

Government Funding of Domestic Violence Services in Utah

A multidisciplinary evaluation

A. PURPOSE

At the direction of Senator Allen Christensen, in recognition of the need for comprehensive, coordinated domestic violence services across the state, the agencies and individuals listed in Appendix A convened a workgroup to accomplish the following:

- Clearly define all sources of government funding for domestic violence services (federal and state funding);
- Develop an understanding of each funding source including determining restrictions, redundancies and reporting requirements;
- Identify barriers to effectively using funding and develop ideas for improvement;
- Determine a plan to come together as a broad coalition of advocates to streamline these funding sources;
- Develop a Collaborative Funding Plan to determine the future of this funding;
- Create a one-page document outlining the different funding sources to be shared with key stakeholders;
- Report findings to Senator Christensen and the Utah State Legislature.

This workgroup primarily examined government funding available to help support the state's shelter-based comprehensive domestic violence services programs, although state funding to support treatment for survivors and offenders is also referenced.

B. FUNDING SOURCES

The following are the federal and state funding sources for domestic violence services in Utah.

1. **VAWA** - Federal grants that encourage the development and implementation of effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women and men and the development and enhancement of victim services in cases involving crimes against women. Administered by the Office on Victims of Crime. The Utah Office for Victims of Crime, in collaboration with specialized victim service providers and specialized victim service experts and advocates from every corner of Utah as well as resourced those across the country,

developed a comprehensive and extensive, 73 page Implementation Plan to guide and direct the expenditure of the STOP VAWA funding in Utah. That plan was accepted and the funding has been awarded for use as outlined within the approved plan. The plan requires ‘Priority areas’ (page 31) within 20 types of projects and programs (page 32). Federal law requires the following award percentages across the required service categories (page 35):

- 25 percent dedicated to law enforcement initiatives and agencies;
- 25 percent dedicated to prosecution initiatives and agencies;
- 5 percent dedicated to court initiatives and administrative office of the courts;
- 30 percent dedicated to non-profit victim service organizations, including a minimum of
 - 10 percent (included within the 30 percent) to culturally specific community-based organizations; and
 - 15 percent dedicated for discretionary purposes, which can include up to five percent for prevention efforts.

VAWA grants require all funded projects be based upon highly detailed and specific, measurable goals and objectives. Grant recipients are required to report on services provided and expenditures under the grant each quarter.

2. **VOCA** - The Crime Victims Fund was established by the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 serves as a major funding source for victim services. This is federal funding that comes from criminal fines, forfeited bail bonds, penalty fees, and special assessments collected by U.S. Attorney's Offices, U.S. Courts, and the Bureau of Prisons. Federal Law dictates that VOCA Funds be administered by a State Administering Agency (SAA) as directed by the Governor of each state. In Utah, VOCA Victim Compensation and VOCA Victim Assistance grants are administered by the Utah Office for Victims of Crime (UOVC). UOVC is an agency within the Utah Office of the Governor and is placed with the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ)

Federal Law 28 CFR 94.103(a) States:

(a) *Direct services.* SAAs may use VOCA funds to provide direct services through sub-recipients or in their own projects, and to cover administrative and training costs of the SAA. **SAAs have sole discretion to determine which organizations will receive funds, and in what amounts, subject to the minimum requirements set forth in VOCA and this subpart. SAAs must ensure that projects provide services to victims of federal crimes on the same basis as to victims of crimes under State or local law.** SAAs may fund direct services regardless of a victim's participation in the criminal justice process. Victim eligibility under this program for direct services is not dependent on the victim's immigration status.

