

# Office for Victims of Crime

## VOCA Administrator Regional Meeting | SUMMARY

---

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	March 13, 2014
<b>MEETING LOCATION</b>	Washington, DC
<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Joye Frost
<b>TYPE OF MEETING</b>	Regional Administrator's Meeting
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Joye Frost
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<p>Suzanne Breedlove (OK), Robert Gallup (CO), Amy Greer (CO), Wendy Butler (CO), Nancy Feldman (CO), Allison Boyd (CO), Anthony Tilger (CO), Mary Vail Ware (VA), Linda Cimino (CT), Kate Henderson (AZ), Michael Sheline (OH), Anna Meola (MA), Daniel Cooper (MA), and Janice Vigil-Kelly (CO). Dan Eddy (NACVCB), Steve Derene (NAVAA), and Steve Siegel (Second Judicial District, CO).</p> <p>Dan Eddy (National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards, NACVCB) and Steve Derene (National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, NAVAA)</p>
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p>From the OVC State Assistance and Compensation Division: Marilyn Roberts, Toni Thomas, DeLano Foster, BJ Horn (Visiting Fellow) and Grace Call (Visiting Fellow)</p> <p>From other OVC Divisions: Bob Cantrell, Eugenia Pedley, and Chris Holloway</p>

### HIGH LEVEL SUMMARY

- OVC wants to proceed with a Federal Advisory Group to discuss implementing statutory changes to VOCA.
- Vision 21 competitive solicitations will be released within the next few weeks regarding legal assistance and technology.
- Please provide feedback to OVC TTAC on its Victim Assistance Training (VAT)
- OVC is preparing an electronic publication that will reflect information Fellows have gathered from you on innovative assistance and compensation practices in the states.

### ATTACHMENT

- Agenda
- Pre-meeting questions

## **DISCUSSION OF THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT (VOCA)**

---

The following points were made during the discussion:

- A Federal Advisory Group will discuss making statutory changes.
- Payment for sexual assault exams continues to be an ongoing issue.
- Flexibility in managing funds is necessary to meet the needs of victims.
- OVC should re-examine the payer of last resort issue regarding Indian Health Service.

## **FRAMING THE CONVERSATION ABOUT THE FUTURE OF VICTIM SERVICES AND CHANGES TO VOCA**

---

The following points were made during the discussion:

- Strengths, opportunities, and weaknesses of VOCA:
  - Increased administrative and training costs
  - Property loss
  - Increase in the VOCA cap
  - Extending the grant period
  - Restitution
  - Prevention
  - Payer of last resort
  - VOCA formula
- Capacity should be built through a claims management system, which can cost about \$1 million in a large state.
- Administrative funds should be increased from 5 to 10 percent, but this will reduce the money available to pay compensation claims. It should be consistent with OVW administrative rate, which is 10 percent. Administrative funds should be tied to statewide needs assessment planning.
- Funds are needed to support the Kentucky State Academy.
- Standard needs assessment necessary for victims, similar to OVW's.
- Training is needed for victim compensation and assistance boards.
  - Reach out to TTAC for training.
  - TTTAC could assist states in managing grants and avoid deobligating funds.
  - OVC can issue policy guidance on using administrative funds to support training.
- Compensation programs should pay for property, such as doors.
- Collection of restitution was discussed. A restitution working group was suggested.
- Some states do not negotiate on subrogation costs.
- Clarification on safety planning is needed.
- Prevention is necessary within the context of providing services.
- There has been a downward trend on compensation paid.
  - In particular for Medicaid/hospital payments.
  - Texas has received fewer applications because murder and assault rates are going down.

- Young adults are submitting fewer claims because they are still on their parents' insurance plans.
- Law enforcement agencies are the best voices for compensation.
- VOCA formula has benefited the assistance programs. The FY 2014 awards will be among the largest ever.
- Keeping the percentage of state payouts works for a state that can payout the same amount. If a state sees a decline, the proportion will be hard to balance.

## **BACKGROUND ON DATA COLLECTION REVISIONS: STATUS REPORT**

---

- States must examine performance measures.
  - Although states have requested one data collection form for all government agencies, this won't happen. OVC wants uniformity in data, which would allow for data aggregation.
- Data should be useful at the federal and state level.
- States have a huge amount of data that OVC doesn't request.
- Some states can't get info on human trafficking.
  - Texas started tracking human trafficking as a crime in its database.
  - Knowing what services are and are not provided is a key issue. We just need to figure out categories and why.
- Training on data collection is needed
- Some states indicate that they are not asked to report on all domestic violence claims.
- Compensation may be able to react to a change more quickly than assistance.
- States want to know how OVC will proceed.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

---

- OVC will look at compensation and state data more closely.
  - OVC will put together a first draft re. state data by touching base with each state re. implications, estimated costs, and other issues. The dream is to aggregate data.
  - Aggregation of data will assist OVC in briefing Congress.
- Some states indicate that compiling data will be costly.
- OVC could request data from states that have more advanced systems when necessary.
- States should provide OVC TTAC with feedback on its Victim Assistance Training (VAT), which will be launched during National Crime Victims' Rights Weeks (NCVRW).
  - The VOCA Administrator Mentoring contact is Fernanda Webster.
  - TTAC can provide training and technical assistance for programs on capacity building. TTAC can put together a webinar on this topic.
  - The Academy and Leadership Institute will be online.
    - States indicate that they need board development training and online basic training for nonprofits to use.
    - United Way used to offer this type of training.

