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Overview of Automated Victim Notification

- Notification is an essential victim right
- Partnering criminal justice agencies
- Registration
  - Open vs. closed systems
- Triggers for notification
- Modes of notification
- Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) SAVIN Program
What is SAVIN?

- States that have an AVN system and have received SAVIN funding (includes Puerto Rico)
- States that have an AVN system but have not received SAVIN funding (includes the District of Columbia)
- States that do not have an AVN system
Methodology

- Phase I: Landscape
  - Document Review
  - Administrator & vendor interviews
  - Review of legislation
  - AVN profiles

- Phase II: Use & Experience with AVN
  - Surveys of service providers and victims

- Phase III: Considerations for Practice
  - Case studies & cost considerations
Limitations

- Lack of definition of “Statewide”
- Evolving evaluation
- Methodological limitations
  - Phase I: Administrator turnover & usage data
  - Phase II: Surveys
  - Phase III: Cost considerations
Victim & Service Provider Findings
Awareness and Use of Automated Notification

Use of Automated Notification Among Victim Advocates (n=1,203)
- System Users, 74%
- Non-System Users, 26%

Registration for Automated Notification Among Victims (n=716)
- Registered, 23%
- Non-Registered, 77%
Overall Satisfaction with Automated Notification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Victims (n=150)</th>
<th>Victim Advocates (n=675)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all satisfied</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very satisfied</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding percentages do not sum to 100%
Benefits of Automated Notification

- Helps victims to make decisions about their safety: 69% (Victims) vs. 88% (Victim Advocates)
- Helps victims feel more empowered: 66% (Victims) vs. 76% (Victim Advocates)
- Increases victims' sense of safety: 65% (Victims) vs. 92% (Victim Advocates)
- Enhances victims' participation in their related legal case: 63% (Victims) vs. 68% (Victim Advocates)

*The victim sample size for each question varied from 134 to 138.
Experiencing Problems with Automated Notification System

Victims (n=134): 18%
Victim Advocates (n=400): 38%
Challenges

Challenges Experienced by Victims (n=24)
- Inaccurate notifications: 47%
- Not enough notifications: 21%
- Trouble with PIN: 21%
- Difficulty registering: 25%

Challenges Experienced by Victim Advocates (n=150)
- Inaccurate notifications: 48%
- Not enough notifications: 25%
- Trouble with PIN: 17%
- Difficulty registering: 13%
- Difficulty using website to check offender status: 13%
- Delayed or outdated notifications: 13%
Common Themes

- Manual notification
- Program costs
- System awareness
- Registration
- Available services
- Notification process
- Contact with a live person
What’s Next?

- States continue to seek funding streams
- States continue to find new ways to innovate and more efficiently implement and improve their programs
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