In this fiscal year, the OVC has awarded 2 year grants (2017-2019), more than 90 Victim of Crime Act grant contracts to more than 80 different victim service programs. Seventy-four of these are contracted to provide specific services to victims of domestic violence. Those programs consist of 13 privately-owned and operated non-profit Domestic Violence Shelter-based programs. The remaining 61 victim service providers contracted to provide specific services to victims of domestic violence crimes, consisting of victim advocates in local law enforcement offices, non-profit legal assistance offices, city and county attorney's offices, Children's Justice Centers, non-profit therapy service providers, victim coalitions, state agencies, and other public or private non-profit entities. Of the \$21,299,362 awarded throughout Utah, more than half (50.13%) has been awarded for providing specific services to victims of domestic violence. Federal law requires OVC to provide not less than 10% of all VOCA funding to each group; child physical and sexual abuse crimes, adult rape and sexual assault crimes, domestic violence crimes and 10% to underserved or previously underserved populations. The 13 non-profit shelter-based programs receive a combined total of 44.42% of all VOCA funding contracted for providing services to victims of domestic violence, totaling \$4,742,844.00. An additional \$2.2 million is provided to those programs that provide co-located but separate and specific rape and sexual assault services in addition to DV services, for a grand total of \$6,961,941.78.

VOCA funding distributed by UOVC for DV services supports and enhances the VOCA allowable services outlined in the VAWA Implementation plan as well as the needs defined in the multi-agency funded and supported Domestic Violence portion of the Crime Victims' Needs Assessment conducted by the University of Utah, Social Research Institute.

As with the STOP VAWA funding guidelines, all funded projects must be based upon highly detailed and specific measurable goals and objectives. Grant recipients are required to report on services provided and expenditures under the grant each quarter.

Additionally, UOVC shall follow ALL Federal VOCA Guidelines and DOJ Financial Guidelines when administering the VOCA funding.

OVC's Model Standards are located at <https://www.ovc.gov/model-standards/>.

The VAWA Implementation Plan and the Domestic Violence Needs Assessment is located at <https://justice.utah.gov/Crime/>.

3. **FVPSA** – Federal funding first passed by Congress in 1984, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act is the primary federal funding stream dedicated to the support of emergency shelter and related assistance for victims of domestic violence including children. Administered by the Department of Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services.
4. **STATE GENERAL FUNDS and STATE RESTRICTED GENERAL FUNDS** – Administered by the Department of Human Services/Division of Child and Family

services (DHS/DCFS) to help subsidize court-ordered and voluntary domestic violence treatment for offenders and survivors.

5. **DV TREATMENT ACCOUNT (RESTRICTED GENERAL FUNDS)** - Administered by DHS/DCFS to provide court-ordered and voluntary domestic violence treatment for offenders and survivors.

The vast majority of FVPSA and State General Funds are passed through DCFS to the shelter-based programs, and smaller allotments go to support programs provided by the UDVC and to help subsidize the cost of providing domestic violence therapeutic interventions for survivors, including children and perpetrators. While some resistance exists to helping fund offender treatment, Utah Rule charges DCFS with making funds available to assist those seeking treatment to help promote family unity and safety. Almost \$4.2 million is allocated to the 13 private non-profit and two state-owned domestic violence shelter programs. \$30,000 is provided to the Utah Domestic Violence Coalition (UDVC) for operation of the statewide domestic violence hotline, and an additional \$7,500 to help support their annual conference on domestic violence.

6. **TANF** - Administered by the Department of Workforce Services to provide grants for domestic violence shelters for domestic violence prevention/victim support services, which may include case management, counseling, short-term emergency shelter/transitional housing, and information and referral services.
7. **HUD** - Administered by the Department of Workforce Services, this funding is designed to assist domestic violence survivors in obtaining housing following a stay in shelter.

C. FUNDING TO SHELTER-BASED PROGRAMS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ANNUAL BUDGETS

	Total Revenue 2013	UOVC Funds	DCFS Funds	% of Budget
CAPSA	1,038,638	166,593	150,300	23
Canyon Creek	388,612	126,899	139,200	68
CWCIC	1,061,570	151,850	168,800	30
Safe Harbor	887,670	205,777	178,400	43
Dove Center	738,714	127,529	154,500	38
New Hope	393,532	125,414	122,300	63
New Horizon	448,539.24	163,165.00	148,300.00	69.00
Peace House	619,840	30,865	131,200	26
Seekhaven	434,329	84,612	121,000	47
South Valley Services	677,160	85,512	217,400	44
Valley Mental Tooele		38,656	205,000	
YCC	1,873,754	245,732	153,800	21
YWCA WIJ program		151,960	423,700	