**OVC VOCA Administrator Regional Meeting – March 13, 2014  
Washington, DC**

**Agenda**

7:45–8:00	Registration
8:00–8:05	Welcome and Overview Joye Frost, Director, OVC
8:05–8:15	Introductions
8:15–8:45	Discussion of the Victims of Crime Act (1984) Joye Frost and Kris Brambila, Attorney Advisor, OJP
8:45-9:15	Framing the conversation about the future of victim services and changes to VOCA Joye Frost, Grace Call, and BJ Horn
9:15–9:40	Small group discussion Group One: Compensation Administrators <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SWOT Analysis of the Compensation portions of the Statute<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Strengths</li><li>○ Weaknesses</li><li>○ Opportunities</li><li>○ Threats</li></ul></li></ul> Group Two: Assistance Administrators <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SWOT Analysis of the Assistance portions of the Statute<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Strengths</li><li>○ Weaknesses</li><li>○ Opportunities</li><li>○ Threats</li></ul></li></ul>
9:40–9:50	Break
9:50-10:30	Continued Small Group Discussion
10:30–11:30	Small Group Report Back
11:30 – 12:30	Lunch – On Your Own
12:30–1:00	Background on Data Collection Revisions: Status Report Marilyn Roberts, Deputy Director
1:00-2:00	Large Group Discussion of the Process for Improving the VOCA Assistance and State Compensation Service and Client Data
2:00 – 2:30	Compensation and Assistance Specific Group Discussions
2:30-2:45	Break
2:45-3:30	Continued Discussions of Assistance and Compensation Specific Groups
3:30–4:00	Summary of discussions and next steps

**What are the five most important things you would like to see changed in the VOCA statute concerning compensation and assistance?**

**BOTH COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE**

***Administration Amount (9 of 15 respondents)***

Increase administration amount to 10%

Increase administration amount

Increase administration amount to 10%

Raise the percentage compensation programs can use towards administrative costs. Some will want this and other may not. But might be worth giving them the option up to say 25%.

Change current 5% administrative allowance to a higher percentage for states to use, to do what's necessary to improve their program performance. Chiefly, states would use this for technology upgrades or for necessary personnel.

Increase the administrative costs allowance from 5% to 10%

Our programs have outstanding training initiatives, raising the cap in training/admin from 5% to 10% 5% admin + 5% training would be more in keeping with the percentage that is truly representative of the need.

Although this is not in the statute, raise the administration and training percentage to 10% (similar to S.T.O.P. VAWA) to allow for advocate training, grant management system maintenance/modifications/upgrades, and additional monitoring staff on the Assistance side; and outreach, administrative/staff needs, and system maintenance/modifications/upgrades on the Victim Compensation side

I would like to see the percentage of administrative monies available for use by compensation increased to at least 10% so that I can hire more staff to do intake and process payments, thereby increasing the productivity of the compensation program.

***Property Loss (8 of 15 respondents)***

Modifications to allow for assistance with property loss/replacement (e.g. cell phones)

Modifications to allow for assistance with property loss/replacement (e.g. doors)

Modifications to allow for assistance with property loss/replacement (e.g. doors)

Allow states to use property damage and loss in the certification as allowed by state statute

Expand VOCA to include compensation payments for property loss directly impacting quality of life (for example: stolen cell phone or television, rent payment or social security payment lost in a robbery). This could be limited to disabled or elderly.

Include property damage to include clothing damaged during the commission of a crime

With respect to the Compensation Guidelines, one important change would be to include doors in the property category as part of the state certification.

I would like to see the statute expanded to included property losses as a result of a crime (especially cars that are damaged due to gunfire)

<b><i>Training (2 of 15 respondents)</i></b>
Allow training to be paid under administrative costs
Allow for an additional percentage for training, but not out of administrative funds
<b><i>Other</i></b>
Allow the ability to request an extension of the end of the grant period to avoid returned money
Raise the cap to \$1 billion to restore victim assistance funding to the level it was in 2000.
<b>COMPENSATION</b>
<b><i>Restitution (7 of 15 respondents)</i></b>
Stop penalizing states for collecting restitution
Change certification process so states aren't penalized for restitution collection
Compensation programs are not penalized for restitution collection
With regard to restitution recovery in compensation programs, allow programs to claim the entire amount of the restitution recovery specialist including overhead as a deduction in Part 1. Line E of the certification form.
This is probably not a statutory change, but we see a need to end the required deduction of restitution and subrogation income on the state certified-payout form.
Inclusion of revenue funds when calculating State Award.
Remove the penalty in the certification for a state that collects restitution and subrogation; the way it currently is done creates an incentive not to collect restitution or subrogation in order to increase a state's VOCA compensation grant.
<b><i>Formula for Determining Award (5 of 15 respondents)</i></b>
Change the way that compensation grant amounts are determined (e.g. eliminate the certification form and 60% match formula to increase in states that really need the funding)
That small state compensation programs could be considered at a higher match.
Increase the % match from the current 60 % match for compensation programs
Raise the percentage of match for compensation programs. Again, if some don't want it, let them elect within a percentage range.
Changing formula to 70%
<b><i>Federal Benefit Programs and Payer of Last Resort (3 of 15 respondents)</i></b>
Expand 10602.b.6 to include foreign countries where a compensation program does not exist or is inaccessible to the victim
Clarify 10602.e as it specifically relates to Indian Health Services; IHS* is better coverage than some compensation programs and allowing them to pay prior helps victims
Re-clarification that state programs are payers of last resort in relationship to all federal benefit programs.
<b><i>Other</i></b>
Allow compensation to pay for non-traditional services in non-traditional manners (e.g. homicide support groups, empowerment weekends, etc.)

