

2007-2009 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)



Services*Training*Officers*Prosecutors (STOP)
Implementation Plan

CALIFORNIA 2007-2009 VAWA STOP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

I	Introduction	1
II	Planning Process	2
III	Needs and Context	4
	Demographics	4
	Geography	4
	Crime Statistics	5
	Needs Assessment	5
IV	Plan Priorities And Approaches	6
	A. Identified Goals	6
	B. Relation to Prior Implementation Plans	23
	C. Priority Areas	24
	D. Grant Making Strategy	27
	E. Addressing the Needs of Underserved Victims	32
	F. Barriers to Implementation	34
	G. Monitoring and Evaluation	36

Attachments

- A. Violence Against Women Act Implementation Plan Committee
- B. VAWA STOP Fund Distribution
- C. Governor's Office of Emergency Services 2006 Recipient Handbook

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Governor's Office of Emergency Services is the State Administrator for the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Services*Training*Officers*Prosecutor (STOP) Program. The goal of the California VAWA STOP Program is to promote collaboration among police, prosecutors, the judiciary, victim service agencies and providers in an effort to better serve victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking and to hold offenders accountable. This effort will result in strengthened law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women as well as the development and enhancement of services for these crime victims.

The initial process in the development of California's 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan was the formation of an Implementation Plan Committee comprised of representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, the courts and victim service providers. At a two day meeting the Committee identified areas of unmet needs and underserved populations. This information was then utilized by professors from the California State University, Sacramento to develop a web-based survey that was sent to all VAWA-funded recipients. The Implementation Plan Committee then met to respond to the findings of the web-based survey. The end result of this process is the *VAWA Service Priority Study* which is included with this 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.

The 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan outlines the methodology California will use to address the issues in the *VAWA Service Priority Study*. Actual changes are anticipated to occur after July 1, 2008 when the next funding cycle begins. As always funds will be allocated consistent with VAWA STOP requirements: 25% for law enforcement, 25% for prosecution, 5% for the courts, 30% to victim services of which at least 10% will be distributed to culturally specific community-based organizations, and the remainder as discretionary. The State of California will meet the match requirement for all non-profit, non-governmental victim service providers and tribes.

II. PLANNING PROCESS

In March 1995, Governor Wilson designated the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) as the implementing agency for the California Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Services*Training*Officers* Prosecutors (STOP) Program. OCJP subsequently convened an advisory task force, composed of 27 representatives, selected statewide, based on their experience and expertise in the areas of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. Members included prosecutors, law enforcement and probation officers, rape crisis, domestic violence and victim/witness advocates, judges, and individuals representing farm workers and Indian tribes.

The mission of the task force was to make funding recommendations to OCJP that addressed the program purpose areas allowed under VAWA and in any of the four required funding categories. In developing the initial VAWA STOP Implementation Plan, the task force met several times during the year. The task force also solicited input through public notices from more than 1,000 law enforcement, prosecution, victim service agencies, trial court judges, statewide associations, and elected state and federal representatives, among others, and assisted in the development of the 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.

In addition to providing assistance on development of the Implementation Plan once a year the task force met to formulate funding recommendations. OCJP made the final determination as to what programs or purposes were to be funded and the amount of funds allocated to each purpose/program. In making these decisions the following were taken into consideration: the feasibility of the program, whether there was any duplication of services, if there were any other existing funding sources for such programs, and whether the programs complied with VAWA STOP Guidelines.

Effective January 1, 2004 the OCJP was abolished by the California Legislature and its functions transferred to the Office of Emergency Services (OES). OES then became the administering agency for the VAWA STOP Program and continued to implement the Program.

With the reauthorization of VAWA in 2005, which instituted new purpose areas and other requirements for the VAWA Program, OES decided to take a different approach in the development of the 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan. OES created a smaller working committee comprised of twelve representatives, who were again selected statewide based on their experience and expertise in the areas of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. (See Attachment A for a list of the Implementation Plan Committee.)

On June 22 - 23, 2006, the initial meeting of the Committee was held in Sacramento. Facilitated by Robin Thompson, STOP Technical Assistance Project Consultant, the purpose of the meeting was to begin the process of soliciting input to be used to determine needs and priorities of victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking.

The end result of the June 22 - 23 meeting was a list of needs generated by the participants. OES contracted with Dr. Francis Yuen and Dr. Chrystal Barranti of the Division of Social Work, California State University, Sacramento, to develop a VAWA

Service Priority Study based upon the input from the June meetings. (A copy of the study is included with the Plan.)

On June 5, 2007, the Implementation Plan Committee met on the campus of California State University, Sacramento to review the survey findings. (All the members were invited but due to other commitments not all attended. See Attachment A for more detail.) The meeting was facilitated by Dr. Yuen, Dr. Barranti and two graduate assistants. Lanette Robles and Catalina Alvarez served as recorders. A more detailed description of the process, survey, and result is included in Part III.

The Implementation Plan Committee will meet to make recommendations on how to enhance existing programs and develop new programs to address the unmet needs and the underserved as outline in the *VAWA Service Priority Study*. Additionally, they will meet on an ad hoc basis, to review the progress made by OES in implementing the plan and any recommendations for new programs or changes in funding allocations.

OES staff will review the committee's recommendations taking into consideration such items as: feasibility of the new program, duplication of services, existence of other funding sources, and compliance with VAWA STOP Guidelines. The final recommendations will be submitted to the Director of OES, and if approved, incorporated into the annual supplement to the 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan provided to the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

III. NEEDS AND CONTEXT

Demographics

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, California's estimated population was 36,457,549 in 2006. This represents 12% of the nationwide total. Additionally, people in California are younger compared to nationwide averages. Of the total California population in 2006, 7.3% (6.8% nationwide) were under 5 years old, 26.9% (24.8% nationwide) were under 18 years old and 10.8% (12.4% nationwide) were 65 years old and over. Women and men were equally represented in California (50% each) compared to 50.8% for women and 49.2% men nationwide.

California's demographics are more diverse than the nationwide averages. 53.8% of Californians classify themselves as white (73.9% nationwide); 6.2%, black (12.4% nationwide), and 7%, American Indian and Alaskan natives compared to 8% nationwide. California's population includes more Asians (12.3% compared to the nationwide average of 4.4%) and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders (4% compared to 1% nationwide).

The influence of bordering Mexico has also impacted California's demographics. Hispanic or Latino make up 35.9% of California's population, compared to 14.8% nationwide. California has more foreign born residents, 26.2%, in 2006, compared to 12.5% nationwide and a language other than English is spoken in 42.5% of California households compared to 19.7% nationwide. Of those speaking a language other than English at home, 67% speak Spanish.

Despite all the appearances that California is a wealthy state, the median household income was \$56,645 compared to a nationwide average of \$48,451. The median value of owner-occupied housing units in California in 2006 was estimated at \$535,000 compared to the national average of \$185,200. Families below the poverty level in California represented 9.7% of the population compared to 9.8% nationwide, and affordable housing is a challenge in California.

The percentage of individuals who classified themselves as disabled was 12.9% in California and 15.1% nationwide.

Geography

California is a large state occupying 155,959.34 square miles. This represents about 4.4% of the entire United States. However, California's population is very concentrated with 217.2 persons per square mile compared to a nationwide average of 79.6. California's 58 counties range in size from San Francisco City and County which has 47 square miles of concentrated population, to San Bernardino County, which has 20,062 square miles of deserts, mountainous terrain, and includes several large cities. There are also extreme differences in the density of population: Alpine County has only 1,208 residents while Los Angeles County has 9,519,338, according to the 2000 Census.

Crime Statistics

Forcible rape in California is defined as "The carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will." Assaults or attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are included. The number of reported rapes has remained relatively constant over the past three years. In 2006, 9,213 rapes were reported, at a rate per 100,000 female population of 50.5%, compared to 9,918 rapes in 2003 at a rate per 100,000 female population of 54.8 %.

