

**REPORT ON  
COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES  
USED BY CVSD GRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK  
July 2011-June 2012**



**December 2012**

**Prepared by:**

**Oregon Department of Justice  
Crime Victims' Services Division  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301  
(503) 378-5348**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*Client: "I now understand that if people love you they are not supposed to hurt you."*

Client surveys and open-ended feedback show the positive impact of grantee services.

This report analyzes the data collected for the year from July 2011 through June 2012. It also compares the data with that collected for each of the two prior years. The data presented in this report provides both qualitative and quantitative evidence of the positive impact of the federal and state funding CVSD administers.

Since January 2006, the Crime Victims' Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) has required that the approximately 120 victim services providers receiving CVSD-administered grant funds collect and report quarterly with regard to three outcome measures. All grantees use a single outcome measure, as well as two additional measures that are specific to the services they provide. Recognizing that grantees work with victims/survivors of crime who may be in crisis or experiencing trauma, they are given wide latitude in assessing which clients may be able to provide feedback. CVSD stresses that clients in crisis are not expected to participate in the satisfaction survey. Grantees are required to collect feedback from at least 10% of their targeted group.

**Nearly 10,000 victims/survivors complete surveys. 94% say that the services provided helped them make informed choices.**

### **Rate of Return**

During this reporting year grantees distributed 31,009 survey forms with a return of 9,592 (30.9%), exceeding the 10% return rate requirement. The return rate varied among provider groups: 60.3% for Domestic and Sexual Violence services providers (DVSA); 28.9% for Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAIC); 15.5% for District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs (DA/VAP); and 50.8% for Other providers.

### **High Rate of Client Satisfaction**

Across all years of outcome data reporting and across all grantee provider groups, victim/survivor responses are overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-four percent (93.8%) of all victims/survivors responding in the current reporting year said that they strongly agreed or agreed that *"The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation."* Responses to the services-specific measures were also positive.

- Ninety-five percent (94.5%) of DVSA clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that *"After working with this agency, I have some new ideas on how to stay safe."*
- Ninety-eight percent (97.5%) of CAIC clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that *"The staff of this agency treated my family with sensitivity and respect."*
- Ninety-three percent (92.9%) of DA/VAP clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that *"As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime."*

**REPORT ON COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES  
USED BY CVSD GRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK  
July 2011 - June 2012**

*Client: "I could never repay you for the help you've given to me except take good care of myself from now on."*

**I. BACKGROUND**

The Crime Victims Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) administers the individual Crime Victims' Compensation Program and also administers seven state and federal grant programs to more than 140 victim service provider agencies serving victims/survivors in every Oregon County.

**TABLE 1: STATE & FEDERAL FUNDS ADMINISTERED TO VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDERS BY CVSD**

<b>Grant Fund</b>	<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>Type of Victim Service Agency</b>
Child Abuse Multidisciplinary Intervention (CAMI)	State Criminal Fines Account	Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAIC), Regional Centers & Multidisciplinary Teams
Victims of Crime Act (VOCA)	Federal Criminal Fines & Assessments	District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs (DA/VAP) Child Abuse Intervention Centers, Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers (DVSA), Law Enforcement Agencies
STOP Violence Against Women Formula Program (VAWA)	Federal General Fund	Prosecutors, Law Enforcement Agencies, Courts, & Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers
Violence Against Women Formula Sexual Assault Program Services (SASP)	Federal General Fund	Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers
Oregon Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Fund (ODSVS)	State General Fund	Non Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers
Criminal Fine Account (aka Unitary Assessment)	Criminal Injury Compensation Account	District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs, City Victim Assistance Programs
Intimate Partner Violence & Pregnancy Program (IPVP)	Federal General Fund <sup>1</sup>	Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers

<sup>1</sup> IPVP funds are part of the Affordable Health Care Act.

