

**REPORT ON
COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES
USED BY CVSD GRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK
July 2010-June 2011**



December 2011

Prepared by:

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since January 2006, the Crime Victims' Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) has required that approximately 120 victim services providers receiving CVSD-administered grant funds collect and report quarterly on data 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. CVSD directs that grantees determine which clients are appropriate to be surveyed (e.g., not clients in crisis), and that grantees collect feedback from at least 10% of this group.

This report analyzes the data collected for the year from July 2010 through June 2011. It also compares the data with that collected for each of the two prior years.

Rate of Return: During this reporting year grantees distributed 34,631, survey forms and collected feedback from 10,148 (29.3%) of appropriate victims served by grantees, far exceeding the 10% requirement. The return rate varied among provider groups: 65.3% for Domestic and Sexual Violence services providers (DVSA); 27.7% for Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAIC); and 16.5% for District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs (DA/VAP).

High Rate of Client Satisfaction: Across all years of outcome data reporting and across all grantee provider groups, victim responses collected are overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-four percent (94%) of all victims 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-four percent (93.6%) of DVSA clients responding agreed or strongly agreed that *"After working with this agency, I have some new ideas on how to stay safe."*
- Ninety-five percent (95.4%) of CAIC clients responding agreed or strongly agreed that *"The staff of this agency treated my family with sensitivity and respect."*
- Ninety per cent (92.3%) of DA/VAP clients responding agreed or strongly agreed that *"As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime."*

Client open-ended feedback reinforced the positive impact of grantee services.

**REPORT ON COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES
USED BY CVSDGRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK
July 2010-June 2011**

I. BACKGROUND

The Crime Victims Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) administers the individual Crime Victims' Compensation Program and also administers state and federal grant programs to victim service providers throughout Oregon. Grant programs administered by CVSD are shown in Table 1, below. The number of grantees receiving funds from each source is not indicated, as many grantees receive funds from more than one source. Overall, CVSD administers funding to more than 120 victim service provider agencies serving victims in every Oregon county.

Table 1: State & Federal Funds Administered to Victim Services Providers by CVSD

Grant Fund	Source of Funds	Type of Victim Service Agency
Child Abuse Multidisciplinary Intervention (CAMI)	State Criminal Fines Account	Child Abuse Intervention Centers, Regional Centers & Multidisciplinary Teams
Victims of Crime Act ¹ (VOCA)	Federal Criminal Fines & Assessments	District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs Child Abuse Intervention Centers; Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers
STOP Violence Against Women Formula Program (VAWA) ²	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 and/or Sexual Violence Services Providers
Oregon Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Fund (ODSVS)	State General Fund	Non Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers
Unitary Assessment	Criminal Injury Compensation Account	District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs & some City Victim Assistance Programs
Intimate Partner Violence & Pregnancy Program (IPVP)	Federal General Fund ³	Non-Profit Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Providers

¹ This includes VOCA American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding that began on 10/1/09 and ended on 9/30/11.

² This includes VAWA American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding that began on 10/1/09 and ended on 3/31/11.

³ IPVP funds are part of the Affordable Health Care Act.

CVSD first required grantee agencies to collect data on client satisfaction in July 2002, as a requirement of the Oregon Domestic & Sexual Violence Services Fund (ODSVS). In October 2004, collection of “client feedback” became a requirement for Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant recipients, as well. Although CVSD created a “Client Feedback Form” appropriate for victims of domestic and sexual violence, grantees were allowed to create their own survey forms, choose the questions they would ask and the scale of satisfaction they would use.

Grantees were required to collect and report feedback from “appropriate clients”⁴ and to strive to collect feedback from at least 10% of clients surveyed. Most grantees were able to meet or exceed the 10% return rate, and the overwhelming majority of the feedback collected was extremely positive. However, because grantees were reporting on a variety of measures (questions asked) and using a variety of satisfaction scales, data reported could not be aggregated to assess the impact of grant funds overall.