	Total Revenue 2014	UOVC Funds	DCFS Funds	% of budget
CAPSA	1,355,136	176,968	208,000	28
Canyon Creek	477,094	134,079	206,600	71
CWCIC	1,402,827	161,627	236,100	28
Safe Harbor	811,302	210,683	228,700	54
Dove Center	630,514	135,556	218,800	56
New Hope	541,417	131,772	189,700	59
New Horizon	443,692	176,174	208,600	71
Peace House	783,920	41,116	198,000	30
Seekhaven	425,511	106,033	187,400	37
South Valley Services	782,699	109,789	254,200	37
Valley Mental Tooele	307,224	38,656	205,000	79
YCC	3,131,266	263,102	352,900	19
YWCA WIJ program	1,351,180	162,465	457,600	45

307,224 Taken from budgets in grants



Other Total Revenue Taken from form 990

	Total Revenue 2015	UOVC Funds	DCFS Funds	% of budget
CAPSA	1,927,837	207,706	199,520	21
Canyon Creek	571,154	140,063	199,869	59
CWCIC	1,421,141	164,840	227,841	27
Safe Harbor	1,130,097	238,802	216,796	40
Dove Center	677,143	153,803	209,931	53
New Hope	621,501	141,475	177,138	51
New Horizon	488,057	215,261	197,593	84
Peace House	810,985	69,346	183,661	31
Seekhaven	387,321	135,549	173,386	79
South Valley Services	826,471	117,507	248,102	44
Valley Mental Tooele	280,664	37,190	129,091	59
YCC	2,277,914	320,028	349,453	29
YWCA WIJ program	1,275,718	165,227	486,077	51

	Total Revenue 2016	UOVC Funds	DCFS Funds	% of budget
CAPSA	1,292,271	317,661	318,086	49
Canyon Creek	715,766	293,721	307,746	84
CWCIC	1,493,846	156,286	225,636	25
Safe Harbor	1,343,018	395,352	390,586	58
Dove Center	798,579	198,816	252,366	56
New Hope	619,201	175,837	233,216	66
New Horizon	617,933	319,143	197,416	83
Peace House	1,363,730	148,015	221,296	27
Seekhaven	444,581	156,888	179,856	75
South Valley Services	986,531	154,410	369,096	53
Valley Mental Tooele	280,664	37,190	206,576	86
YCC	2,348,329	2,348,329	2,348,329	2,348,329
YWCA WIJ program	1,368,674	238,242	552,956	57

Taken from budgets in grants

Other Total Revenue	<i>Taken from form 990</i>
----------------------------	----------------------------

	UOVC Projected Total Revenue 2017	UOVC Funds	DCFS Funds	% of budget
CAPSA	1,369,107	419,894.49	223,206.00	47
Canyon Creek	895,462	334,094.43	203,956.00	60
CWCIC	1,380,509	352,531.57	232,786.00	42
Safe Harbor	1,558,274	450,123.63	324,836.00	49
Dove Center	678,282	229,440.00	240,296.00	69
New Hope	671,279	349,226	185,016	79
New Horizon	968,952	435,970	228,046	68
Peace House	1,074,687	158,403	194,886	32
Seekhaven	416,100	223,492	188,806	99
South Valley Services	1,118,847	349,536.91	305,526.00	58
Valley Mental Tooele	315,896	103,339	220,756	102
YCC	2,150,851	498,085	440,466	43
YWCA WIJ program	1,387,330	291,815	584,346	63

	<i>Taken from budgets in grants</i>
--	-------------------------------------

Other Total Revenue	<i>Taken from form 990</i>
----------------------------	----------------------------

C. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

In March 2017, the Social Research Institute at the University of Utah published the *Crime Victims Domestic Violence Needs Assessment* completed at the request of the Center for Criminal and Juvenile Justice in conjunction with DCFS. Data was gathered by collecting survey data from domestic violence stakeholders and in-depth phone interviews. The top five unmet needs in urban areas identified as emergency shelter, short-term housing, transitional housing, relocation assistance, and long-term housing. Respondents in rural areas identified their top five unmet needs as relocation assistance, rental assistance/short-term housing, intervention with employer, landlord, creditor, etc., transitional housing, and immigration attorney assistance. Barriers to obtaining services were identified as:

Recommendations made are as follows: 1. Implement basic victim services programs in areas without programs; 2. Collaborate with partners statewide to develop comprehensive housing models (e.g., expand selected shelters, partner with rapid rehousing, work with others to get legislative funding for housing projects); and 3. Train and retrain in trauma-informed service models and other best practice services such as Lethality Assessment Program.