CVSD first required grantee agencies to collect data on appropriate<sup>2</sup> client satisfaction in July 2002. In July 2005, CVSD convened a workgroup of grantee agency representatives and other stakeholders to develop common outcome measures<sup>3</sup> that could be used by all CVSD grantees. The objective of the workgroup was to develop measures that reflected the purpose of the various grant funds administered by CVSD, and measure changes that could be reasonably anticipated to result from grant-funded activities.

One common outcome measure was identified that could be used by all CVSD grantees, coupled with additional measures for each of the three major grantee groups (DVSAs, DA/VAPs and CAICs).

The outcomes selected are shown in Table 2. At the end of the first reporting year (2006), CVSD surveyed grantees as to the effectiveness of the measures. Grantee responses confirmed the measures as both reflecting grantee values and providing a means for worthwhile client feedback.

**TABLE 2: COMMON OUTCOMES TRACKED BY CVSD GRANTEES**

<b>Grantees Required to Use Outcome</b>	<b>Outcome Measure (Question)</b>
All CVSD Grantees	The services provided by this program helped me <b>make informed choices</b> about my situation.
DVSAs	After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about <b>how to stay safe</b> . After working with this agency, I know more about <b>resources</b> that may be available, including how to access them.
DA/VAPs	As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand <b>my rights as a victim of crime</b> . The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand <b>the criminal justice system process</b> as it relates to my case.
Other Grantees	Law enforcement and other grantees track the same outcomes as the DA/VAPs.
Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAICs)	The staff of this agency treated my family with <b>sensitivity and respect</b> . The staff members of this agency were supportive in helping me to <b>access recommended treatment services</b> for my child and family.

<sup>2</sup> Because grantees of funds administered by CVSD work with victims of crime who may be in crisis or experiencing trauma, they are given wide latitude in assessing which clients may be able to provide feedback. CVSD stresses that clients in crisis are not expected to provide satisfaction feedback.

<sup>3</sup> “Outcome” as used in this report means a short-term change brought about as a result of a specific activity, and is distinguished from an “output”, which would count the activity itself. An example of an “output” is notifying a victim of a hearing to be held with regard to the victim’s case. A corresponding “outcome” might be the victim’s increased understanding of his or her rights as a victim of crime.

In asking for client response to the required outcome measures, CVSD grantees are required to use a 5-point Lickert scale for measuring client response to the measures as follows: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree and No Opinion (Neutral).

Beginning in January 2006, grantees have been required to collect client feedback using the common outcome measures and to report quarterly to CVSD. In January 2011, CVSD migrated from a paper-based to a web-based grant application and reporting system. Reporting requirements are as follows:

- Number of client surveys distributed (DVSA in at least one service category e.g. clients receiving shelter service, non-shelter services, or in support groups)
- Number of client surveys collected
- Method of distributing surveys
- Number of responses to each of the required
- Any additional information grantees want to report (e.g., open-ended client comments, grantee explanation of success or challenges in data collection)

*Client: "I'm leaving from here with joy, your program made me grow as a person and made me understand what I'm really worth."*

## **II. OUTCOME RESULTS for July 2011 – June 2012**

### **A. Rate of Return**

Grantees are required to collect feedback from a minimum of 10% of the clients surveyed. If a grantee's return rate is lower than 10%, they are required to explain what they have done/will do to increase the return rate. Surveys were distributed and collected through a range of methods, and the method used often had an impact on the rate of return achieved. In general, on-site client feedback has a higher rate of return than mailed surveys, but is not always possible or appropriate to collect. The overall return rate reached 30%. Client feedback forms were completed in English, Spanish, Khmer, Burmese, French, Russian, Korean, and Chinese.

Tables 3-7 indicate the rate of return for all grantees, and for each grantee group, comparing the current reporting year with the two prior years.

The number of surveys distributed and received by each program is the result of tremendous individualized effort to solicit feedback. With many programs facing staffing reductions and other budget cuts, this level of response is significant. Volunteers play an important role in contacting victims/survivors for their feedback; but training and supervising volunteers is a significant staffing responsibility that many programs have not been able to maintain. This is reflected in narrative comments that identify the value of volunteer efforts and the intent to re-establish their engagement.