In order to address this lack of aggregate client satisfaction data, in July 2005 CVSD convened a workgroup of grantee agency representatives and other stakeholders to develop common outcome measures⁵ 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 measured changes that could be reasonably anticipated to result from grant-funded activities. The workgroup included members with expertise in:

- Services provided to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence by nonprofit agencies (“DVSAs”);
- Services provided to victims of crime by victim assistance programs located in district and/or city attorney offices (“DA/VAPs”);⁶ and
- Services provided to victims of child abuse by child advocacy and child abuse assessment and intervention agencies (“CAICs”).

Over the course of the next four months, and with input from a broad range of grantee providers and other stakeholders, the workgroup identified one common outcome measure that could be used by all CVSD grantees, as well as additional measures for each of the three grantee groups (DVSAs, DA/VAPs and CAICs).

The outcomes selected are shown in Table 2, on the following page. These outcomes were identified with the understanding that after a year of implementation CVSD would survey

⁴ 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.

⁵ “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.

⁶ The DA/VAP group also includes a small number of law enforcement and other agencies receiving either VAWA or VOCA funds and reporting on these outcomes.

grantees as to any recommended changes or concerns. At the end of the first reporting year (2006), CVSD surveyed grantees as to the effectiveness of the measures. Grantee responses, detailed in the 2006 final report, available from CVSD, reflected grantee’s satisfaction with the measures as both reflecting grantee values and providing a means for worthwhile client feedback.

Table 2: Common Outcomes Tracked by CVSD Grantees

Grantees Required to Use Outcome	Outcome Measure (Question)
All CVSD Grantees	The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.
DVSAs	After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about how to stay safe .
	After working with this agency, I know more about resources 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 my rights as a victim of crime .
	The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand the criminal justice system process as it relates to my case.
Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAICs)	The staff of this agency treated my family with sensitivity and respect .
	The staff of this agency were supportive in helping me to access recommended treatment services for my child and family.

II. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

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). An *example* of how this would appear on a grantee survey appears in Table 3, below.

Table 3: Required Common Outcome Measures for DVSA Provider Clients

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1. The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.					
2. After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about how to stay safe.					
3. After working with this agency, I know more about resources that may be available, including how to access them.					

Beginning on January 1, 2006, grantees were required to collect client feedback on the outcomes and to report the following information to CVSD for each quarter of the calendar year:

- Number of client surveys distributed;
- Number of client surveys collected;
- Method of distributing surveys;
- Number of responses to each of the required; and
- Any additional information grantees want to report (e.g., open-ended client comments, grantee explanation of success or challenges in data collection).

January 2011 marked the beginning of a transition in the method of grantee reporting, as CVSD migrated from a paper-based to a web-based grant application and reporting system. CAICs and DA/VAPs began to report in the new CVSD web-based “E-Grants” system, while the DVSAAs continued to use paper copies. This report includes both data reported by paper and data entered in E-Grants. As of October 2011, all reporting will be in the E-Grants system.

The following sections summarize the data submitted by grantees to CVSD for state fiscal year from July 2010 through June 2011 and compare that data to the comparable data collected for the two preceding fiscal years. It notes where the migration to web-based system has had an impact on reporting.

III. OUTCOMES REPORTED

A. Rate of Return

Grantees distributed and collected data through a range of methods, and the method used often had an impact on the rate of return achieved. For example, a domestic violence shelter program collecting feedback from clients as they exit shelter may have been able to achieve a nearly 100% rate of return, while a district attorney-based victim assistance program mailing out surveys to all victims of crimes prosecuted in a given month may have received a far smaller percentage of returns.