Domestic violence is defined as "Abuse committed against an adult or a minor who is a spouse, former spouse, cohabitant, former cohabitant, or person with whom the suspect has had a child or is having or has had a dating or engagement relationship." Within this definition, abuse is further defined as "intentionally or recklessly causing or attempting to cause bodily injury, or placing another person in reasonable apprehension of imminent serious bodily injury to himself or herself, or another."

In California, domestic violence related calls for assistance has slowly decreased over the past three years. In 2006, there were 181,362 domestic violence-related calls for assistance compared to 194,288 in 2003. Of those calls, weapons were involved in 51.3% of the complaints. Because the Penal Code does not require that the type of weapon involved in the call be reported, it is difficult to provide accurate statistics on the use of firearms, knives, etc. that were involved.

It is also unknown why the number of calls has declined and whether it is related to funding.

Needs Assessment

OES contracted with the State University California, Sacramento Division of Social Work to conduct a *VAWA Service Priority Study*. This document, which is attached, was used to identify unmet needs and underserved populations for California's 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

A. Identified Goals

The goal of the California VAWA STOP Program is to promote collaboration among police, prosecutors, the judiciary, victim service agencies and service providers in an effort to better serve victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking, and to hold offenders accountable. This effort will result in strengthened law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women, as well as the development and enhancement of services for these crime victims.

To achieve the overall goal, OES and the VAWA Task Force developed several programs which focus on the needs of crime victims. All of the programs, listed below, were funded during the 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan time frames. OES will be continuing these programs, but may be adding new requirements or components that are consistent with the *VAWA Service Priority Study*.

The Implementation Plan Committee will assist in the development of these new requirements or components. This process will take place on an ad hoc basis so that any changes can be reflected in the Requests for Applications (RFA) and/or Requests for Proposals (RFP) that are issued each year by OES.

The objectives and activities for each program are included in the RFA/RFP. Recipients respond with their projected objective achievement on an annual basis. OES staff work with the recipients to ensure that agreed upon objectives are being met.

The current programs within each funding category, and their corresponding objectives and activities are as follows:

LAW ENFORCEMENT CATEGORY

Program Name (Prefix)	Law Enforcement Training Program (PO)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	Non-Competitive targeted RFA
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	This program funds the Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) to train law enforcement in the areas of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking.
Program Objectives	Statewide training to law enforcement in the areas of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking
Who is eligible?	POST
Other Additional/Relevant Information (products developed, annual reports, evaluation, etc.)	Update, as appropriate, course curriculum & provide training on: <u>Sexual Assault (SA)</u> SA for College Campus Police (16-hour) SA for First Responders (8-hour) SA for Public Safety Dispatchers (8-hour) <u>Domestic Violence (DV)</u> DV for First Responders (8-hour) Crisis Negotiators in DV cases (24-hour) Officer Involved DV (8-hour) DV for Public Safety Dispatchers (8-hour) DV for Criminal Investigators-ICI training (40-hour) Training Material: Trainer guides and student materials for the above training curriculum

Program Name (Prefix)	Law Enforcement Specialized Units (LE)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time the program was competitive was for fiscal year (FY) 2003/04
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30

<p>Program Description/Purpose</p>	<p>The purpose of this program is to continue the efforts of law enforcement agencies to enhance or create specialized units to focus special effort on the handling of violent crimes against adult women, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking.</p> <p>The specialized units will accomplish this purpose through thorough investigation, immediate victim advocacy, and training for law enforcement officers. Thorough investigation leads to successful prosecution of cases, immediate victim advocacy provides victims with the support and resources to help disrupt the cycle of violence, and training assists departments in providing a consistent, effective, and compassionate response to female victims of violent crime.</p>
<p>Program Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate criminal cases of suspected sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and/or stalking crimes against women by specialized units within law enforcement agencies. • Contact and offer advocacy to 100% of female victims of specified violent crimes from cases assigned to the unit. • Provide advocacy, including crisis intervention, resource and referral assistance, emergency assistance, and restraining order assistance to adult female victims of above specified crimes. • Provide training sessions for law enforcement officers on the handling of violent crimes against women, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and/or stalking.
<p>Who is eligible?</p>	<p>California Police and County Sheriff's Departments. Currently fund 17 agencies.</p>

Program Name (Prefix)	Probation Specialized Units (PU)
Current year status of grant	Non-Competitive
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time the program was competitive was for FY 2002/03
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	The purpose of this program is to enhance or create specialized units within California Probation Departments, to intensively supervise small caseloads of offenders of violent crimes against adult women, including one of more of the following: sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and/or stalking.
Program Objectives	The Probation Specialized Unit Programs has the following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide intensive probation services to probationers convicted of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. • During the grant period, complete weekly contacts with each active probationer at a minimum of one per week. • Reduce caseload to between 25-40 cases per full-time probation officer. • During the grant period, contact will be initiated with all victims.
Who is eligible?	California County Probation Departments. Currently fund seven agencies.

PROSECUTION CATEGORY

Program Name (Prefix)	Prosecutor Education, Training and Research Program (LT)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	Non-Competitive targeted RFA
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	State General funds; VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	This program enables the California District Attorney's Association (CDAA) to conduct training seminars on sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking.

Program Objectives	The CDAA is a nonprofit association that conducts training, distributes publications, maintains a Violence Against Women Brief Bank, and develops and distributes manuals for prosecutors.
Who is eligible?	California District Attorney's Association
Other Additional/Relevant Information (products developed, annual reports, evaluation, etc.)	<p>CDAA produced and updated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Home Front</i> (DV) & <i>Unsilenced</i> (SA) Newsletters; • Investigation and Prosecution manuals addressing: Domestic Violence; Sexual Assault; Stalking and Threats Crimes; • Video Film Bank: The Legal Aftermath; Murder for Hire; Prosecutorial Contact Skills with Sexual Assault Survivors; • Violence Against Women Brief Bank; Introductory orientation materials for sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking case prosecutors.

Program Name (Prefix)	Violence Against Women Vertical Prosecution Program (VV)
Competitive vs. Noncompetitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2005/06
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	<p>The purpose of this program is to fund specialized units in prosecutor's offices in California to vertically prosecute crimes against women, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. Vertical prosecution has shown to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve conviction rates; • Reduce victim trauma; and • Provide more consistent and appropriate sentencing.

Program Objectives	<p>There are four mandatory objectives for the projects funded under this program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase prosecution and conviction rates of violent crimes against women as measured by the total number of cases projected to be assigned/accepted by the unit; • Achieve vertical prosecution standards as measured by the number of cases to be prosecuted in each of the categories: True, Major Stage, and Unit; • Reduce specialized caseloads by a minimum of 1/3 (excluding warrant cases) as measured by the comparison to the non unit caseloads; and • Ensure minimization of trauma to victims of specified crimes as measured in advocate employee direct services or referrals to local victim service agencies.
Who is eligible?	County District Attorney and City Attorney's Offices. Currently fund 16 agencies.

Program Name (Prefix)	Threat Management/Stalking Vertical Prosecution Program (TM)
Current year status of grant	Non-Competitive
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 1999/2000
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	<p>This program provides funds to District Attorney's Offices to create or enhance specialized units to reduce the threat of victimization related to the crime of stalking through early arrest, prosecution, and sentencing of perpetrators charged with this crime. The crime of stalking, as defined by California Penal Code Section 646.9 does not require the suspect to have actual physical contact with the victim. Rather, those charged with the offense engage in a pattern of conduct intended to follow, alarm, and harass the victim causing reasonable fear in the victims or their immediate family. This program concentrates efforts and resources toward this offense, utilizing special investigators and vertical prosecution of offenders.</p>

Program Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosecute defendants charged with the crime of stalking. • Vertically prosecute cases. • Increase the number of orders filed against perpetrators in stalking cases from the previous 12-month period. • Provide training to law enforcement and criminal justice personnel on the dynamics of power and control, on how and when to obtain emergency protective orders, and on how to prepare more comprehensive preliminary investigations in stalking cases.
Who is eligible?	County District Attorney and City Attorney offices. Currently fund three agencies.