*Grantee: "Feedback forms are sent to clients who have been with the program a minimum of 30 days. However it is up to the discretion of the case manager as to when will be the best time for each client to complete a form."*

Overall, the return rate reached 30% for the first time. CAIC programs increased their distribution, collection, and return rate. However, the overall spike in the distribution and return of forms last year was not maintained. While DVSA’s distributed more forms, they collected slightly fewer, and DA/VAP distribution and return was down. However, for the first time, the client response to grantees categorized as “Other” was reported separately from the DA/VAP programs. Added together for comparison with previous years, the return rate would have exceeded 17% even though the combined distribution and return levels were lower.

**TABLE 3: DISTRIBUTION, COLLECTION & RETURN RATE: ALL GRANTEES<sup>4</sup>**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	31,426	8,680	27.6%
7/10-6/11	34,631	10,148	29.3%
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>31,009</b>	<b>9,592</b>	<b>30.9%</b>

*Grantee: “The forms are handed to each client individually in English or Spanish. Clients put their completed, anonymous forms in a secure collection receptacle.”*

**TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION, COLLECTION & RETURN RATE: DVSA PROVIDERS ONLY**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	7,001	4,225	60.8%
7/10-6/11	8,484	5,537	65.3%
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>8,946</b>	<b>5,396</b>	<b>60.3%</b>

*Grantee: “Exiting participants are given the option of filling it out in the moment or mail in the form in the provided envelope. If they chose to fill it out in the moment, the Advocate removes themselves from the room and will receive the sealed envelope...”*

**TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION, COLLECTION & RETURN RATE: DA/VAPs ONLY**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	20,441	3,269	16.0%
7/10-6/11	22,636	3,743	16.5%
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>17,618</b>	<b>2,734</b>	<b>15.5%</b>

*Grantee: “Self-addressed common outcome cards are sent to every victim by mail. The card is sent with a copy of the judgment and a letter explaining post sentencing rights and the restitution process, if ordered. In addition, a phone call is made to each victim approximately two weeks after the form is sent as a follow up...[and to] complete the survey over the phone. The call is made by an advocate who had no involvement in the case.”*

<sup>4</sup> The totals in Table 3 may be slightly higher than the sum of the totals shown in Tables 4-7 due to the how the data from a small number of grantee agencies classified as “other” was counted. This year “other” is treated as a separate category and counted independently of the DA/VAP data.

**TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION, COLLECTION & RETURN RATE: OTHER GRANTEES ONLY**  
(PREVIOUSLY REPORTED IN THE DA/VAP DATA)

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>50.8%</b>

*Grantee: “We have discovered that most victims are more than willing to answer the questions that are on the forms over the phone or in person, however when they receive the Judgment and the card by mail, they are relieved the case is over and they are ready by that time to put it all behind them.”*

**TABLE 7: DISTRIBUTION, COLLECTION & RETURN RATE: CAICs ONLY**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	3,984	1,156	29.0%
7/10-6/11	3,511	868	27.7%
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>3,636</b>	<b>1,051</b>	<b>28.9%</b>

*Grantee: “One parent who had a difficult time with the assessment process was able to process the experience with the survey caller and felt the opportunity to give feedback was helpful.”*

Grantees are allowed latitude in determining which category of clients to survey and how and when to administer the survey. Challenges to collecting program feedback include the effort to find the balance between inviting victim/survivor feedback and respecting their privacy. Virtually all grantees work with people who have experienced and/or are currently experiencing trauma, and this reality shapes the process of collecting feedback. DV/SA providers work with victims/survivors of intimate partner violence who are faced with the daunting tasks of building new lives, often with very few resources; their completing one more form may be quite difficult. Parents of children who have been abused face equally daunting challenges.