Open a revenue opportunity for grants for data system upgrades or replacement where victims could remotely follow their case as it moves through the process. VINE already provides that service to victims.
Ensure states do not deny claims based on citizenship or immigration status of the victim
Review the requirement for cooperation with law enforcement
Remove or enforce the federal delinquency requirement for compensation
Consideration of compensation for vulnerable white-collar victims of crime. It is hard breaking to receive so many claims from elders who have been swindled.
<b>ASSISTANCE</b>
<b><i>Prevention (3 of 15 respondents)</i></b>
Expand assistance to include prevention
Allow eligibility of prevention activities
Allow for some prevention activities. In stalking and vandalism cases, cameras would be helpful.
<b><i>Increase Base Amount of Funding (2 of 15)</i></b>
I would like to see the base amount for victim assistance increased, because when assistance programs have insufficient funding there is greater strain on the compensation program.
If we could raise the base amount from \$500,000 to 600,000 that would be extremely helpful. It has not been changed for some time.
<b><i>Other</i></b>
Allow for work with incarcerated offenders who are also victims
Allow relocation expenses to be paid through assistance grants
Allow for payment of an annual needs assessment
Allow states to waive the match requirement for grants to Indian Tribal governments
Allow a portion of grant funds to subrecipients to be used for operational expenses
Change the way the VOCA funding is distributed so that VOCA assistance grants are not the last in line for the funds remaining
Allow the ability to pay for security deposits on housing and utilities, rent assistance and mortgage payments, or other items to assist victims in obtaining safe, stable housing
Allow states to apply for financial assistance to create a statewide database/information collection system (for reporting purposes), for all victim service subrecipients
Explore innovative models of service delivery. Increase VOCA assistance funding for integrated services (one-stop shops, case management, Family Justice Centers, Trauma Recovery Centers, victim services, transitional housing, and victim compensation without walls).
Create opportunities for cooperation and collaboration between victim assistance and compensation programs.
Expand services to include legal assistance. This is especially important in cases of

<p>domestic violence. It is soul crushing for a victim of domestic violence to be in the courtroom, alone, when the perpetrator is there with a high paid attorney. This would enable us to expand the legal advocacy portion of our services to include providing assistance from a member of the Vermont Bar Association to victims.</p>
<p>Expand VOCA to include payment for transportation costs and costs related to lost income in a wider variety of circumstances including court appearances, taking care of an injured child, or taking a family member to counseling, court or medical appointments. Compensation doesn't always cover these issues, which can have a significant impact on victims with limited income.</p>
<p>It would be helpful, given the size of the VOCA fund, to have the established cap include automatic annual increases for all authorized VOCA programs, including Assistance.</p>
<p>Clarify that OJP Management and Administrative costs should be taken directly out of the fund itself and should not be included as part of the funds under the annual cap.</p>
<p>Change the formula so that the program areas (Children's Justice Act, OVC discretionary funds, VOCA Compensation, and VOCA Assistance) receive consistent amounts and are not dependent on victim compensation awards. This would eliminate fluctuations in other programs, such as VOCA Assistance, based on the payouts for the victim compensation programs.</p>
<p><b>OTHER</b></p>
<p>Improve how well connected the federal Victim/Witness personnel are to the network for victim service programs in each state</p>
<p>Improve on-going support of SAVIN (notification) programs through VOCA</p>
<p>Maybe this information exists, but it would be helpful to receive electronic reports on the funds OVC issues to each state for victims services and this would include and state and non-profits.</p>

**Does your office collect any service of client data in addition to what is reported to OVC?**

**ASSISTANCE**

From Cal OES: Cal OES only collects what the fund source requires. However, if a project is funded with more than one fund, (i.e. VOCA and VAWA), the project is required to collect data based on each fund source’s requirement. (CA)

Our new Colorado Grant Management System (COGMS) can capture demographic information on clients served. This will be used to satisfy special condition eighteen in our federal Assistance award. We also have Project Specific Goals and Objectives that count the number of service contacts per client, and we ask for outcome impact data including the method of data collection. The data is collected through quarterly reports. It is not compiled into a report but the data is used by the staff and the Crime Victim Services Board to look at trends throughout the state as well as the progress of the individual subgrantees. (CO)

Reports to other federal sources (e.g. STOP VAWA, SASP, FVPSA) (IA)

Sheltering victims traditionally and non-traditionally (IA)

# media contacts and type of contact (IA)

# of collaboration by types of collaboration (IA)

# of referrals by programs conducting referrals (IA)

Where services were provided by victimization (IA)

County where victim is from/where they receive services (if non-identifying) (IA)

Moving to a unit of service performance collection within the next 1-2 years (e.g. types of services provided to the victim, number of hours provided in each service category, and where/how are victims house in lieu of traditional shelter) (IA)

Yes. We collect demographic data (sex/age/race/disability) on each primary victim served. (MN)

Elder-specific crimes (OH)

LGBTQ (OH)

Homeless youth (OH)

**COMPENSATION**

Currently our program only collects data required by OVC. While we report compensation totals to OVC, we can access and review the more detailed information that makes up the reported totals. (AZ)

VCGCB collects client and service data in addition to what is reported to OVC. We collect demographic data about claimants and data about payments made. We report some of this data to the public on our website via our annual report and internally the data is used to manage inventory and inform program decisions. (CA)