COURTS CATEGORY

Program Name (Prefix)	Court Personnel Training Program (CW)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	Non-Competitive targeted RFA
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	This program funds the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, to train court personnel on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and elder abuse issues.
Program Objectives	Training, seminars, publications, symposium and other programs for court personnel on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and elder abuse.
Who is eligible?	Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts
Other Additional/Relevant Information (products developed, annual reports, evaluation, etc)	Conduct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses at the Continuing Judicial Studies Program • Family Violence Regional Conferences • Judicial Institute trainings • Courses at the 2006 Judicial College • Workshops at he the 2007 Statewide Judicial Education Conference

Other Additional/Relevant Information (cont.)	Develop and Disseminate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report • Fact Sheet • Updated Bench Manuals for judges Provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and technical assistance to approximately 10 courts during the fiscal year
--	---

VICTIM SERVICES CATEGORY

Program Name (Prefix)	Training & Technical Assistance Project (TE)
Current year status of grant	Non-Competitive
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 1995/96.
Funding source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	Funds the California Coalition against Sexual Assault to provide a variety of training and technical assistance to rape crisis centers throughout the State.
Program Objectives	Objectives include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance to rape crisis centers; • Maintain regular communication pertinent to sexual assault via newsletters, web-site and media contact; • Provide information and referrals to rape crisis centers, the general public or interested parties; • Distribute materials to rape crisis centers; • Convene statewide conference; • Develop activities and distribute materials pertaining to sexual assault awareness month.
Who is eligible?	California Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Program Name (Prefix)	Domestic Violence Assistance Program (DV)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2001/02
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVSPA); Victims of Crime Act (VOCA);

	State General Fund; VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	The Statewide Domestic Violence Assistance Program is designed to (1) provide local assistance to existing service providers to maintain and/or expand services for victims of DV and their children, based on need as demonstrated by prior service statistics, local crime statistics, current population and population projections, economic factors, geographic and cultural factors; and (2) provide local assistance for the development and establishment of DV services to currently unserved and underserved populations, including, but not limited to, rural areas, non-English speaking groups, minorities, or geographical areas without services.
Program Objectives	The program provides financial and technical assistance to local domestic violence centers in implementing all of the following services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twenty-four hour crisis hotlines. • Counseling. • Business Centers. • Emergency “safe” homes or shelters for victims and families. • Emergency food and clothing. • Emergency response to calls from law enforcement. • Hospital emergency room protocol and assistance. • Emergency transportation. • Counseling for children. • Court and social service advocacy. • Legal assistance with temporary restraining orders, devices, and custody disputes. • Community resource and referral. • Household establishment assistance.
Who is eligible?	Domestic violence shelters. Currently fund 85 agencies.

Program Name (Prefix)	Domestic Violence Response Team (VA)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2000/01
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	FVPSA; VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	<p>The primary goal of the Domestic Violence Response Team (DVRT) is to fund staff to provide immediate response crisis intervention services following a domestic violence incident, and to provide advocacy and accompaniment services to domestic violence victims throughout the criminal justice and civil legal process. The DVRT must also collaborate with and coordinate efforts with multidisciplinary teams/organizations serving clients in common to ensure a continuum of care.</p> <p>DVRT refers to a team that includes a domestic violence advocate and a law enforcement representative. It may also include a domestic violence deputy district or city attorney, a probation officer, and a hospital representative or health care provider. The DVRT is designed to immediately respond to the secured scene of a domestic violence incident in person or by telephone when requested by law enforcement and provide crisis intervention services. If law enforcement does not request immediate response, the DVRT advocate must follow-up with the domestic violence victim within 48 hours of notification of the incident from law enforcement to provide intervention services.</p>
Program Objectives	<p>Objectives include:</p> <p>Provide immediate response crisis intervention services to the victim of a domestic violence incident after law enforcement has secured the scene and determined DVRT presence is required.</p> <p>Provide intervention services within 48 hours of notification of a domestic violence incident when immediate response is not requested.</p> <p>Provide advocacy throughout the criminal justice and civil legal process.</p> <p>Provide accompaniment services throughout the criminal justice and civil legal process.</p>

Program Objectives (cont.)	<p>Demonstrate protocols for a team approach, which includes a domestic violence advocate and a law enforcement representative, in responding to DV incidents.</p> <p>Collaborate and coordinate efforts with local district attorney's or city attorney's vertical prosecution units, hospitals, probation departments, victim/witness assistance centers, social service agencies, community faith representatives and community service organizations including interagency referrals, meetings, and technical assistance in order to ensure a timely response to, and a continuum of care for, domestic violence victims.</p>
Who is eligible?	OES funded Domestic Violence Assistance Program (DVAP) recipients in good standing. Currently fund 12 agencies

Program Name (Prefix)	Rape Crisis Program (RC)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this programs was competitive was FY 1992/93
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VOCA; State General Fund; State Victim/Witness Assistance Fund; VAWA,
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	The program funds 84 rape crisis centers that service all 58 counties. Rape crisis centers assist sexual assault victims in dealing with the emotional trauma inflicted by the assault, provide assistance as these victims progress through the criminal justice system, and provide community education programs.
Program Objectives	<p>Rape crisis centers provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24-hour crisis line; • crisis intervention services; • follow-up counseling services; • in-person counseling; • group counseling; • accompaniment; • advocacy; • information and referral services; • community education.
Who is eligible?	Rape Crisis Centers (either Community Based Organizations (CBO's) or Hospital Based) which adhere to the <i>Service Standards for the Operations of Rape Crisis Centers</i> . Currently fund 84 agencies but only five receive VAWA

Program Name (Prefix)	Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) Program (SA). (As of 10/1/2007 this program was incorporated into the Rape Crisis Center Program grants for the 22 agencies that were operating SARTs.)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 1996/97
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	Provides funding for Rape Crisis Center victim advocates to support and participate in the development and/or enhancement of local SART efforts to improve multidisciplinary responses to sexual assault victims.
Program Objectives	Participate in planning and coordinating local SART team efforts to improve the quality of services and response to sexual assault victims.
Who is eligible?	Rape crisis centers. Currently fund 22 agencies as part of their Rape Crisis Center funding.

Program Name (Prefix)	Statewide SART Collaboration Program (SS)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	Non-Competitive targeted RFA
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1, end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	Develop and coordinate Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART) in California to ensure effective community sexual assault response systems.
Program Objectives	Objectives are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development, enhancement and improvement of SART systems and efforts; • Availability of effective, comprehensive sexual assault response systems for sexual assault victims; • Identification of key procedures and protocols; • Coordination of SART policy needs.
Who is eligible?	The California Medical Training Center, University of California, Davis

Program Name (Prefix)	Farmworker Women's Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Program (FW)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2001/02
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	Develops and implements activities that educate and increase awareness of sexual assault and domestic violence among monolingual and bilingual Spanish-speaking and low-income farmworker women.
Program Objectives	<p>Objectives are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide community outreach programs addressing sexual assault and domestic violence to farmworker women. • Train service providers on addressing sexual assault and domestic violence issues in the farmworker community. • Link farmworker sexual assault victims to established rape crisis service providers. • Link farmworker domestic violence victims to established domestic violence service providers. • Expand the sexual assault/domestic violence components of the program by training farmworker women on sexual assault and domestic violence issues. • Develop/strengthen the Indigenous Mixteco Farmworker Woman Program by involving Mixteco women through training to promote sexual assault and domestic violence awareness (resources/referrals).
Who is eligible?	Community based organizations providing services to farmworkers who are victims of sexual assault or domestic violence.

Program Name (Prefix)	American Indian Women Domestic Violence Assistance Program (AIWDVAP)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2001/02
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VOCA; VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	The American Indian Women domestic violence assistance program provides culturally appropriate services to American Indian women victims of domestic violence.
Program Objectives	Program objectives include crisis line, information and referrals, emergency shelter referrals, emergency food and clothing, emergency transportation, counseling, assistance with Temporary Restraining Orders, culturally appropriate trainings and community education programs.
Who is eligible?	Any California Indian tribe, consortium, council or an agency which provides services to American Indian population. Currently fund three agencies.