*Grantee: “All clients who come to our intake center are called within a few days of their interviews. Trained volunteer advocates check in with the families and ask the questions on the OMS caregiver survey, which covers the questions below as well as other areas of satisfaction with services. The answers are recorded by the volunteers and kept in a binder by staff members.”*

## B. Victim Response to Individual Outcome Measures

The Tables that follow summarize the response reported for each of the outcomes used with the current reporting year compared to prior years. Across all grantee groups, all quarters and all years, feedback continues to be overwhelmingly positive. Although there is some variation in the number of responses collected, the percentage of respondents agreeing and strongly agreeing to each statement stayed consistently high in all program areas.

Grantees protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the feedback process. They look to this input for indications of program success, need, and ideas for improvement. DA/VAPs and CAICs, more than DVSA, receive feedback from victims who may focus on their disappointment or frustration with the disposition of a case as well as or instead of the quality of services provided by the program.

- Tables 8-12: Responses to the Common Outcome Measure
- Tables 13-15: DVSA Client Responses
- Tables 16-20: Portland Women’s Crisis Line Call Responses
- Tables 21-24: DA/VAP and Other Grantees’ Client Responses
- Tables 25-26: CAIC Client Responses

### 1. Responses to the Outcome Measure Required for All Grantees

The first outcome, summarized in Table 8 below, is used by all CVSD grantees. Tables 9-11 break out the responses of individual grantee groups (DVSA, DA/VAPs & CAICs).

**TABLE 8: ALL GRANTEES VICTIM RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION.<sup>5</sup>**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	8,457	5,457 (65 %)	2,373 (28%)	119 (1%)	97 (1%)	411 (5%)
7/10-6/11	9,875	6,363 (65%)	2,892 (29%)	114 (1%)	86 (1%)	420 (4%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>9,460</b>	<b>6,299 (67%)</b>	<b>2,576 (27%)</b>	<b>97 (1%)</b>	<b>88 (1%)</b>	<b>400 (4%)</b>

**TABLE 9: DVSAS ONLY VICTIM RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	4,250	3,132 (74%)	956 (23%)	23 (0%)	17 (0%)	121 (3%)
7/10-6/11	5,362	3,784 (71%)	1,380 (26%)	36 (0%)	16 (0%)	146 (3%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>5,395</b>	<b>3,901 (72%)</b>	<b>1,279 (24%)</b>	<b>27 (0%)</b>	<b>18 (0%)</b>	<b>170 (3%)</b>

<sup>5</sup> Because the “all grantee” totals include a few grantees classified as “others”, some of these totals are slightly higher than the combined totals of the individual grantee groups shown in Tables 9-11. Portland Women’s Crisis Line data is reported separately.



**TABLE 10: DA/VAPs ONLY VICTIM RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	3,066	1,648 (54%)	1,077 (35%)	76 (3%)	63 (2 %)	202 (7 %)
7/10-6/11	3,665	2,054 (56%)	1,270 (35%)	64 (2%)	59 (2%)	218 (6%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>2,687</b>	<b>1,470 (55%)</b>	<b>974 (36%)</b>	<b>48 (2%)</b>	<b>57 (2%)</b>	<b>138 (5%)</b>

**TABLE 11: OTHER GRANTEEES ONLY VICTIM RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION. (PREVIOUSLY REPORTED IN THE DA/VAP DATA)**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/11-6/12	402	265 (66%)	97 (24%)	9 (2%)	2 (0%)	29 (7%)

**TABLE 12: CAICs ONLY VICTIM RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,141	677 (60%)	340 (30%)	20 (2%)	16 (1 %)	88 (7 %)
7/10-6/11	848	525 (62%)	242 (28%)	14 (2%)	11 (1%)	56 (7%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>976</b>	<b>663 (68%)</b>	<b>226 (23%)</b>	<b>13 (1%)</b>	<b>11 (1%)</b>	<b>63 (6%)</b>

*Client: "The Victims' Advocates provided me with support emotionally and validation of my choices. They went beyond my expectations of services provided by the county. I truly feel that their encouragement and understanding enabled me to make healthy choices. I now have a life worth getting out of bed for. Thank you."*