Data is collected from the application and on all actions taken on the claim such as eligibility determination and payments made on each benefit category. (CA)
Data is compiled in an number of different reports and includes information such as: Date application was received, crime code, crime category, if the crime was domestic violence, filing status of claimant, date of birth, gender, ethnicity, Crime county, eligibility determination, benefits category paid on claim and total amount paid on claim. (CA)
VCGCB also collects data regarding processing time and production at our Sacramento headquarters and at our satellite offices. We have a number of offices throughout the state where we have established county contracts for claim processing or restitution imposition. We issue reports for each of our contracted offices. (CA)
As one of only two decentralized states, the Office for Victims Programs (OVP) within the Division of Criminal does not collect additional service or client data separate from what is necessary to complete the statewide performance report and state certification for victim compensation. The individual victim compensation programs in the twenty-two judicial districts may collect additional information for purposes of administering the local program; however, this information is not forwarded to or collected by OVP. We collect the aggregate data for the OVC statewide performance report as well as for the OVP annual report on Colorado’s Victim Compensation Program. (CO)
In D.C., additional demographic information such as age, sex, race, primary language spoken and disability. This information is used for planning, hiring decisions and to inform related victim service providers at meetings. (DC)
How many applications received from each county in the state (guides outreach efforts and can also be compared to known crime data) (IA)
Statistics around forensic exams (e.g. what is paid for the facility, service provider, and preventative medications) (IA)
Due to our antiquated data system data retrieval is problematic and results are inaccurate or unreliable. Data is provided on an as needed basis, sometimes filing requests augmenting data with “hand counted” information to ensure some accuracy. (KY)
No (MA)
CICB has a VOCA grant that funds a victim services coordinator. This coordinator collects data for the VOCA reporting requirements. (MD)
Walk-in client stats (NJ)
Switchboard calls (NJ)
Translation assistance (NJ)
Claims by county, gender, race, TAT (NJ)
3rd party billing savings (NJ)
Denial statistics (NJ)
Appeals statistics (NJ)

<p>Yes; Used to assist in processing claims and meet annual report requirements; Not publicly reported other than the state required annual report (TX)</p>
<p>Yes—additional data is used in the Fund’s public annual report and then there are separate reports that help medical providers determine which bills are not yet paid and why, which police reports have not been received and why, etc. (VA)</p>
<p>Our Victim’s Compensation Program has a data base called Sedna. Most of the data fields correspond to those required by OVC in the reports. Sedna is also has fields for brief summary of the crime from the affidavit... Other data that is collected in our system would include the “type of loss” ---lost wages, medical, funeral expenses, Rx, counseling, other. We also have an exact amount of those losses entered into the data base plus medical insurance information. (VT)</p>
<p>We do not list all the qualitative responses from our victim satisfaction surveys in the OVC reports because they are not requested. (VT)</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p>
<p>It would be helpful if there could be one report for STOP VAWA, SASP, and VOCA Victim Services (Assistance). You could list the # of victims service, # of services provided by type of service, etc. Just have a column for VAWA, SASP and VOCA for the actual numbers. A program could enter their totals and then the % paid for by VOCA, SASP, etc.) (IA)</p>

**Are there other state offices or statewide groups collecting victim service and client data? What types of information are they collecting? How is it collected, compiled, used, and reported?**

In Arizona there are a number of other state agencies that collect victim service and client data. Most of this data collection is in response to other federal grant requirements (STOP grants, VAWA, etc.). Arizona is currently in the process of establishing a centralized federal grant administrative office. All federal applications and reporting would flow through this office. (AZ)

The California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) collects victim service and client data. (CA)

Each of the twenty-two local victim compensation programs collects the data that is used for the state performance report. The Office for Victims Programs at the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice is the only state office or statewide group that collects victim service and client data (in the aggregate form) from the local programs related to victim compensation in Colorado. (CO)

Many domestic violence organizations collect data on the numbers of victims served. The DV Coalition does an annual “snapshot” collection on a specific day to determine what an average day looks like in terms of numbers seeking assistance and the types of services needed. This method also measures those services that were requested and could not be provided. (DC)

The state Department of Human Services (DHS) administers the Domestic Violence Program (DVP) and the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA). DHS asks the domestic violence projects to provide data on a monthly basis. (CO)

IA Finance Authority (Housing Authority) collect homelessness funds and housing funds; emergency sheltering and rates of homelessness; how full shelters are at any given time. (IA)

United Way (IA)

We have found that compensation programs are unique individually and collectively. Non-profit organizations collect data related to their sphere of interest ( Kentucky Domestic Violence Association, Kentucky Association for Sexual Assault Programs) (KY)

The MA Office of Victim Assistance and Jane Doe, Inc. (the state Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Coalition) collects data relevant to their service population. Rates of specific crimes and use of grant funded services. It is collected by their offices through surveys and quarterly reports by sub-grantees. (MA)

United Way (MN)

Do not have info on this (NJ)

OH Criminal Justice Services collects VAWA, FVPSA, and JAG grant information (OH)

OH Criminal Justice Services also collections victimization data by county (OH)

OH Bureau of Criminal Investigation collects information from law enforcement agencies about domestic violence calls (e.g. total police responses to these calls, incidences of arrests made) (OH)

Several state wide groups collect victim data which they use to support grant

applications; types of info are generally the number and type of victims served or assisted. (TX)

The VOCA assistance administrator, state police, as well as the statewide DV/SV coalition also collect data. (VA)

The Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence just initiated a new data collection system. We actually we have an upcoming meeting with them to learn about it. We also have crime data reported via the Vermont Criminal Information Center. The Vermont Institute for Justice Research is a great organization that assists the Vermont Center for Crime Victim Services in studying the criminal justice landscape in our state. (VT)

**Have other offices or statewide groups done IT assessments or organizational capacity assessments in the last 5 years? If yes, can you share the assessment tool or a summary?**