Also in March 2017, the University of Utah College of Social Work completed the *Utah Domestic and Sexual Violence Needs Assessment: Survivor and Provider Findings*, at the request of the Utah Domestic Violence Coalition. Data was gathered using focus groups of domestic violence survivors within shelters and shelter service providers throughout the state.

Domestic violence survivors in this assessment identified challenges to obtaining adequate assistance as: 1. Inadequate law enforcement and criminal/legal system response; 2. Clergy lacking education about domestic violence; 3. Adequate childcare; and 4. Transportation and employment, particularly in rural areas. Service providers named the following challenges: 1. Lack of funding and restrictions placed on it; 2. Services for people with substance use and mental health issues; and 3. Transportation, particularly in small towns and rural areas. The assessment also identified that use of the Lethality Assessment Protocol has increased identification of persons needing immediate shelter, driving up the need for already scant resources.

Recommendations made are: 1. Provide domestic violence education for law enforcement, judges, prosecutors and clergy; 2. Raise awareness for stigma and community resources; 3. Enact legislation regarding protective orders and safety; and 4. Provide trauma-informed wrap-around services (affordable housing, mental health and substance abuse services, legal services, employment, and childcare).

D. REDUNDANCIES

Grant applications are made to three state agencies: the Office for Victims of Crimes, for VAWA and VOCA, the Division of Child and Family Services for FVPSA, and the Department of Workforce Services for TANF and HUD. Reporting on the use of those funds goes to each awarding agency. Reporting requirements consist of submission of numerical and demographic data, as well as narrative reporting. While programs are required to report to the various agencies

administering the funds, there are very few overlapping reporting requirements; each department requires a separate application and data reports from subgrantees.

E. HOW FUNDING DECISIONS ARE MADE

1. VAWA/VOCA - The Utah Office for Victims of Crime (UOVC) is the agency designated by the governor to administer federal funds for the following three programs: Victim of Crime Act Victim Assistance Formula grant (VOCA), STOP Violence Against Women Formula grant (VAWA), and Sexual Assault Service Program (SASP). UOVC's goal in administering these federal grant programs is to ensure that crime victims throughout the state of Utah have access to vitally needed services and to assist local communities to enhance and expand crime victim services.

The methods used to make award decisions are as follows: A) Statewide Announcement: Upon receipt of federal grant funds, UOVC announces the availability of funds through a Request for Proposal (RFP) announcement to stakeholders statewide using a wide variety of methods. B) Training: Extensive training and technical assistance is provided to agencies throughout the state, as well as through individual meetings, email, and telephone discussions. Training includes program purposes, eligibility requirements, past accomplishments, certified assurances and grant conditions, applications, process, and deadlines. C) Application Review and Funding Recommendations: Screening and Allocation Committees review grant applications and make funding recommendations.

Committee membership selection is based on demonstration of the following: knowledge of the grant program; experience in victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, human services, advocacy etc., grant writing skills; grant management and administrative skills; and program implementation abilities. Each committee has both urban and rural representatives. This comprehensive peer review process begins when grant applications are submitted. Each committee consists of four community members. Each committee member reviews an average of ten grants, which they read, score, and rank. Committee members are looking for completeness of grant; alignment with VOCA/VAWA/SASP program goals/objectives; whether the proposed program justifies the submitted budget. Committee members meet with UOVC grant analysts and review each grant in detail. During this review, grant analysts write comprehensive notes on application strengths, revisions that need to be made, and application weaknesses.