## 2. Detailed Victim Response to Measures Used by DVSA's Only

**TABLE 13: DETAILED DVSA CLIENT RESPONSE - THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION. (7/10-6/12)**

Year/Type of Service	Total Collected	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services 2010-11	3,108	2,274 (73%)	736 (24%)	11 (0%)	5 (0%)	82 (3%)
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2,438</b>	<b>1,872 (77%)</b>	<b>472 (19%)</b>	<b>15(1%)</b>	<b>4 (0%)</b>	<b>75 (3%)</b>
Shelter Services 2010-11	1,067	740 (70%)	268 (25%)	16 (2%)	8 (1%)	35 (3%)
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>662 (69%)</b>	<b>236 (25%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>8 (1%)</b>	<b>40 (4%)</b>
Support Group 2010-11	1,187	770 (65%)	376 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	29 (2%)
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2,002</b>	<b>1,367 (68%)</b>	<b>571 (29%)</b>	<b>3 (0%)</b>	<b>6 (0%)</b>	<b>55 (3%)</b>
Grand Total 2010-11:	5,362	3,784 (71%)	1,380 (26%)	36 (1%)	16 (0%)	146 (3%)
<b>Grand Total 2011-12:</b>	<b>5,395</b>	<b>3,901 (72%)</b>	<b>1,279 (24%)</b>	<b>27 (1%)</b>	<b>18 (0%)</b>	<b>170 (3%)</b>

**TABLE 14: DETAILED DVSA CLIENT RESPONSE - AFTER WORKING WITH THIS AGENCY, I HAVE SOME NEW IDEAS ABOUT HOW TO STAY SAFE. (7/10-6/12)**

Year/Type of Service	Total Collected	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services 2010-11	3,106	2,120 (68%)	789 (25%)	28 (1%)	4 (0%)	165 (5%)
2011-12	2,438	1,810 (74%)	484 (20%)	21 (1%)	7 (0%)	116 (5%)
Shelter Services 2010-11	1,017	653 (64%)	290 (29%)	21(2%)	8 (1%)	45 (4%)
2011-12	956	634 (66%)	260 (27%)	15 (2%)	9 (1%)	35 (4%)
Support Group 2010-11	1,177	732 (62%)	379 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	54 (5%)
2011-12	1,980	1,359 (69%)	533 (27%)	8 (0%)	5 (0%)	75 (4%)
Grand Total 2010-11:	5,300	3,505 (66%)	1,458 (28%)	58 (1%)	15 (0%)	264 (5%)
<b>Grand Total 2011-12:</b>	<b>5,374</b>	<b>3,803 (71%)</b>	<b>1,277 (24%)</b>	<b>44(1%)</b>	<b>21 (0%)</b>	<b>229 (4%)</b>

**TABLE 15: DETAILED DVSA CLIENT RESPONSE - AFTER WORKING WITH THIS AGENCY, I KNOW MORE ABOUT RESOURCES THAT MAY BE AVAILABLE, INCLUDING HOW TO ACCESS THEM. (7/10-6/12)**

<b>Year/Type of Service</b>	<b>Total Collected</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>
Non-Shelter Services 2010-11	3,085	2,167 (70%)	729 (24%)	31 (1%)	7 (0%)	151 (5%)
2011-12	2,438	1846 (76%)	482 (20%)	13 (1%)	7 (0%)	90 (4%)
Shelter Services 2010-11	1,066	687 (64%)	304 (29%)	27 (3%)	9 (1%)	39 (4%)
2011-12	956	661 (69%)	238 (25%)	10(1%)	8 (1%)	39 (4%)
Support Group 2010-11	1,184	708 (60%)	403 (34%)	19 (2%)	11(1%)	43 (4%)
2011-12	1,588	1000 (63%)	474 (30%)	17 (1%)	5 (0%)	92 (6%)
Grand Total 2010-11:	5,335	<b>3,562 (67%)</b>	<b>1,436 (27%)</b>	<b>77 (2%)</b>	<b>27 (0%)</b>	<b>233 (4%)</b>
<b>Grand Total 2011-12:</b>	<b>4,982</b>	<b>3,507 (70%)</b>	<b>1,194 (24%)</b>	<b>40 (1%)</b>	<b>20 (0%)</b>	<b>221 (4%)</b>

