionately in our society. So to truly move the needle in victim services, and again, this is just so at the heart of what the NRC has done in the years since its inception, we need to think differently and more holistically about harm and victimization. And as James Baldwin said, "not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced." And the stark reality and disparities that we've talked about today, I think really call on all of us to think deeply about our roles, not only as victims service providers and partners in this work, but really as members of this society that is still plagued by such significant disparities and all the work that we still have ahead.

And with that, again, I wanted to make sure to leave you with a number of resources so that you can dig deeper, so that you can follow up, and be a part of this conversation in your states. This includes the text of the rule change itself, the side-by-side comparison chart I mentioned that I think is invaluable in navigating and deciphering what these changes really mean and how to be an advocate for these possibilities. The directory of who these decision-makers are across all 56 states and territories. The report we talked about with these findings who

experiences violent victimization and who is accessing services currently. The first ever publications and some related webinars on the new Victim Services Statistical Research Program, again which I hope are helpful tools to guide these conversations and to advocate for change in addressing gaps across the country.

And with that, I hope that everybody knows that they should please consider me a resource moving forward. Please reach out with questions, comments to further the discussion to make this information useful and meaningful in your lives and work. I am available and welcoming of that moving forward. And with that, there is my contact information. Please do reach out any time and I'm appreciative for your time today. Thanks so much.