2. When the application review is complete, the committee votes on whether to recommend one of the following options: Fund the application as proposed; partially fund the application with required revisions; or not fund the grant application. Once all grants have been reviewed, the Screening and Allocation Committees' recommendations are summarized and presented to UOVC's Board, and the board either approves the committees' recommendations or partially approves committees' recommendations while adding changes or making restrictions. Once the board makes its final determinations, UOVC grant analysts communicate with applicants informing them of the board's final decision. Once informed, the subgrantee has the option of either making any necessary

changes to receive the award declining the award. If needed, once the revisions have been submitted, a contract is issued. Changes to the contract can only be made in writing through a grant change request.

3. **FVPSA** - Annually, DCFS receives an award from the Administration of Children and Families. Each of the non-profit shelters is given a \$100,000 base rate. Rural shelters are given an additional \$10,000 (there are seven); and semi-rural shelters are given an additional \$5,000 (there are two). After state administrative costs are backed out from the remainder of the above allocations, that amount is divided among the shelters based on a percentage determined by an average number of shelter days over the past three years. In 2014, an additional \$700,000 in ongoing funding was allocated and is divided among the shelter programs, so about another \$58,333 for each. If the legislature allocates a specific amount for a particular program, that program also receives those funds (currently, there is one shelter that receives an additional annual allocation of \$147,000).
4. **STATE GENERAL FUNDS (SGF) and STATE RESTRICTED GENERAL FUNDS (SRGF)** - There is no separate application process for agencies wishing to receive these funds. SGF and SRGF money is included in the amounts from DCFS to the shelter programs along with FVPSA money.
5. **TANF** - There are a few ways that DWS administers grants with TANF funds. One way is through a direct appropriation from the legislature. If the legislature names an entity to receive funds through an appropriation, DWS directly contracts with that entity. In the case of DV services, the legislature appropriated funds to "DV shelter services" in general. When this happens, DWS creates a grant application process and treats it like an RFP, or as referred to by DWS a Request for Grants (RFG). Typically, there is an amount associated with the appropriation. Based on the scores of the applications, DWS awards the grants from highest scoring applications down until all money is allocated.
6. **HUD** - The Unified Funding application instructions and RFP are posted on the DWS web site around early February. Reporting is standard for the awardees. The System Performance measures look at data quality, point in time counts, and demographic information on clients. These are all HUD required reports, so DV programs submit their reports directly to HUD, not to DWS. The funding application for Continuum of Care (COC) funding from HUD also is a separate process than the Unified funding (includes Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG, Fed), Critical Needs (state) TANF (Fed through HCD) and Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund (PAHTF, State). The CoC is a competitive application that is funded directly from HUD to agencies, but applications are accepted through the CoC collaborative applicant and ranked for funding. The reporting HUD requires is actually pulled and submitted by the State or the HMIS lead agency, which we currently are. The Agency's CoC reviews it and pushed the "submit" button, but we do fill that need here in our office of downloading the data file and uploading on behalf of the agencies.

F. GRANTS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice Office for Victims of Crime is working with other state agencies to create a grant management system that could minimize the number of times a DV program would have to enter data for reporting or for funding applications. They are going through the RFP process now. Once that is completed, they will go through a pilot process with UOVC and CCJJ and then broaden it from there.

The goal is for agencies to have the ability to create a profile, review available grants, and then apply for those they qualify for. At that point, information from their profile would auto-feed into each application. The system will include a data management component, and will also work closely with FINET, so there will be a cut on cost for personnel and reduction in human error. Once the system is available, agencies will be able to buy in to use it.

VOCA/VAWA - A two- year cycle from one - The use of two-year grant contracts will also be rolling out for the new fiscal year. The longer timeframe will reduce administrative burden and help to strengthen, enhance, and stabilize non-profit organizations and government agencies by increasing retention and morale. Potential employees and employers will have a greater ability to invest in each other with a longer period of commitment to each other. Training opportunities have increased, as well as wellness programs.

The UOVC's next goal is to increase the use of technology. They hope to increase service availability in rural communities by using laptops with cameras so that people can work face to face, even from a distance. Following that, they will also be working on improving translation services.