Not that I am aware of, but we would be interested if the opportunity presented itself. (AZ)
As part of the OVC Crime Victim Compensation Initiative Grant we are currently engaged in performing a baseline data review, needs assessment and gap analysis for CalVCP. Upon completion, we will share the tools, methodology and findings. (CA)
The Governors Office of Information Technology (OIT) has done a statewide broadband analysis on an Education initiative called Project SchoolView™ . This initiative envisions a flexible enterprise information management system that will equip users to manage and use information for informed decision making ensuring that all students in Colorado are ready for post secondary or workforce success. OIT has also developed strategies for incorporating technology regarding health care information that was put into the health care delivery system. (CO)
No, I am not aware of any IT assessment that has taken place. (DC)
No, but currently exploring the costs for a statewide needs assessment for victim services (e.g. current need and gaps in victim services) (IA)
US Department of Health and Human Services is currently evaluating the new model of services being implemented in Iowa. (IA)
Not aware of any (KY)
Unknown (MA)
Not that I'm aware (MD)
Our office is the only state office that has done those types of assessments on crime victim service providers. In the development of our Best Practices Guidelines for Crime Victim Services, we asked grantees to complete a self-assessment. I've attached two types of self-assessments – one for non-profits, and one for government-based victim service programs. Grantees then used their self-assessment to determine areas of strength and areas needing further development. They completed a form identifying these areas and submitted it to us. We then sent a team of two grant managers to each grantee site to meet with the E.D. and board member for a 3-hour development interview, to go over the best practices and to determine what activities should be on their development plan for the grant year. This is explained in the Best Practices intro section, also attached. (MN)
The VCCO has been implementing a total overhaul of its IT system (NJ)
None (OH)
Not aware if other offices or statewide groups have done IT assessments or organizations capacity assessments – and this question is a little confusing as to what

exactly are IT assessments and organization capacity assessments. (TX)

We have just hired an outside IT firm, and they are in the middle of assessing our IT capacity. This is more from a security standpoint, than evaluating our data collection. (VT)

**What would be the impact of data collection changes on subrecipients? Are there subrecipients that would experience a greater or lesser impact than others? Why?**

Data collection changes would impact all subrecipients. Strangely enough those with less sophisticated data systems (EXCEL, ACCESS) may be able to adapt more quickly than those using off-the-shelf systems or tracking systems developed in-house. The cost to make changes may also be greater for those subrecipients with more sophisticated systems. (AZ)

The data we provide to stakeholders is information that we gather from our own database. Collection of the data does not have an impact on the stakeholders, however, with additional resources we could probably make more information available to our stakeholders. Such information could have a positive impact on their ability to reach and serve crime victims. (CA)

The continuum of data collection systems runs the gamut from a manual system of hash marks to a database called ALICE, which was created ten years ago by the domestic violence coalition. Some agencies use an excel spread sheet and others use databases ranging from ACCESS to privately developed software programs. As to the impact of data collection on subrecipients, some of the smaller programs may experience difficulty if the requirement included changes to the intake process and/or contact forms and if the data collection process became more time consuming. One of the greatest challenges is that each funding source (VAWA Muskie reports, VOCA, FVPSA, Emergency Shelter grants, Community Services Block grants, etc.) has its own requirements and some agencies also have data collection requirements from their accreditation sources such as National CASA and National Child Advocacy Centers. There are some very small programs that only have 2.5 FTE. It can be a challenge for these programs to provide crisis intervention and direct services as well as complete all of the monthly or quarterly reporting requirements. (CO)

Changes in data collection would incur a cost to the D.C. Crime Victims Compensation Program because it would require modification of the case management system. Subrecipients with fewer budget resources would be affected the most. (DC)

The amount of data currently requested by State and Federal agencies is large and none of the reporting/data measures are consistent between the agencies. This makes it extremely difficult for all of our sub-recipients to continue to provide services while collecting such an abundance of data. (IA)

Most of our agencies cannot afford the necessary equipment to aid them in data collection/reporting efforts. We are currently exploring options around purchasing a statewide database collection system that we could provide to all of our sub-recipients, regardless of which funding stream they are receiving from us (VOCA, VAWA, SASP, FVPSA). (IA)

<p>We would also like to add performance collection categories/reports for alternate funding streams (HUD, etc.), so we would have access to the data and the programs could compile necessary reports in the same system. (IA)</p>
<p>It would be extremely helpful if there were discretionary grants/funds available to make [statewide data collection] systems a reality for States. (IA)</p>
<p>Unknown (MA)</p>
<p>As long as the data collection changes are in line with what VAWA and/or FVPSA is already requiring, there would be no impact on subrecipients. Some of data software programs that would have to be altered if we changed the data elements required for reporting, and they'd not like that, but I understand why we might need to do that. I know the coalitions would like us to be collecting additional data. (MN)</p>
<p>The VCCO doesn't have subrecipients (NJ)</p>
<p>VOCA subrecipients of this office generally report being unburdened by the data currently requested of them; however we would need to evaluate specifics of increasing data collection. (OH)</p>
<p>Some subrecipients with minimal technological infrastructure or knowledge may require technical assistance. (OH)</p>
<p>No subrecipients for VOCA compensation. If you mean impact on a VOCA compensation program, any data collection comes at a cost, whether that cost is a measurable dollar cost to change systems, or the cost of employee time to enter the data. (TX)</p>
<p>It depends, if it is more streamlined that would be good, if it is more cumbersome that would be bad. (VT)</p>
<p>Maybe we need to establish "data collection protocol" or "best practices training for data" collection, for people who work with victims, that reminds them of the importance of getting good data, and helps to establish good weekly/daily habits to input into a database to create reports---when they have a moment to reflect (if they have a moment) Many of our shelters have faced budget and staff cuts their time is consumed with putting out fires. (VT)</p>

**What information currently collected by you or others is useful to subgrantees for their evaluation or planning? What information that you collect now is of little value in determining impact or assisting with evaluation or planning? What could we collect at a reasonable cost that would benefit sub grantees as well funders?**