*Client: "...very beneficial to have a group for young pre-teens on self-worth and what that should look like"*

### 3. Portland Women’s Crisis Line

The Portland Women’s Crisis Line handles the largest crisis call volume in the state. Reporting this data separately gives greater clarity to client responses to services throughout the state. The data in Tables 16 - 20 are in addition to the Common Outcome and DVSA data included above.

Table 17 shows the rate of response by callers. Table 18 indicates the range of response. As is the case with other providers, crisis line responders ask for feedback only from callers who are not in immediate crisis. A high percentage of Crisis Line calls are specifically about identifying and accessing resources, hence the lower number of responses about safety.

The mid-year decision to use survey questions that matches other CVSD grantees is reflected in the 6-month reports for 2011-12.

**TABLE 16: RATE OF PORTLAND WOMEN’S CRISIS LINE TELEPHONE RESPONSE (7/10-6/12)**

	Total Calls Answered	Total Callers Asked
2010-11	23,607	7,355 (31%)
2011-12	21,364	6,761 (32%)

DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERNIGHT CALLS FROM 11PM-7AM

**TABLE 17: PORTLAND WOMEN’S CRISIS LINE TELEPHONE RESPONSE (7/11-12/11)**

	Question	Yes	Somewhat	No	Total
2010-2011	1. After calling PWCL, I feel safer.	4,049 (87%)	541 (9%)	224 (4%)	5,814
2011-12: Quarters 1&2	1. After calling PWCL, I feel safer.	2,452 (94%)	103 (4%)	60 (2%)	2,615
2010-2011	2. After calling PWCL, I know more about the available resources.	6,941 (94%)	307 (4%)	139 (2%)	7,487
2011-12: Quarters 1&2	2. After calling PWCL, I know more about the available resources.	3,228 (96%)	62 (2%)	56 (2%)	3,346
2010-2011	3. After calling PWCL, I know more about how to access resources.	6,954 (95%)	216 (3%)	128 (2%)	7,398
2011-12: Quarters 1&2	3. After calling PWCL, I know more about how to access resources.	3,194 (96%)	63 (2%)	64 (2%)	3,321

After the second quarter, PWCL changed its measures to match other DV/SA grantees.

**TABLE 18: PORTLAND WOMEN’S CRISIS LINE TELEPHONE RESPONSE - THE SERVICE PROVIDED BY THIS PROGRAM HELPED ME MAKE INFORMED CHOICES ABOUT MY SITUATION.**

**2011-12: 1/12 – 6/12**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1546 (45%)	1561 (46%)	133 (4%)	63 (2%)	112 (3%)

*Client: “These services helped set up financial independence away from my abuser.”*

**TABLE 19: PORTLAND WOMEN’S CRISIS LINE TELEPHONE RESPONSE - AFTER WORKING WITH THIS AGENCY, I HAVE SOME NEW IDEAS ABOUT HOW TO STAY SAFE. 2011-12: 1/12 – 6/12**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1393 (41%)	1660 (49%)	163 (5%)	68 (2%)	131 (4%)

**TABLE 20: PORTLAND WOMEN’S CRISIS LINE TELEPHONE RESPONSE - AFTER WORKING WITH THIS AGENCY, I KNOW MORE ABOUT RESOURCES THAT MAY BE AVAILABLE, INCLUDING HOW TO ACCESS THEM. 2011-12: 1/12 – 6/12**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1714 (50%)	1369 (40%)	144 (4%)	69 (2%)	119 (3%)