Program Name (Prefix)	Native American Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Program (IN)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2001/02
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start: October 1 end September 30
Program Description/Purpose	Native American sexual assault and domestic violence victims are severely underserved due to the lack of conveniently located or culturally sensitive services, lack of information regarding the dynamics of sexual assault and domestic violence and, in some cases weak linkages between tribal communities and non-tribal criminal justice and victim services systems. Projects are funded to address sexual assault and domestic violence among this population.

Program Objectives	<p>Native American programs provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community outreach programs. • Training to agencies on sexual assault and domestic violence in Indian Country. • Training to members of the Indian community. • Link clients to domestic violence service providers. • Link clients to sexual assault service providers <p>In addition, individual projects offer other services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual and group counseling for survivors. • Facilitated healing groups on sexual assault and domestic violence issues. • Resource library for Native American women and agencies
Who is eligible?	Native American Shelters. Currently fund four agencies.

DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY

Program Name (Prefix)	Victim/Witness Assistance Program (VW)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	Legislation mandates that every county in the State of California be provided funding for comprehensive centers for victim and witness assistance.
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	VOCA; State Victim/Witness Assistance Fund: VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	This program helps victims and witnesses of all types of crime by maintaining local centers that provide comprehensive assistance, including all legislatively mandated services. Victim/Witness Centers are in place in every county in the state with 44 projects in District Attorney's Offices, eight in probation departments, and four in community- based organizations, one in a county office and one in a county sheriff's office.

Program Objectives	<p>The projects are required to provide 14 mandatory services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis Intervention; • Emergency Assistance; • Resource and Referral Assistance; • Direct Counseling; • Victim of Crime Claims; • Property Return; • Orientation to the Criminal Justice System; • Court Escort; • Presentations and Training for Criminal Justice Agencies; • Public Presentations and Publicity; • Case Status/Case Disposition; • Notification of Family/Friends; • Employer Notification/Intervention; and • Restitution.
Who is eligible?	Local units of government and community based organizations. Currently fund 58 agencies of which three receive VAWA funds.

Program Name (Prefix)	Medical Training Center (EM)
Competitive vs. Non-competitive History	The last time this program was competitive was FY 2003/04
Funding Source(s)/Funding Level(s)	State General Fund: VAWA
Funding Cycle	Start July 1 end June 30
Program Description/Purpose	<p>The purpose of this program is to ensure forensic medical examinations are conducted statewide in a standardized, consistent and qualified manner by training medical personnel who perform examinations for child sexual and physical abuse and neglect, adult sexual assault, domestic violence and elder/dependent adult abuse. Training on evidentiary examination procedures is also provided to investigators and court personnel involved in dependency and criminal proceedings. This is accomplished through the development of a wide variety of curriculum guidelines and provision of training courses.</p>

Program Objectives	Develop and implement standardized training for medical personnel in five focus areas (Sexual Assault, Child Sexual Abuse, Domestic Violence, Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse, and Child Physical Abuse and Neglect); deliver ongoing basic, advanced and specialized training throughout the state; develop guidelines for evaluating results of training; convene Advisory Groups annually; ensure availability of qualified staff to respond to questions regarding forensic exams.
Who is eligible?	Hospital based units of government or hospital based non-profit organization.

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

B. Relation to Prior Implementation Plans

(1) Sustaining Existing Programs

Almost all ongoing programs funded during FY 2007/08 (as contained in California's 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan) will be sustained during FY 2008/09. As indicated in the findings contained in the *VAWA Service Priority Study*, most current VAWA providers believe that they are providing client-centered and culturally competent services that are fiscally and programmatically sound.

There were only slight changes to the original 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan. In FY 2003/04, due to a decrease in California's VAWA award, insufficient VAWA funds were available to continue funding all victim service programs. The VAWA Task Force recommended not providing VAWA funds to the Domestic Violence Assistance Program (DVAP) and to find other funding to offset this cut. Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) and Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funds were allocated to the DVAP Program; thus, there was no loss in funding to the program.

However, in FY 2005/06, there was a substantial increase in VAWA funds to the State of California. At that time, the VAWA Task Force recommended allocating VAWA funds to the DVAP Program, in addition to the FVPSA and VOCA funds that they were also receiving. This recommendation was also implemented in FY 2006/07, FY 2007/08, and will be sustained in the 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.

(2) Shifts in Direction

An area that has been slightly altered is the funding to Rape Crisis Centers and Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART). In California's 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan, more funding was allocated to the SART Program as agencies implemented these programs. Now that most Rape Crisis Centers have their own teams, funding for "stand-alone SARTS" was shifted to the Rape Crisis Centers to enhance their SART activities.

"One-time" grants were also completed under the 2003-2005 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan. These were the Tribal Court Program, the Tribal Law Enforcement Training Program and the American Indian Planning grants. OES will be working with the Implementation Plan Committee to assist in building on existing or developing new programs which best meets the needs of the Native American community.

Lastly, the Law Enforcement Specialized Unit and Probation Specialized Unit Programs are at the end of their "funding commitment cycles." Both these programs are being re-evaluated and may be changed depending upon input from the Implementation Plan Committee and OES staff.

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

C. Priority Areas

(1) Priorities

A VAWA Service Priority Study was conducted to assist OES in determining future service priorities for the 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan. Dr. Francis Yuen and Dr. Chrystal Barranti of the Division of Social Work, California State University, Sacramento, and graduate assistants Lanette Robles, Catalina Alvarez and Carlos Bravo, worked with OES in developing and implementing the study. Consisting of three components, the study included a literature review, a web-based survey, and a focus group of Implementation Plan Committee members. Below is a summary of the findings of the focus group in which they responded to the findings of the web-based survey. (The complete Study is included with the 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.)

Summary Findings of VAWA Service Priority Study
Underserved Populations
<i>Undocumented immigrants, people with mental health needs, incarcerated survivors, people with disabilities, and people with substance abuse concerns</i> are the most underserved groups. Teens and ethnic and cultural minorities are categorized as being “significantly underserved” but not considered as being “very significantly underserved”.
The literature review supports the assertion that <i>immigrants, people with mental health needs, and teens</i> are the most underserved groups. Cultural competency and program design are noted as the major barriers that contribute to these groups as being underserved.
<i>Older adults, women in military, lesbian gay bisexual transgender (LGBT), and other immigrant women</i> are noted as the underserved populations by service providers. They however, have not been the focus of the publication media such as books and journals.
Overall, focus group findings highlight the need to address populations that continue to remain invisible. More keenly stated, there are populations such as the <i>LGBT community, undocumented immigrants, incarcerated victims, ethnic and cultural groups, persons with disabilities, victims of human and sex trafficking, teens, and people with mental health needs</i> who are in need of outreach, education and accessible services; yet these populations remain out of the awareness of providers, communities and funding sources.
Needs of Unmet Populations
<i>Undocumented immigrants, ethnic or cultural minorities, people with mental health needs, older adults, and women in rural areas</i> are the top groups whose needs are unmet (e.g. needs not being addressed by services and funding).
Emerging Areas of Concern
<i>Cyber Stalking, teen dating, and women in the military</i> are emerging areas of concerns.
<i>Direct service, education and outreach as well as legal services</i> are rated to be the areas that need VAWA funding emphasis.

Summary of the Focus Groups' Response to the Survey Findings

At the close of the meeting, the following question was posed to the focus group for consideration: *"If you were going to summarize today's meeting, what would you say?"* Responses to this concluding question resulted in themes related to cultural competence, funding, and needs driven services.

- *"There is a need for more comprehensive cultural services that are culturally competent."* There is a clear indication from data and focus group discussion that outreach and services are needed for underserved and unmet populations. Correspondingly, building capacity in cultural competence within direct services, legal services, collaboration with community and resources through technical assistance was an emergent theme.
- Service priorities should be driven by client and community needs rather than by funding streams. Flexibility and programming beyond the traditional models (outside the box) in which services are wrapped around the victim and include the victim's determination of their own needs.
- There is a need to pursue other avenues of funding (beyond VAWA) to support programming and services for victims and the increasingly diverse victim population. *"Must it take specific funding to provide services to targeted populations?"*

The focus group also participated in a nominal group process to determine service priority. Their top choices are listed below. The complete results are contained in the *VAWA Service Priority Study*.