In the past, the DA/VAPs had the lowest rate of return, largely because of the way in which they solicit feedback, as noted in the paragraph above. Prior to January 2011, these programs would complete a paper form showing the number of forms distributed and the number received, but would not be asked to calculate the rate of return this represented. Thus, grantees who failed to meet the 10% rate would not necessarily realize that this was the case, leaving it to CVSD to follow up, as time and resources permitted. The E-Grants system is able to perform that calculation automatically as grantees enter their raw data, and CVSD has added a question asking: *If your return rate is lower than 10%, please explain what you have done/will do to increase your return rate.*

In the first quarter of this reporting year (July – September 2010), when reporting was still on paper, 9 DA/VAPs failed to meet the 10% return rate. That number dropped to 6 for the next two quarters, during which DA/VAPs were reporting in E-Grants and therefore aware they had failed to meet the 10%. In the fourth quarter, only 3 DA/VAPs received a lower than 10% rate of return. While it is not possible to know the extent to which this new awareness caused that decrease, program narrative responses to the question noted above are interesting. One program, with an 8% rate, wrote:

Our office notes that the great majority of the returned forms have positive comments for Victims' Services. This is on line with what we hear personally from victims during our interactions. However, we find that we receive a lower return rate than we would like. We believe the victims may not desire to revisit the process by the time the disposition documents are sent to them. We are encouraging victims to fill out the forms at the time they come in for sentencing, and even earlier in the process.

In response to another question, the program added:

At the conclusion of many cases, feedback from victims is direct. Victim Advocates are present with the victims throughout the judicial process. After the judgment has occurred, victims frequently return to the victim waiting room to debrief the experience with the advocates. Even if the outcome of the cases have not been supportive of the victim, the responses to the advocates have been of appreciation and gratitude for their support throughout the process.

Interestingly, in the next quarter, that program's rate exceeded 10%. Another program with a 3% rate, wrote:

We have provided postage in the past and there is no difference in return. Having the forms available at sentencing is not very sensitive, so we do not feel offering them then is appropriate. We are thinking of having a volunteer call and ask the victim if they received the judgment and survey and as a reminder if they could fill it out and return to the advocate office. If the victim has lost or misplaced a survey we can send them another one in hopes of more returns.

That program's rate rose to 13% in the next quarter. The director wrote: *With the continued phone and one-on-one contact I believe this has been instrumental in the increase of victim response.* The following quarter the rate rose above 43%.

Program feedback reflects efforts to balance between inviting victim feedback and respecting their privacy. A program whose rate fell just below 10% reflected:

Advocates will be asked to increase their efforts to discuss in person the importance of victim feedback as a way to improve overall services to victims. Some advocates have mentioned they're not comfortable seeking input from victims and feel as if they are "fishing for a compliment". We will seek ways to articulate the need for client feedback while allowing our advocates to maintain a level of comfort about the process.

Tables 4-7, below, indicate the rate of return for all grantees, and for each grantee group, comparing the current reporting year with the two prior years. Overall, significantly more forms were distributed between July 2010 and June 2011 than had been distributed in each of the two prior years, and more forms were returned. The return rate for all grantees also increased, nearing 30%. Changes varied from group to group. DAVAPs received more forms, with a higher return rate than each of the two prior years although more forms had been distributed two years previously. Reading the narratives written by DAVAPs about their efforts to encourage victims to complete and return surveys, it seems likely that this increased rate is not coincidental, but rather is the result of conscious --and conscientious -- effort. DVSA programs had higher results across the board. CAICs were the only group to see their numbers and rate decrease. It is possible that this result correlates to the process of shifting from a paper to E-Grants reporting process. It will be interesting to track whether this trend continues in the next year.

Table 4: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: All Grantees⁷

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/08-6/09	32,695	8,841	27.0%
7/09-6/10	31,426	8,680	27.6%
7/10-6/11	34,631	10,148	29.30%

Table 5: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: DVSA Providers Only

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/08-6/09	7,359	4,220	57.3 %
7/09-6/10	7,001	4,225	60.8%
7/10-6/11	8,484	5,537	65.3%

Table 6: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: DA/VAPs Only

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/08-6/09	23,105	3,598	15.6%
7/09-6/10	20,441	3,269	16.0%
7/10-6/11	22,636	3,743	16.5%

⁷ Because these totals include a small number of grantee agencies classified as "other", these numbers are slightly higher than the sum of the totals shown in tables 5-7.