**4. Victim Response to Measures Used by DA/VAPs and Other Grantees Only**

**TABLE 21: DA/VAP CLIENT RESPONSE - AS A RESULT OF THE INFORMATION I RECEIVED FROM THIS AGENCY, I BETTER UNDERSTAND MY RIGHTS AS A VICTIM OF CRIME.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	2,949	1,635 (55%)	1,029 (35%)	66 (2%)	63 (2%)	156 (5%)
7/10-6/11	3,655	2,049 (56%)	1,324 (36%)	69 (2%)	47 (1%)	166 (5%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>2,694</b>	<b>1562 (58%)</b>	<b>941 (35%)</b>	<b>46 (2%)</b>	<b>46 (2%)</b>	<b>99 (4%)</b>

**TABLE 22: OTHER GRANTEE CLIENT RESPONSE - AS A RESULT OF THE INFORMATION I RECEIVED FROM THIS AGENCY, I BETTER UNDERSTAND MY RIGHTS AS A VICTIM OF CRIME. (PREVIOUSLY REPORTED IN THE DA/VAP DATA)**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>265 (66%)</b>	<b>97 (24%)</b>	<b>9 (2%)</b>	<b>2 (0%)</b>	<b>29 (7%)</b>

**TABLE 23: DA/VAP CLIENT RESPONSE - THE INFORMATION GIVEN TO ME BY THIS AGENCY HELPED ME BETTER UNDERSTAND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PROCESS AS IT RELATES TO MY CASE.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	2,873	1,519 (53%)	1,013 (35%)	91 (3%)	65 (2%)	185 (6%)
7/10-6/11	3,605	1,948 (54%)	1,285 (36%)	102 (3%)	65 (2%)	205 (6%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>2688</b>	<b>1434 (53%)</b>	<b>1017 (38%)</b>	<b>51 (2%)</b>	<b>65 (2%)</b>	<b>121 (5%)</b>

*Client: [Victim Advocate] "...was very helpful at keeping me informed throughout the proceedings. Not only did I understand what the process of my case was going to be they gave me so much information on programs that can help me during and after my case."*

**TABLE 24: OTHER GRANTEE CLIENT RESPONSE - THE INFORMATION GIVEN TO ME BY THIS AGENCY HELPED ME BETTER UNDERSTAND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PROCESS AS IT RELATES TO MY CASE.**

(PREVIOUSLY REPORTED IN THE DA/VAP DATA)

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>230 (57%)</b>	<b>124 (31%)</b>	<b>8 (2%)</b>	<b>2 (0%)</b>	<b>41 (10%)</b>

*Client: The "Victim Assistant made an unpleasant situation tolerable for us. Greatly appreciated her upbeat attitude and her interaction skills with me and my wife."*

CVSD accepts victims' rights complaints when an informal non-judicial response is indicated. CVSD works with victims and agencies to remedy violations that can be handled through policy or procedural changes rather than court action. In some cases, victims are referred to the Oregon Crime Victim Law Center (OCVLC) for legal services.

Many "victims' rights" calls received by CVSD concern issues that are not protected by victims' rights law. These calls most often include misunderstandings or confusions about the justice system, need for resources following victimization, complaints about law enforcement or district attorneys not filing charges in a case, and neighbor to neighbor disputes.

During the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, DOJ CVSD received 72 contacts from individuals claiming a violation of victims' rights. Of these, 14 (19%) were valid crime victims' rights complaints with 6 involving a county DA or VAP. Nine were remedied informally by direct contact with the agency concerned and three were referred to OCVLC for legal services. The remaining 58 contacts (81%) included a need for information, assistance in communicating with other agencies, or referrals to other resources; five involved VAPs and were resolved.