- Community based services;
- Services to promote meaningful access to the courts;
- Develop collaboration with non-traditional groups to meet needs of underserved and underserved communities;
- Training and technical assistance (cross-disciplinary, e.g. district attorney and victim witness advocate training) focused on identified underserved communities;
- Creating competent outreach and education materials for underserved populations, including dependent adults and people with disabilities;
- Flexibility in funding and programming to meet the needs of victims in communities based on local needs;
- Capacity-building (cross-discipline training and technical assistance) to address emerging needs or concerns (e.g. cultural competency, funding, etc) on a local level (such as the domestic violence and sexual response teams which employ collaborative approaches).

The Implementation Plan Committee will be reviewing the result of the *VAWA Service Priority Study* with OES during its next meeting. Recommendations for addressing the identified unmet needs and underserved populations will be reflected in the programs and grants that are implemented starting July 1, 2008.

The Implementation Plan Committee will be asked to provide four separate categories of recommendations. They are as follows:

- Elimination of existing programs.
- Changes/enhancements to existing programs that do not require any additional costs.
- Changes/enhancements to existing programs that require minimal costs.
- Creation of new programs and projected costs.

The Implementation Plan Committee will meet at least annually to make recommendations for the next cycle of applications/proposals. They will also assess the progress being made in meeting the priorities/goals of California's 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan.

(2) Description of types of Programs supported with STOP funds

A complete description of the Programs supported with STOP grant dollars, along with objectives and activities is contained in Part IV. A.

(3) Distribution of funds

At least 25% of the funds will be distributed for law enforcement; at least 25% for prosecutors; at least 30% for non profit non-governmental victim services; at least 5% of the funds will be distributed for the courts; and the remaining funds allocated to the "discretionary" category. Of the 30% allocated for victim services, a minimum of 10% of the funds will be distributed to culturally specific community-based organizations. In addition, the State of California will meet the 25% match requirement for all non-profit non-governmental victim service providers and tribes.

Refer to Attachment B FY 2007/08 VAWA STOP Program Fund Distribution Chart for the list of programs and amount of allocation for each program funded with FY 2007 VAWA STOP funds.

(4) How subgrant amounts are determined

While developing the VAWA STOP Program competitive RFPs and Guidelines, each county is reviewed according to population, square miles, type of geographic area to be served (i.e., urban, non-urban, or rural), needs of underserved populations (including American Indians), and availability of existing sexual assault and domestic violence programs. Funds are allocated to areas of varying geographic size, type, and population, and with the greatest showing of need (including unserved/underserved populations to the greatest extent possible) given the number and quality of the applicants received. The goal is to continue to observe all of the identified funding priorities to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of VAWA STOP funds throughout California. (See Part IV, Section D. Grant Making Strategy for more specific details on how population and geographic areas are factored into the funding allocations.)

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

D. Grant Making Strategy

(1) Geographic Size and Need Prioritization Process

The equitable distribution of funds is a prominent goal which is strongly supported by OES in all aspects of its public safety and victim services divisions, including its advisory committees. For example, California's State Advisory Committee (SAC) on Sexual Assault is a legislatively created multidisciplinary committee composed of prosecutors, law enforcement representatives, medical personnel, victim service providers and a public defender. The SAC meets four times a year to review and set mandatory standards and services for OES sexual assault and child sexual abuse programs.

In addition, many programs include funding priorities or requirements that are specifically tailored to the purposes and goals of the grant program or named in the originating legislation. Previous VAWA STOP funded RFP Programmatic Instructions requested a number of requirements and priorities consistent with STOP requirements. The following are examples of RFP excerpts:

Example #1:

Grant Award Amount and Funding Categories Determined by Population.

This language was included in a recent request for proposals for the Vertical Prosecution Program which receives VAWA funds.

OES will select approximately 15 projects throughout the state for funding in amounts ranging from \$45,000 to \$90,000 for a six month grant period, depending upon the availability of funds and on the population of the proposed service area as follows:

COUNTY POPULATION	VAWA FUNDS
3,000,000 and Above	\$90,000
1,000,000 and 2,999,999	\$70,000
500,000 to 999,999	\$55,000
200,000 to 499,999	\$52,500
Under 200,000	\$45,000

Refer to the County Populations by Jurisdiction Table and Funding Levels (Part III, Forms) to determine level of applicant's eligibility.

OES will select the highest-ranking applications, giving consideration to geographic distribution, need, and underserved populations.

Example #2:

How applicants identify the extent of the problems and demonstrated needs.

The following language was included in a Request for Proposals. Applicants were asked to respond, at a minimum, to the following:

- a. Objective information which identifies the extent of the problem in this underserved population specific to the proposed service area, including geographic, economic, social, cultural, lingual, and political factors which are directly related to the problem;*
- b. One legible map which clearly shows the boundaries of the proposed service area and the applicant's location;*
- c. A demonstrated understanding of the special needs and problems facing the American Indian women from the proposed service area in dealing with sexual assault and domestic violence;*
- d. Current, referenced demographic, statistical, and crime data which supports the problem statement; and*
- e. A discussion which addresses why current resources are not meeting the needs of the American Indian women in the proposed service area.*

The applicants were rated on their response. OES reserves the right to give consideration to geographic distribution, need, and underserved populations when selecting applicants. (OES may deviate from selecting the highest ranking applicants if adequate geographic distribution/underserved population, etc is not being met.)

Example #3:

Service Areas

Extensive efforts have been made to ensure that OES' Rape Crisis Program funds sexual assault services throughout the State, and that Rape Crisis Centers (RCC) Service Areas do not overlap. There are multiple reasons for this effort, including: 1) limited funding requires services to be provided in the most cost-efficient manner; 2) funding more than one RCC to service the same geographic area is not a prudent use of funds; 3) lack of clarity and/or conflict between RCCs over a particular geographic area may cause confusion for victims and stakeholders (law enforcement, medical providers, social service agencies, schools, etc.); and 4) long-standing verbal agreements regarding service provision practice may become controversial and/or contentious when agency leadership and Board membership changes.

As a result, clear RCC Service Area boundaries (county lines, highways, streets, etc.) which define the geographic area those RCCs are funded to serve.

Example #4:

Enterprise Zones

California Government Code Section 7082 requires OES to give preference to applicants from areas in the state designated as Enterprise Zones. These areas have been identified to receive state contract preference points due to high unemployment, lower incomes, and population density. The goal of the Enterprise Zone program is to stimulate growth in economically distressed areas. 5 percent (5%) of the applicant's total score are added to the proposal for applicants that specifically target a designated zone for services. Two percent (2%) are added to the proposal for applicants whose service area includes an Enterprise Zone, but who do not specifically target the area for services.

(2) Request For Proposals (RFP)/Request For Application (RFA) Process

When OES identifies funds available for a program, it utilizes one of two developed application processes, competitive or non-competitive. Typically, funds are awarded on a competitive basis for a three-year period (funding cycle) through the solicitation of RFPs. However, in situations where there are sufficient funds for all eligible applicants during a funding cycle, or where the legislation directs the specific projects that are to receive funds, a program will be set up non-competitively through RFAs.

Non-Competitive Process (RFA)

For non-competitive programs, applicants are contacted by email with a link to the OES website, which includes links to the RFA and all necessary forms and instructions to allow OES to process the requested application. Additionally, applicants can access the OES' Recipient Handbook on OES' website, which addresses the administration of OES grants and various administrative requirements with which recipients must comply. Once processed, the recipients' application becomes part of the Grant Award Agreement with OES. This agreement is a plan of how the recipient will utilize the grant funds to accomplish the goals of the program, and includes the recipient's budget.

Competitive Process (RFP)

The RFP is posted on the OES website and includes information on which forms and instructions are necessary for the applicant to prepare a proposal for the program. The RFP also includes contact information that can be used by applicants to obtain technical assistance in preparing the proposal. However, in order to maintain equity and fairness to all applicants, OES does not provide assistance as to the substantive matters contained in applicants' proposals.