Table 7: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: CAICs Only

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/08-6/09	2,081	949	45.6%
7/09-6/10	3,984	1,156	29.0%
7/10-6/11	3,511	868	27.7%

As described above, grantees are allowed latitude in determining which clients to survey and how and when to administer the survey. Grantees are asked to report on their method of distribution and collection and a representative range of responses is included, below. Again, the new web-based format encourages this kind of information by having a dialogue box that grantees are required to complete. As the grantee narratives explain, DAVAPs have the lowest rate because they distribute forms most widely. Typically, distribution and return of forms for the other groups is face-to-face, resulting in the significantly higher rates.

DVSAs:

The form is handed out when a client goes into shelter and when they leave as well. There is a locked comment box at the shelter for the completed forms. At our main office/drop-in center we have a stack of forms next to a box for them to put into as well. Advocates have forms in each of their offices to hand out. The forms are in English and Spanish along with the signs on the box encouraging clients to fill out the form.

We keep them in a stack at each advocate's desk for people to fill out when they come in and hand them back. We don't mail them unless someone requests that it is okay and safe. We need to put a sign with a ...box or something so people can return them later.

We have distributed surveys in several ways. While the majority are handed directly to the client by the attorney, we also mail them with SASE at the close of the case, or have support staff do the survey by phone when possible. Returned surveys are routed to the Regional Directors. (Some clients did not receive surveys if they provided no safe mailing address and did not come into the office for an appointment.) [Legal services provider]

DA/VAPs:

Client Feedback forms are given to victims at the time of sentencing. If a Victim does not attend sentencing, forms are mailed with the judgment order with a self-addressed envelope included.

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. (Note: in the next quarter, they add, “Our goal is to reinstate this service once we have increased our volunteer numbers”.)

We have now put the client survey in our Victims Assistance Brochure, with the three questions below. The back page of the brochure is a tear off so that victims can return to us. We also have brochures in the office and a survey form on the clipboard in the VAP Office on top of the desk with a marked basket for victims to return the surveys.

- *When meeting with victim’s at grand jury and when reviewing their rights to them we will review the survey with them and ask them to please fill out and return back to our office once the case has concluded.*
- *In cases where we have not met with the victim we will send out a cover letter with the survey and self addressed, stamped envelope and ask them to return to us.*
-

CAICs:

[Our Agency] has found the most successful way of gathering feed back is to call. Three attempts are made. The agency is currently looking into perhaps distributing not only by phone but also by email.

Every family who comes through [Our Agency] receives an intake packet of informational materials, which includes an evaluation form. An advocate explains the importance of the form to the client or guardian. If the family does not return the form to the advocate at the time of the interview, a different volunteer will make a follow-up call 1-2 weeks later requesting their feedback.

Trained advocates call our clients after their visit to the Center and ask the three questions over the phone. The advocates mark the responses and turn them in to our Intake Coordinator, who keeps track of the client feedback.

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 of intimate partner violence who are faced with the daunting tasks of building new lives, often with nothing more than the clothes on their backs, so that finding the time to complete one more form may be difficult. Parents of children who have been abused face equally daunting challenges. One DVSA provider wrote:

“This is the first time we’ve received 0% back. The only explanation would seem to be that most of the people we gave them too were too much in crisis mode to take the time to complete the surveys.”

B. Victim Response to Individual Outcome Measures.

The pages that follow summarize the response reported for each of the outcomes used. Each outcome is presented in a box, with the cumulative responses tabled below. Again, the current reporting year is compared to the prior years. Across all grantee groups, all quarters and all years, feedback is overwhelmingly positive. Results in the current year are close to those of the prior year. Again, there is an increase in numbers in all groupings except the CAIC’s, while the distribution of answers remains approximately the same.