**ASSISTANCE**

Client surveys and client focus groups seem to be a useful way to gather information for planning and evaluation purposes. One of the rape crisis programs in Colorado was experiencing a decline in the number of Latinas utilizing their services. The agency conducted focus groups with monolingual former clients that revealed their strong desire for a native Mexican Spanish speaking therapist rather than a white bilingual therapist. This agency has begun an extensive search to meet that expressed need. Another program in a different jurisdiction convened focus groups that were held with victims/survivors the agency had served. One of the pieces of information that was provided was the participants felt the referral materials that were provided to them were outdated and as a result were not helpful. The local funder that paid for this evaluation subsequently convened the law enforcement victim advocates in that jurisdiction and shared the feedback with them. As a result, all of the community resources listed on the referral materials was updated and a process was put in place to make sure the information stays current. (CO)

Currently OVP attempts to measure how an agency achieves their objectives (process) and the number of victims they are serving (quantity). Although we ask for impact measures, it is very difficult to measure the impact of services without available funds for evaluations. As a result, the information we get is not very helpful. One possible solution is for the federal agencies to develop consistent outcome measures for the different types of projects that are funded with federal funds. Once these consistent outcome measures are developed the subgrantees' staff would need to be trained as to data collection and outcomes, including the current program methodology and software for data collection. As OVP staff would need to provide the training to subgrantees, it would be challenging to provide this service unless the administrative and training VOCA Assistance percentage raised was raised to ten percent. (CO)

Counting "heads" the first time a service is provided has not proved useful. It's not indicative of how helpful our services were, whether or not we met the victim's needs, nor does it fully illustrate what we provided to the victim. It doesn't account for the number of times a victim may be accessing services either. (IA)

We intend to move to a “unit of service” data collection method here in Iowa. We believe it would make far more sense to move to this on a federal level as well. It makes far more sense to track the amount of time advocates are spending with each victim by type of service and the number of victims served by type of victimization. Programs already have to track their advocates direct service time and typically this is tracked by types of services provided to the victim. If we are able to provide them with a tool/system for easily tracking this data, we can determine unit of costs per victim, unit of costs per service type and we could break this down per advocate/agency. We are hopeful to be able to provide this tool in a mobile application format as well, so advocates can enter basic information from any location. This would streamline data collection, make it more efficient for advocates and provide us a much better way to demonstrate the productivity of advocates, thereby allowing us to convey the need for victim services and funding allocation in our State. (IA)

Demographic data is always the most useful information we collect. I realize we don't report demographic data to VOCA, but we need to collect it for VAWA/FVPSA. On a rare occasion we'll get a request for the types of services provided by a specific agency or in a particular area of the state. The information we collect now is all useful for the most part. There could be more categories of crime victimization, such as labor trafficking and sex trafficking. We try to not use the “other” category but it's sometimes challenging. The types of services are fairly comprehensive and useful. (MN)

While the VCCO does not have subgrantees, the following info maybe helpful to subgrantees and policy makers with respect to victims of crime: Income, Education level, lived in shelter, Section 8, WIC, SSI, TANF, Insurance, and Criminal History/Municipal charges. (NJ)

Interested in data describing long-term outcomes after victimization and receipt of services (OH)

All data that is collected is used (OH)

### **COMPENSATION**

Somehow I think we need to get a sense of why the majority of victims do not utilize our services. This information would be helpful to both funders and subrecipients. In 2011, the Statistical Analysis Center at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission completed the Arizona Victimization Survey and found that only about 10% of victims of violent crime are accessing victim services. This mirrors the same utilization statistic in the National Victimization Survey. We need to take this one step further and find out why, and what services we could provide that would be better utilized. (AZ)

We publish an annual report which provides output data regarding whom we've served and detailing our payments by category. Every year we send each California county victim assistance center a report that describes claims received from that county and the payments made on behalf of claimants from that county. With

additional resources to create reports, we could provide reports to a wider audience of victim assistance providers. (CA)

With additional resources devoted to data collection and analysis, application data could be compared to crime rates to identify locations and populations where increased outreach may be needed. We hope to do part of this analysis through our OVC Crime Victim Compensation Initiative Grant. (CA)

The numbers of claims filed and type of crime information helps to inform victim assistance and law enforcement agencies about their outreach performance and the types of crimes that most often need compensation. I do not think that any of the data that we collect would be considered to be of little value. (DC)

The data is only somewhat useful (MA)

The compensation fund can collect data on the number of claims in an area and compare it to the eligible reported crimes as well as the number of PERKs paid. This data helps to drive our planned outreach and education efforts across the state. The Fund also collects data on restitution ordered and paid and uses that information to target underperforming localities with information and training. (VA)

We are supporting core victim service programs. We can see the numbers of victims served and the nature of the crime and service. We know from these numbers that the service is needed, but we do not have a qualitative evaluation. Vermont is not a very diverse state, but in general many people just don't answer questions about race because it is perceived by many as irrelevant, or even racist to answer. (VT)

**What is the process for modifying how you collect and compile data for reports? Is this uniform across all offices in your department? Across other departments within your state's government?**

**ASSISTANCE**

There is very little uniformity among state agencies when it comes to collecting and compiling data. This is the purpose of the new centralized federal grant administration office. (AZ)

From CalOES: When we receive new federal guidelines we change the progress report template and distribute to our recipients. (CA)

Data currently is collected quarterly or in some cases monthly depending on the subgrantee and the backup documentation that is provided. There are Division wide policies as to how data is collected, but there is discretion among programs. We coordinate with the other grant programs in the Division such as the Juvenile Justice and Justice Assistance Grants. We also meet quarterly with the Department of Human Services staff who administers the Domestic Violence Program and FVPSA funds regarding their data collection process; however, at this point there is not consistent data being collected between these two departments. The Colorado Health Department has some prevention funds but at this time there is not a coordinated effort as to data collection between the Departments. (CO)