In most situations, applicants initially apply for funds through a competitive program. About two weeks before the RFP is released, a letter announcing the availability of the RFP is emailed to interested parties, and posted on the OES website. The RFP describes the eligibility requirements and funding amounts. A successful proposal includes a description of community needs, a plan to address those needs, and illustrates the organizational ability of the applicant to implement the plan with the funds available through the grant program.

(3) RFP Scoring Process

In addition to forms and instructions, the RFP describes the rating system used by OES to make a qualitative appraisal of the project described in the proposal so that the applicant will know the standards by which their proposal will be judged.

All OES RFPs also contain formatting instructions, including that the proposals be double-spaced, set at particular point size and font, and adhere to a particular space limitation. These rules are simply intended to make the application fairer by ensuring that all proposals submitted are similar in length and format. These rules also assist the applicant in focusing on how to address each particular objective discussed in the RFP. Failure to comply with these spacing/formatting requirements is one of many factors that may negatively impact the comprehensive assessment score.

The chief of the section in which the program is administered selects raters. Often, the chief will utilize staff not only from their own section, but employ staff from other sections who may possess particular knowledge and/or background in the subject matter of the program. The section chiefs, when selecting raters, ensure the raters selected do not have conflicts of interest with the program to be rated, or any of the particular applicants.

Proposals are rated by a team of, or if needed multiple teams of, three raters. Each rater reads all the proposals received and assigns numerical scores for a number of graded categories. The average of the three raters score for each criterion will be totaled to one final score. Once it is determined how many projects can be funded with the available funds, a cutoff is established based on the ranked scoring. The ranked list of applicants is then submitted to the OES Director, along with any recommendations for funding (which may, depending on the program, take into consideration geographical distribution, areas of greatest need, and the past performance of previously funded projects).

A formal written policy for past performance has also been created that detail the process for considering a recipient's prior performance problems with the grant requirements in connection with the recipient's application for new funding. The procedure only applies where a project has had "serious" and "unacceptable" performance issues. Bonuses are not given for exceptional past performance, so as not to unfairly burden new applicants with a competitive disadvantage.

To invoke the past performance policy, prior to the commencement of the rating process, either the section chief or branch chief (who is not part of the rating team) may request a performance penalty. The chief must prepare a memorandum discussing in detail the performance problems with the applicant, which is then submitted through the supervisory chain to the Director for approval/disapproval. If the penalty is approved, it will be applied only after it has been determined that the applicant has scored within the funding range. The applicant shall be provided with a summary of why the performance problem penalty was invoked. An applicant is entitled to appeal this denial of funding on the same basis as other appeals of denial of funding.

Appeals

The California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ), the body that hears appeals, has approved revised guidelines which have now been implemented. OES now allows recipients extra time to file appeals statements, and will provide information to unsuccessful applicants to assist them in understanding the denial of funding and in the development of their appeals.

(4) Stop Grant Cycle

Generally VAWA STOP formula funds are allocated in the year that they are awarded. For the VAWA STOP FY 2007 award, OES applied in January 2007 and received the award July 27, 2007. However, OES began the RFA/RFP process in January 2007, prior to receiving the award or fund allocation amount. The proposal and applications are available on the OES website and may also be mailed upon request to applicants.

The applicants are given approximately two months to complete the proposals/forms and return them to OES. Competitive proposals are rated per the process described above. All proposals and applications are reviewed by OES staff. Grants are then awarded generally with a start date of July 1 if they also contain state funds. Awards that contain federal funds generally start October 1.

(5) Technical Assistance

Once selected for funding, either competitively or non-competitively, OES renders technical assistance to the recipient to finalize the Grant Award Agreement. The OES Recipient Handbook contains specific requirements of OES staff regarding the provision of technical assistance and site visits. (See Attachment C for the Sections of the Handbook that pertain to Technical Assistance (10200) and Site Visits (10300).)

(6) Funding Cycle

Recipients are usually funded in one-year increments (in certain cases OES may extend the time frame) and given a three-year funding commitment. At completion, OES may initiate "continuous funding" or issue another competitive process. See Section (2) of Part IV, D for more information on the RFA/RFP process.

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

E. Addressing the Needs of Underserved Victims

OES contracted with the California State University, Sacramento, Division of Social Work, to conduct a VAWA Service Priority Study. The main focus of the study was to determine the underserved or unmet population and needs of victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These needs are outlined in Part IV. C. Priority Areas.

In addition, other programmatic areas identified in the *VAWA Service Priority Study* which need to be taken into consideration when addressing the needs of the underserved victims are:

- Client-centered and personal approaches, culturally competent practice, and case management that emphasize individualized, non-judgmental approaches with a focus on safety are found to be “best practices.”
- Quality of staff, collaboration, training and technical assistance, positive and organization support are important in providing services to victims.
- Capacity building is necessary and is facilitated through technical assistance.
- Victims need more support and assistance in navigating and accessing the legal and service systems.
- Outreach to the identified underserved population through effective community-based programs and collaboration among agencies is needed.
- Collective planning and coordinated approaches on the part of providers should be taken into consideration when providing services to victims.

The next step is to develop processes to address the unmet needs and underserved populations identified in the Study. This will be accomplished as follows:

Implementation Plan Committee

In 2006, OES disbanded the VAWA Task Force and created a smaller, more diverse group to assist in the creation and continued evolution of California’s 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan. The group consists of representatives from law enforcement, prosecution and the courts as well as our domestic violence and sexual assault collations. The underserved populations that are represented include Asian/Pacific Islanders, farmworkers, Native Americans, the disabled and the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender communities.

The Committee was essential in determining the initial needs that were used in the web-based survey. They later met to review and provide further input as to the survey findings.

The Committee will continue to meet at least once a year to assist in making recommendations regarding the use of VAWA STOP funds. One of their roles will be to review existing programs and funding levels. The committee will make

recommendations as to which methods to employ in addressing the unmet needs and populations identified in the *VAWA Service Priority Study*. These recommendations will be incorporated into existing RFAs and may result in the issuance of competitive RFPs to solicit new applicants, or the creation of new programs.

It is anticipated that the most cost effective method to address the underserved populations is to enhance existing programs to reach these communities. Again the Implementation Plan Committee will be our main resource in determining how to reach these populations and to incorporate their unmet needs into our currently-funded programs. This process will ideally be accomplished with a minimum amount of additional costs.

If there is additional funding beyond what is needed to sustain current programs, then new programs will be developed. The Implementation Plan Committee will also look at our existing programs to see if there are some that can be eliminated or reduced in funding in order to free up money for new programs.

IV. PLAN PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

F. Barriers to Implementation

Barriers/Obstacles Identified by the State STOP Administrator

- **Funding:** California currently provides VAWA STOP funds to 174 agencies to implement programs for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Most of these programs address underserved communities and have received continuous VAWA funding over the years. To reach other underserved populations, either additional funding is needed, or current recipients must have their funding cut in order to free up funds for new recipients or programs. Federal VAWA STOP monies are the only source of funding for these programs, as the State of California is not in a position financially to increase funding at the state level.
- **Funding Cycle:** Over the past years, STOP State Administrators have not known what the state allocations were until May and awards were not issued until July, even though the VAWA STOP application was due in January. California operates on a state fiscal year, so OES has been issuing requests for applications in March not knowing what the dollar amounts of grant awards would be. Our grant awards generally start July 1, but because the Federal VAWA STOP awards have been issued in late July to early September, OES has not been able to finalize grant awards to our recipients or reimburse them for services until the awards were issued. For community-based organizations such as rape crisis centers and domestic violence shelters, they do not have the cash to pay salaries/rent, etc. for two to three months from the start date of their grant, before they can get reimbursed. Without a federal VAWA STOP award, OES cannot draw down funds to reimburse the agencies for their expenses.

Barriers/Obstacles Identified by the Recipients

Note: *These were responses from agencies that completed the VAWA Service Priority Survey. (See VAWA Service Priority Study which is included with California's 2007-2009 VAWA STOP Implementation Plan for more detailed information.)*

- **Insufficient Funding:** Insufficient funding, inadequate pay for staff and staff turn over are major barriers for program success.
- **Need for Additional Funding:** The need for increased funding (to hire staff to serve the needs of immigrant and trafficked women and to address the issues of financial dependence and employment needs of victims) emerged as the resounding theme of the narrative responses to the VAWA Service Priority Survey.
- **Reporting Requirements:** Recipients identified the complicated reporting requirements (VAWA Annual Report) as a barrier for program success.