G. PREVENTION

Minimal funding is available for domestic violence prevention services. The Department of Health administers grants for Primary Prevention of Sexual Assault. Primary prevention is designed to stop the initial occurrence of violence, while Secondary Prevention efforts are designed to keep it from happening again after an episode takes place. Given that primary prevention addresses root causes of violence and uses risk and protective factors associated with sexual violence to design strategies, it does address multiple forms of interpersonal violence, including domestic violence.

FVPSA recipients contracted with DCFS are required to conduct education and public awareness sessions. In 2016, 1,285 presentations were made to adults, which included 83,500 people. (This number is high because one program provides a radio program, and so the audience is estimated). 831 presentations were made to children, with 36,138 reached.

H. AMERICAN INDIANS



The majority of American Indians in Utah live in very rural areas, which as noted above, are often greatly underserved. And the rates of intimate partner violence against indigenous women are higher than the state average, presenting a higher need for services. Most tribes do not have their own shelter facility, which increases the need for cultural proficiency among the existing shelter programs. There is a need, too, for culturally knowledgeable advocates and treatment programs. A recent report found that 97 percent of American Indian women who were assaulted have non-native abusers. This is a very complicated issue, with over 250 sovereign nations.

The most recent renewal of VAWA created a path for tribal courts to assume jurisdiction over non-native abusers who have abused American Indian women, but the application process is complicated for many of the sovereign nations, and the tribes are required to change tribal law to coordinate with U.S. code.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Outreach to homeless shelters is needed. Availability to housing (emergency, short-term, and long-term) is critical for survivors.
- Shelters are usually at capacity, and hotel beds are found for victims. Additional funding for communities would aid in obtaining additional hotel beds when the shelters are at capacity.
- It is important that we all share information utilizing a common terminology. This will enable us to serve our clients in a better-informed way. This may require regional meetings with law enforcement and victim advocates to come to a clear understanding of what services are available. UDVC member programs subscribe to a common set of standardized service definitions, which have been incorporated into the DCFS shelter contract. These definitions are endorsed by the National Network to End Domestic Violence as evidence-based practices to support positive outcomes for survivors.
- Building Tribal court capacity, better relationships between Tribal and local governments, culturally-appropriate and accessible treatment services, and a justice system that meets the needs of American Indian women. Other suggestions are building collaboration between agencies and Tribes, developing a unique referral process for each agency, developing a Memorandum of Understanding between agencies to define roles, and designing a formal consultation policy between agencies and Tribes.
- Allocate ongoing funds to replace revenue from the diminishing Restricted Account.
- Continue this work by developing an annual or semi-annual Domestic Violence State Plan that identifies trends, gaps, and plans for service development.
- Evaluate options to utilize a common database among all the state's domestic violence shelters.
- Evaluate using HMIS resources when locating housing for domestic violence survivors.

APPENDIX A: COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Jennifer Campbell, Co-Chair
South Valley Services



Brent Platt, Co-Chair

Department of Human Services

Anthony Guzman

Urban Indian Center of Salt Lake

Brant Wadsworth

Canyon Creek Women's Crisis Center

Brian Parnell

Division of Child and Family Services

Chris Davies, Liz Watson, Jenn Oxborrow

Utah Domestic Violence Coalition

Dorothy Hall, Kimberly Carter, Sarah Moore

Department of Workforce Services

Elizabeth Albertson, Martha Fallis

Utah Domestic Violence Treatment

Gary Scheller, Christine Watters, Jennifer Menteer

Utah Office for Victims of Crime

Gloria Arredondo

Domestic Violence Survivor

Heather Smith Wolsey

Domestic Violence Survivor

James Toledo

Utah Office on Indian Affairs

Jill Anderson

Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse

Julee Smith

Your Community Connection

Lindsey Boyer

D.O.V.E. Center

Megan Waters

Utah Department of Health

Ned Searle

Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

The committee wishes to express our deep gratitude to Veronica Argyle and Carol Miller at the Division of Child and Family Services for providing logistical and administrative support.