We administer all direct service funds for victim service agencies (VAWA, VOCA, FVPSA, SASP) so making data collection changes at our level are pretty easy. The problem we run into, is we have no ability to change the reports/categories requested at the federal level and the reports aren't uniform, so programs still have to collect ALL of the required reporting information. (IA)

We collect all of our statistical data from reports that subrecipients submit on our online grants management system. The data can be exported to Excel for sorting and summarizing. We create the report forms and can modify them independently of any other state agency. (MN)

**COMPENSATION**

Data collected is determined by the database fields. Reports are developed based on the available data field. It is an internal process to alter report requirements for data gathered. If changes to the database are needed to alter the reports, then an assessment would be completed to determine if the changes are plausible and cost effective. (CA)

Because Colorado utilizes a decentralized system for the administration of Victim Compensation, OVP collects data from each of the twenty-two jurisdictions in aggregate form and reports that data for the entire state. The form used to collect data by OVP closely resembles the federal performance report. OVP tallies and organizes the data reported by the local districts. (CO)

<p>Our data is currently compiled by our case management system. CVCP data is in a separate system from the rest of the court. The collection of data from other departments is not applicable. (DC)</p>
<p>Through reorganization all technical assistance has been centralized. This system is still unfolding so its total impact is unknown in Kentucky. Specifically we treat each inquiry for information individually. Make a data inquiry, pull the report and supplement as needed. Our whole agency works in this manner. Some other state departments and agencies have been able to purchase upgraded data system which has allowed better and more efficient reporting. (KY)</p>
<p>Self-modifications; Each Division compiles data from their own records (MA)</p>
<p>We have a unique database that is customized for our use as a victim compensation agency. We generate reports based on the data we enter into this database. One of the reports we generate from our database is the Federal Report for OVC. (MD)</p>
<p>Not aware of any uniformity in this area. Absent department directives, each division makes changes in house. (NJ)</p>
<p>Processes at CICF are completely automated. Other departments in state government their own processes for data collection. (VA)</p>
<p>We receive and record data in excel spreadsheets. (VT)</p>

**Have service and client data impacted funding decisions in your jurisdiction? If yes, which data and what kind of impact?**

**ASSISTANCE**

Yes. The Board and the staff review the service and client data and the method of collection of the data for each subgrantee. This information is taken into account during the next funding process and may affect the subgrantees future funding. The data reviewed for subgrantees include services provided and the intended outcome/impact for their projects. (CO)

Absolutely! In prior years, State victim service funds have been cut and even zeroed out entirely. When Iowa moved to adopt a housing first model a year and a half ago, statistics around traditional shelter costs and efficiencies around service provision were utilized to educate State Legislators. In turn, we were awarded our largest state appropriation in the history of our programming; increasing funding by \$4 million. Because of this increase, we are being held accountable for proving that what we are doing is in fact working. This has driven our conversations around data collection. We've found it's not going to be enough to simply count the heads walking through the doors of our programs. We want to paint a picture for our legislature about the needs of victims and how our programs/funding are meeting those needs. Again, we believe the only way to accurately show this will be through units of service in all of our service categories (housing, legal advocacy, medical advocacy, etc.). Our Legislators want to know exactly what their state dollars are being spent on and it isn't enough anymore to just say, it pays for the needs of victims. (IA)

Yes. Because we are able to see the service level of current subrecipients we can work with them on capacity building, or corrective action plans, or ultimately reallocate funding if necessary. Service data shows us if programs are helping people with reparations forms, or if their primary services are only info/referral, etc. Additionally, the data helps us assess where additional funding is needed if new money becomes available. The demographic data also shows us if underserved populations in certain areas of the state are receiving services, and we can determine if we need to get funding directly to that community, or work closely with the subrecipient to do targeted outreach. (MN)

As a result of surveys regarding available sexual assault services, we have been able to focus grant dollars on service expansion in geographic regions. (OH)

**COMPENSATION**

Yes, utilization and satisfaction data has been important in identifying victim service needs and effective services. (AZ)

We anticipate that the information gathered as a result of the OVC Crime Victim Compensation Initiative Grant will have an effect on how we target and fund outreach strategies. (CA)

Funding for Victim Compensation is not really affected by the data collected since each victim compensation claim is reviewed based upon the state statute requirements, the federal guidelines, and the unique aspects of each claim. (CO)
Service and client data is used to support funding on the victim assistance side. Service and client data are used as performance measures to support the budget on the compensation side. (DC)
Data from compensation claims have been used to identify areas with lower than expected claims based on publically available victimization data. We have used this information to target outreach and awareness of the compensation program. (IA)
No (KY)
Not at this time (MA)
We compensate a large number of claimants who are family members of homicide victims. The fact that we provide compensation to these victims has been used as a reason to not fund homicide assistance programs. (MA)
The data that CICF collects drives our outreach and training activities throughout the year. For example, if we note a trend of few sexual assault claims being prosecuted, we may funnel funds into investigation and prosecution training. It also informs Fund policy making around items paid and possible cost controls that might be necessary. (VA)
Most of our formula grants are based on population and not driven by crime or victimization rates. So not really. (VT)

**Do you issue reports? If yes, what types of information do you include? Is there a size limitation? Are there additional national statistics, reports, or research that would educate elected officials and policymakers?**