## 5. Victim Response to Measures Used by CAIC's Only

**TABLE 25: CAIC CLIENT RESPONSE -THE STAFF OF THIS AGENCY TREATED MY FAMILY WITH SENSITIVITY AND RESPECT.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,107	893 (81%)	174 (16%)	4 (0%)	9 (1%)	27 (2%)
7/10-6/11	865	709 (82%)	116 (13.4%)	10 (1.1%)	7 (.8%)	23 (2.7%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>905 (87%)</b>	<b>108 (10%)</b>	<b>6 (1%)</b>	<b>5 (0%)</b>	<b>15 (1%)</b>

**TABLE 26: CAIC CLIENT RESPONSE - THE STAFF OF THIS AGENCY WERE SUPPORTIVE IN HELPING ME TO ACCESS TREATMENT SERVICES FOR MY CHILD AND FAMILY.**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,053	687 (65.2%)	266 (25.3%)	15 (1.4%)	15 (1.4%)	14 (1.3%)
7/10-6/11	845	574 (67.9%)	206 (24.4%)	12 (1.4%)	10 (1.2%)	43 (5.1%)
<b>7/11-6/12</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>717 (74%)</b>	<b>189 (19%)</b>	<b>8 (1%)</b>	<b>12 (1%)</b>	<b>49 (5%)</b>

### **III. OPEN-ENDED FEEDBACK**

Client feedback is highlighted throughout this document. Grantees occasionally share client comments on the reporting form. The overwhelming majority is very positive; those that are critical typically have an unmet need or a case outcome that was not in their favor.

*Client: "I feel that the wheels of justice here were slow. I feel information I needed was vague. The Victims' Advocate was wonderful. I feel the person that did this got off pretty good and that does not sit well with me."*

Grantees also use the report to discuss issues they are facing, especially concerning collecting outcome surveys.

"Some victims of crime have stated that they just are glad that their ordeal is over and don't want to have another thing they need to deal with."

"...protocol has been NOT to call Domestic Violence survivors for evaluation calls because, as they're done 4-6 weeks after the family's initial visit, we have no way of knowing if the batterer is back in the home and don't want to put the survivor/children in danger. This year, however, over 50% of our clients served have been victims of DV. This nearly 20% increase in DV cases served has made us reevaluate our current policy and look for ways to safely contact survivors for Follow-up Evaluations. We are currently working with the DV Witness Team to create new protocol. We anticipate that the number of evaluations collected will increase once this protocol has been implemented."

"Our office has had an increase this reporting period of evaluations returned due to the recruitment of new volunteers."

"The inclusion of the follow up phone call has increased the number of survey returns, thus we will continue to use this practice to assess our services to victims."

"Victim Services Evaluation Forms are sent to Victims at the time Judgment letters and copies of Sentencing Orders are mailed. The Victim's Department has temporarily discontinued having a volunteer contact Victims by phone for completion of Common Outcome Measure Forms, due to a reduction of staff and increased caseload. The number of collected forms has decreased since the volunteer phone contact was discontinued. Our goal is to reinstate this service once we have increased our volunteer numbers."

"We are currently working on electronic forms for our website so victims can access the information from their home computers."



#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

These Common Outcome Measures were developed as a means for articulating key funding objectives, for measuring the success of grantee programs in meeting those objectives, and for giving programs a meaningful tool for client response. While a number of grantees face challenges in consistently capturing this feedback, most have developed procedures for distribution and collection that work well for their agency.

The data presented in this report provides both qualitative and quantitative evidence of the positive impact of the federal and state funding CVSD administrators. The overwhelmingly positive feedback this data represents provides important recognition for the hundreds of advocates, volunteers and other professionals who work daily to save and improve victim/survivor lives. These results are shared with policy makers and stakeholders, including grantees, as well as the advisory bodies that make recommendations to DOJ on the allocation of funds. They provide fund coordinators with information as to individual grantee strengths and needs for periodic technical support. Individual client feedback provides grantee agencies with information they can use in planning and delivering services.

The grant applications and grantee narrative reports submitted to CVSD include an update on grantee strategic and cultural competency/anti-oppression planning, including how victim/survivor voices are incorporated. Non-profit grantees report that, in addition to these CVSD outcome surveys, they gather and incorporate victim/survivor feedback through focus groups and interviews, while all grantees receive informal feedback from daily interactions. Additionally, many grantees include victims/survivors as members of staff, volunteers and non-profit Boards of Directors. The ongoing role of CVSD is to be sure that victims/survivors from all parts of the grantee communities are recognized and have a voice.