- **Fear of the Justice and Service System:** Identified by recipients as a challenge for them in dealing with victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

IV. PLANS PRIORITIES AND APPROACHES

G. Monitoring and Evaluation

OES staff evaluate the performance of all recipients pursuant to Section 10000 of the Recipient Handbook (See Attachment C). A brief description of the types of activities conducted by staff are as follows:

- **Desk Reviews – Progress Reports**
Recipients are required to participate in data collection (beyond federal requirements) and submit progress reports on a bi-annual basis, which are reviewed by OES program staff. The progress reports are developed by OES program staff and are specific to the objectives for each program. These are a historical record of the implementation of the project in achieving the objectives in accordance with the term of the program. They also serve as a mechanism by which the recipient can identify problems encountered in the implementation of the project.

In addition, all VAWA STOP funded recipients are required to complete the Annual Report for VAWA STOP subgrants.

- **Technical Assistance**
Programmatic technical assistance is available to all projects upon request.
- **Site Visits**
OES program staff conduct site visits to make an on-site assessment of a recipient's project and to provide technical assistance. The site visit is a formalized and documented visit. New projects are visited within the first six months of the grant period. In addition, projects are visited at least once every three years.
- **Monitoring Visits**
OES staff monitor projects for compliance with the applicable laws, regulations, policies and program requirements. These monitorings are conducted by a separate OES unit, independent from the program staff that administers the VAWA STOP-funded grants. The monitoring encompasses a programmatic, administrative and fiscal assessment of the project and is conducted on both a random and as-needed basis.

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT
Implementation Plan Committee**

Law Enforcement Representative

Les Weidman, Public Safety Liaison
Officer
Replaced by Thomas Sawyer due to Mr.
Weidman's retirement
Governor's Office

Prosecution Representative

Kate Killeen, Deputy Director
California District Attorney's Association
Replaced by Ken Puckett when Ms.
Killeen left the agency

Courts Representative

Bobbie Welling
Judicial Council, Administrative Office of
the Courts
Center for Families, Children and the
Courts

Sexual Assault Representative

(Non-profit)

Suzanne Brown-McBride, Executive
Director
California Coalition Against Sexual
Assault (CALCASA)

Domestic Violence Representative

(Non-profit)

Marivic Mabanag, Executive Director
California Partnership to End Domestic
Violence

Victim Witness Representative

Cindy Marie Absey, Director
Victim Witness Coordinating Council

Disabled Representative

Delia Isabel Soto, Deputy Director
Communications and Legislation
State Council on Developmental
Disabilities

Federal and Victims Representative

Debbie Deem, FBI Victim Specialist
Federal Bureau of Investigations

Tribes Representative

Olin Jones, Director
Office of Native American Affairs

**Asian and Pacific Islander
Representative (Non-profit)**

Fiorza Chic Dabby, Institute Director
Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on
Domestic Violence

**Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and
Transgender Representative**

(Non-profit)

Jovida Guevara-Ross, Executive Director
Community United Against Violence

Farmworker Representative

(Non-profit)

Mily Trevino-Sauceda, Executive Director
Organization en California de Lideres
Campesina

Members present at the June 5, 2007 Meeting

Prosecution Representative

Ken Puckett
California District Attorney's Association

Courts Representative

Tracy Kenny
Substituting for Bobbie Welling
Judicial Council, Administrative Office of the Courts
Center for Families, Children and the Courts

Sexual Assault Representative (Non-profit)

Ellen Yin-Wycoff
Substituting for Suzanne Brown-McBride, Executive Director
California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA)

Domestic Violence Representative (Non-profit)

Tara Shabazz
Substituting for Marivic Mabanag, Executive Director
California Partnership to End Domestic Violence

Victim Witness Representative

Cindy Marie Absey, Director
Victim Witness Coordinating Council

Disabled Representative

Delia Isabel Soto, Deputy Director
Communications and Legislation
State Council on Developmental Disabilities

Federal and Victims Representative

Debbie Deem, FBI Victim Specialist
Federal Bureau of Investigations

Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender Representative (Non-profit)

Jovida Guevara-Ross, Executive Director
Community United Against Violence

Members present at the June 22-23, 2006 Meeting

Prosecution Representative

Kate Killeen, Deputy Director
California District Attorney's Association
Replaced by Ken Puckett when Ms. Killeen left the agency

Courts Representative

Bobbie Welling
Judicial Council, Administrative Office of the Courts
Center for Families, Children and the Courts

Sexual Assault Representative (Non-profit)

Suzanne Brown-McBride, Executive Director
California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA)

Domestic Violence Representative (Non-profit)

Marivic Mabanag, Executive Director
California Partnership to End Domestic Violence

Victim Witness Representative

Cindy Marie Absey, Director
Victim Witness Coordinating Council

Disabled Representative

Delia Isabel Soto, Deputy Director
Communications and Legislation
State Council on Developmental Disabilities

Federal and Victims Representative

Debbie Deem, FBI Victim Specialist
Federal Bureau of Investigations

Tribes Representative

Olin Jones, Director
Office of Native American Affairs

Asian and Pacific Islander Representative (Non-profit)

Fiorza Chic Dabby, Institute Director
Asian and Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence

Farmworker Representative (Non-profit)

Mily Trevino-Sauceda, Executive Director
Organization en California de Lideres Campesina

ACTUAL FY 07/08 VAWA S*T*O*P FUND DISTRIBUTION revised 10/22/07
Actual FFY 2007 Award \$9,732,429 minus \$681,270 (7% admin) = \$9,051,159
FFY 2006 Award was \$11,429,859 minus \$571,493 (5% admin) = \$10,858,366

	Law Enforcement	Prosecution	Victim Services	Courts	Other
Training	\$473,578 – Law Enforcement Training	\$203,572 - Prosecutor/Legal Training	\$180,000 - Sexual Assault Coalition for T/A and training	\$452,558 – Court/Judicial Personnel Training	
Specialized Units	\$1,497,762 – VAWA Law Enforcement Specialized Units \$248,740 - VAWA Probation Specialized Units	\$1,815,000 – VAWA Vertical Prosecution			\$100,159 – VAWA Victim/Witness Specialized Units
Victim Services			\$ 441,575 - DV Shelters \$ 208,282 - Farmworker Women SA/DV Program \$1,337,057 - of which \$547,241 for RCCs in underserved areas and \$789,816 for RCCS that conduct SARTS \$102,944 – Statewide Sart \$ 291,595 – DV Response Teams		
Stalking		\$ 420,000 - Threat Management/Stalking Vertical Prosecution			
Indian Tribes			\$333,250 – American Indian Shelter Programs \$416,564 - American Indian DV/SA Program		
S/Assault Medical Exams					\$372,129 - Medical Evidentiary Training Center
Minimum Percentage required by legislation	25%=\$2,262,790	25% = \$2,262,790	30% = \$2,715,348	5% = \$452,558	None
Actual Allocation VAWA 07 funds	\$2,220,080	\$2,438,572	\$3,311,267	\$452,558	\$472,288
Unallocated	\$42,710 VAWA 07	0	0		\$113,684 VAWA 07 can be used in any category

GOVERNORS OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

2006 RECIPIENT HANDBOOK

10000 REPORTING PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS

10100 PROGRESS REPORTS

10110 Purpose

Progress Reports serve as a historical record of the implementation of the project. The Progress Report documents the project's progress in achieving the objectives in accordance with the terms of the program and provides a mechanism by which the Recipient can identify problems encountered in the implementation of the project.

10111 Source Documentation

Funded projects are required to participate in data collection and submit progress reports. Projects must keep accurate records as source documentation to support the information reported in the Progress Report.

These records must be retained by the project for at least three years from the date of the termination of the grant or the date the final fiscal and program reports are submitted to OES, whichever is later. During programmatic monitoring and site visits, OES will review these records for accuracy and compare that data to the progress reports submitted by the project.