**ASSISTANCE**

Colorado does not have general funds allocated for victim services because each judicial district has a Local Victim Assistance and Law Enforcement (Local VALE) Grant Program. The funds used for these grant programs are collected through offender surcharges. OVP collects the data from each of the twenty-two Local VALE programs and issues an annual report on the collection of funds and the grants that are provided to community agencies for victim services. This report is distributed and made available to members of the Colorado General Assembly, judges, judicial district administrators, elected district attorneys, and posted on the OVP website. There is no size limitation on the report. OVP also issues annual reports on the grants that are funded with VOCA, VAWA, SASP, and State VALE funds. During the past year, OVP worked with other agencies in providing two special project reports, one on the need for legal services and one on the state of transitional housing for domestic violence victims in Colorado. There have not been any size limitations on any of these reports. OVP also tracks new research findings that are published and relies on the state sexual assault and domestic violence coalitions for data, statistical information, and research that is available for these specialized populations. It would be very helpful to have additional information on evidence based practices including what types of victim services programs have been evaluated and the results of those evaluations, and the methods that can be used for program evaluation that are cost effective and realistic for small non-profit agencies to utilize. We are continually asked about evidence based practices, but there is little data and funding available to accomplish these evaluations. (CO)

Yes, we issues reports with number of victims served by type of victimization, number of shelter nights, number & types of victims sheltered, # of crisis calls, etc. (IA)

It would again be good there were one simplified report for VOCA, VAWA, FVPSA and SASP funds so states could also summarize this information for official and policymakers. (IA)

We would also love if funds were made available to create a database all sub-recipients could utilize to report monthly statistics, so we as Administrators could directly access all non-confidential data, compile stats and report on information for any part of, or for all of the State. (IA)

We also have been doing comparative reports on # of victims served by service area, crisis calls by service area and number & types of victims sheltered by service area in order to assist in identifying trends, roadblocks and planning. (IA)

A report that we issue every 3-5 years is the Advocate Salary & Benefits Summary Report. This report provides information on the average salary and benefits of non-profit advocates in our state. This has assisted victim service programs in getting their community & boards to increase salaries, or increase benefits to staff, which of course

<p>helps in longevity of staff. The amount of salary and benefits of the programs was a recent discussion in a state legislative budget hearing. (IA)</p>
<p>Yes, we issue an annual summary of statistical data submitted by subrecipients. The reports include information on demographics and services provided by crime type. (MN)</p>
<p>Internal Crime Victim Section Reports (OH)</p>
<p>OVC Annual Performance Reports (OH)</p>
<p><b>COMPENSATION</b></p>
<p>We are not required to issue any reports related to the victim compensation program, but we do provide an annual summary of program activity. This increases program awareness among policy holders. Fiscal impacts of victimization is very influential as well as demonstrating how victimization impacts communities at the local level, often beyond the victim alone (employers, family members, etc.). (AZ)</p>
<p>Yes, the annual reports that are posted on the public website. The reports include: New applications by type of crime, Compensation paid by type of expense, Total applications received in the following categories: females, males, minor, adult, domestic violence crimes, attorney or advocate represented, directly filed, and, Compensation paid and total applications received by county where the crime occurred. (CA)</p>
<p>The Office for Victims Programs issues a Colorado Victim Compensation Annual Report on an annual basis which collects data from the twenty-two individual victim compensation programs and summarizes the data into one report for the most current federal fiscal year. The Annual Report is distributed and made available to members of the Colorado General Assembly, judges, judicial district administrators, elected district attorneys and posted on the OVP website. It is typically 35 pages in length, but has no size limitations. Included in this report is the amount of federal VOCA victim compensation monies received and the distribution of those funds. (CO)</p>
<p>As to additional national information, the information put out by the National Victim Compensation Association that compares the collections and distributions of victim compensation funds among states is very helpful and provides useful information for our Boards, elected officials and policy makers. (CO)</p>
<p>We publish a statutorily mandated Annual Report which is distributed through state government specifically to the legislators and government officials. It provides a revenue chart as well as an expense chart, and county by county assessment of cases filed and awards made. We make special note of the decreases we have sustained related to revenue sources to update our audience. (CO)</p>

<p>Aside from OVC reporting, we issue reports upon request. There is no size limitation. One thing that would be beneficial in justifications to lawmakers is some measurement of outcome of the services being provided. (Which can be difficult to measure). (DC)</p>
<p>We monitor monthly collections of court costs (main source of income) and share that information with policy makers etc. (KY)</p>
<p>Additional national information that would be helpful is trends in violent crimes, shifting attitudes and emergence of any new data that impacts compensation. An example is that through our professional association we continue to be updated on changing perceptions as they relate to human trafficking vs prostitution in the country's vernacular. (KY)</p>
<p>The Attorney General's Office files an annual report that includes data from our Victim Compensation and Victim Witness Advocate programs. We include aggregate numbers relating to reports received, funding expended and cases served. Comparative state data in relation to program size and funding would provide elected officials and policy makers a comparative picture of program growth and the impact of programmatic changes. (MA)</p>
<p>We issue an annual report. The report includes statutory requirements; where we receive our revenues; and how we spend our funds. (MD)</p>
<p>NJ VCCO Annual Report or In-House reports include: walk-in client stats, switchboard calls, translation assistance, claims by county, gender, race, TAT, 3rd party billing savings, denials and appeal stats. (NJ)</p>
<p>As required by state statute, we issue an annual report. Data on applications, payments, gender, and age are reported. Current annual report can be found at: <a href="https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/AG_Publications/pdfs/cvs_annual2013.pdf">https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/AG_Publications/pdfs/cvs_annual2013.pdf</a> (TX)</p>
<p>The Fund issues an annual report to the legislature along with a statistics summary that breaks down claims, PERKS, amounts paid, and restitution by locality. This helps advocates in localities measure themselves against localities with similar characteristics. (VA)</p>
<p>We had been issuing annual reports, but sadly we have lost that position due to funding cuts. We have not been issuing products for over a year now. We rely on our web site for the dissemination of information. I would like information on how much money is spent providing vocational training for convicts v. \$\$\$ spent on vocational/career training for victims of domestic violence. (VT)</p>