Projects are to retain source documentation for progress reports on a quarterly basis, regardless of submission requirements. The progress reports provide project staff and OES with a formal process to document ongoing grant activities and project progress toward the achievement of stated program goals. All progress reports are reviewed by Program Specialists and retained in the project's award file at OES.

Review of Records

Acceptance of a grant obligates the project to allow employees and/or authorized representatives of OES unrestricted access to inspect, copy, and audit all pertinent books, documents, papers, and records, including redacted confidential records.

10120 Submission

Unless otherwise specified in the terms of the program, OES requires one status report and two progress reports for the grant period. The status report covers the first three months of the grant's operation. A progress report is due at the end of each six-month period of the grant. The first progress report will contain information about the first six months of operation, and the second report will contain cumulative figures for the twelve-month grant period.

All projects are required to submit an original and one copy of the status/progress report to OES. These are due 30 calendar days after the end of the reporting period. For example, if the reporting period ends October 31, the report must be submitted to OES by November 30.

Failure to submit a report on time may result in the withholding or disallowance of grant payments, the reduction or termination of grant funds, and/or the denial of future grant funding.

10120.1 Reports for Extended Grants¹

If the grant period is extended, additional progress reports may be required. Contact your OES Program Specialist for the additional requirements.

10130 Final Payment²

Final payment of the grant funds may be withheld until receipt of the following:

- a. Written response, when appropriate, to conditions placed on the Grant Award;
- b. All required progress reports, including those covering the period for which an approved Grant Award extension has been authorized;
- c. Any additional reports required by federal, state, or OES guidelines; and
A final Report of Expenditures and Request for Funds (OES 201, Appendix 9).

Funds may be withheld or terminated and future grant funding may be denied if the project has not complied with the terms and conditions of the Grant Award in a timely manner (see Section 12000).

10200 PROGRAMMATIC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Programmatic technical assistance is available to all projects upon request. Requests for on-site technical assistance should be made in writing by submitting the Request for Programmatic Technical Assistance (OES 651, Appendix 19), via letter or email directed to the appropriate program branch. Technical assistance may be provided on-site or over the phone.

10300 SITE VISIT

10310 Purpose

The purpose of a technical assistance/site visit is to make an on-site assessment of current project conditions and to provide technical assistance. As part of the assessment, the *Recipient Handbook* and terms of the program will be reviewed with the Recipient.

These visits are for OES staff to provide on-site technical assistance to the project, which may include the following:

¹ Section 10120.1: This section has been modified to allow OES flexibility in requiring additional reports.

² Section 10130: This section has been revised to remove the reference to the 5% hold.

- a. Provide information that will assist the project in meeting program goals;
- b. Review project objectives to determine if they are achievable;
- c. Review project activities to determine if they will reasonably result in achievement of the objectives;
- d. Review the project's source documentation and data collection process;
- e. Review the project's Report of Expenditures and Request for Funds (OES 201, Appendix 9) to determine whether any adjustments are needed;
- f. Review the Monitoring process with project staff so they know what to expect during future visits; and
- g. Review the progress reports to determine if they are complete and accurate.

10320 Timeframe

Newly funded grant projects will normally receive a site visit within the first six months of the grant period. In addition, projects will normally receive a site visit at least once in each three-year grant cycle.

10330 Follow-up

Projects determined to be progressing satisfactorily will receive a letter acknowledging their current status. Projects that require corrective action may be required to submit a corrective action plan or will receive a letter outlining appropriate corrective action.

10400 MONITORING

10400.1 Definition

A Monitoring visit is an on-site assessment of the programmatic, administrative, and fiscal components of an OES-funded project. The resulting Monitoring report provides a detailed review of the project and identifies, in limited scope, areas in which the project is and is not in compliance with the applicable laws, regulations, policies and program requirements. The Monitoring report is a useful tool that helps guide the Recipient and the Program Specialist as they work together to develop a corrective action plan (CAP). Corrective action is viewed by OES as a constructive, strengthening process for Recipients. Generally, the Monitoring visit does not affect the Recipient's funding.

10410 Monitoring Requirements and Access to Records

Projects are monitored for compliance with the applicable laws, regulations, policies and program requirements.

Acceptance of the Grant Award Agreement obligates the project to allow OES staff and/or its authorized representatives unrestricted access to all project books, documents, papers, and records, for inspection, copying, Monitoring, and auditing.

OES reserves the right to conduct unannounced Monitoring visits.

10420 Standard Monitoring Procedures

OES staff will normally provide two month's written notice prior to the Monitoring visit. A letter is sent to the Project Director and copied to the finance director informing the project of the date of the Monitoring, and the grant(s) and time period(s) to be monitored. The individual(s) responsible for preparing the Report of Expenditures and Request for Funds (OES Form 201, Appendix 9), the progress report, and the oversight of grant related activity should be available during the Monitoring visit to answer questions.

A field document will be provided to the Recipient prior to the Monitoring visit to assist the Recipient in preparing for the visit. At the end of the Monitoring visit the Monitor will review the findings with the Recipient.

10421 Scope of Monitoring

The OES Monitoring process complies with the intent of federal and state requirements. The process assesses programmatic, administrative, and fiscal components of the project. The review of fiscal compliance is not an audit and cannot be used to replace OES audit requirements.

10422 Monitoring Field Document

The Monitoring Field Document is designed and developed specific for each program in accordance with the applicable laws, regulations, policies and program requirements.

10430 Monitoring Report

The Monitoring report provides a "Summary of Monitoring" and a narrative report, which includes the areas of compliance and noncompliance. The approved Monitoring report will be sent to the Recipient.

10431 No Findings Identified

If no findings are identified in the Monitoring report, it becomes final and the Monitoring process is complete.

10432 Findings Identified

If findings are identified in the Monitoring report, the Recipient will receive a Monitoring Report Response Form. The Recipient has 30 calendar days to submit the Monitoring Report Response Form to:

Governor's Office of Emergency Services
Monitoring and Audits Section
Attention: <Program Monitor's Name>
3650 Schriever Avenue
Mather, CA 95655

There are three ways a Monitoring report becomes final:

1. The Recipient submits the Monitoring Report Response Form and agrees the report is accurate as of the date of the Monitoring.

2. The Recipient submits the Monitoring Report Response Form, finds the report is inaccurate as of the date of the Monitoring, provides documentation to support its position, and the disputed finding(s) is/are resolved (see Section 10434).
3. The Recipient does not submit the Monitoring Report Response Form.

Once the Monitoring report is finalized, the Monitoring and Audits Branch will forward a copy of the Recipient's response and any OES response to the appropriate Program Specialist.

10433 Corrective Action Plan Process

For findings identified in the final Monitoring report, the Recipient and the Program Specialist are responsible for developing a corrective action plan. The plan must be implemented and the technical deficiencies resolved within six months of the finalization of the Monitoring report.

Six months after the report is finalized, OES will conduct a follow-up inquiry to verify the status of the corrective action plan.

10434 Disputed Findings

Program compliance findings not resolved will be forwarded to the appropriate OES Program Specialist.

Recipients may dispute findings in the Monitoring report on the Monitoring Report Response Form (see Section 10432). The Recipient must provide documentation to support its position that the finding(s) is/are in error. OES staff will work with the Recipient to resolve the dispute.

10435 Sanctions

If the project does not complete the required corrective action, OES may take action as appropriate including, but not limited to:

- a. Withhold or reduce the amount of any payments requested by the project on a Report of Expenditures and Request for Funds (OES 201, Appendix 9);
- b. Reduce the amount of the current Grant Award agreement;
- c. Terminate the current Grant Award agreement, after providing 14 calendar days written notice to the project (unless OES determines that good cause exists to waive the 14 calendar day notice); and/or
- d. Restrict future funding (see Summary of OES' Past Performance Policy, Appendix 27).

10436 Final Action by OES

After a project has completed all corrective actions required by OES, a letter will be sent notifying the project that all required actions are completed. The Recipient should maintain the letter on file for three years. The Monitoring report and any subsequent corrective action documentation are then considered public documents.