Grantees as a whole take negative feedback very much to heart. DA/VAPs receive feedback from victims who may focus on their disappointment or frustration with the disposition of a case and not on the quality of services provided by the victim assistance advocate. One VAP wrote,

We have added a final question to the feedback forms asking: “If you have indicated in your responses that you were not satisfied with our services, can we give you a call to further discuss how we can improve our program?” A victims’ advocate attempts to contact those clients ...During this quarterly reporting period, we followed up on one feedback where the victim indicated the receptionist had been rude to her when she called in. The issue was resolved.

1. Responses to the Outcome Measure Required for All Grantees

As described above, in Table 2, above, the first outcome is the only one used by all CVSD grantees. Table 8, below, summarizes all grantees’ responses, while Tables 9-11 break out the responses of individual grantee groups (DVSAs, DA/VAPs & CAICs).

“The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.”

Table 8: Victim Response Reported by All Grantees⁸

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	8,261	5,184 (63%)	2,441 (30%)	136 (2%)	103 (1%)	397 (5%)
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%)

⁸ 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.

Table 9: Victim Response Reported by DVSAs Only

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	4,176	2,923 (70%)	1,050 (25%)	35 (1%)	29 (1%)	139 (3%)
7/09-6/10	4,250	3,132 (73.7%)	956 (22.5%)	23 (.5%)	17 (.4%)	121 (2.8%)
7/10-6/11	5,362	3,784 (70.6%)	1,380 (25.7%)	36 (.7%)	16 (.3%)	146 (2.7%)

Table 10: Victim Response Reported by DA/VAPs Only

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	3,075	1,632 (53%)	1,079 (35%)	78 (3%)	65 (2%)	221 (7%)
7/09-6/10	3,066	1,648 (53.8%)	1,077 (35.1%)	76 (2.5%)	63 (2.1 %)	202 (6.6 %)
7/10-6/11	3,665	2,054 (56.0%)	1,270 (34.8%)	64 (1.7%)	59 (1.6%)	218 (5.9%)

Table 11: Victim Response Reported by CAICs Only

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	942	584 (62%)	291 (31%)	20 (2%)	8 (1%)	39 (4%)
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%)

2. Victim Response to Measures Used by DVSAs Only

Tables 12 & 13, below, show the responses reported to the two measures used by DVSA provider grantees only. Each measure is repeated in a box above the table to which it corresponds. Changes in responses are slight, with a slight shift from “Strongly Agree” to “Agree”.

“After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about how to stay safe.”

Table 12: DVSA Client Response about Ideas for Safety

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	4,197	2,822 (68%)	1,143 (27%)	39 (1%)	21 (1%)	172 (4%)
7/09-6/10	4,225	2,958 (70%)	1,050 (25%)	26 (1%)	17 (0%)	174 (4%)
7/10-6/11	5,300	3,505 (66.1%)	1,458 (27.5%)	58 (1.1%)	15 (.3%)	264 (5%)

“After working with this agency, I know more about resources that may be available, including how to access them.”

Table 13: DVSA Client Response about Accessing Resources

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	4,204	2,893 (69%)	1,083 (26%)	54 (1%)	21 (1%)	153 (4%)
7/09-6/10	4,232	2,949 (69.7%)	1,041 (24.6%)	35 (.9%)	17(.4%)	189 (4.7%)
7/10-6/11	5,335	3,562 (66.8%)	1,436(26.9%)	77 (1.4%)	27 (.5%)	233 (4.4%)

Beginning in July 2009, DVSA grantees were required to break out the responses reported by type of services the victim or survivor had received.⁹ Tables 14-16 showing responses by service type, are included on the following pages. Each table shows a single year, with the responses broken out by service types. Tables are grouped by question, with (a) showing results for 2009-10 and (b) 2010-11. The prior year is included for purposes of comparison.

Responses among the service types reflect the same slight shift described above, from “Strongly Agree” to “Agree”, since the aggregate data is the same. In both years, in all questions, Support Group participants have a higher rate of “Agree” and a lower rate of “Strongly Agree” than Shelter and Non-Shelter services. Finally, in the first year of this more detailed reporting, a number of forms were returned with the type of service not indicated. In the second year that was not the case.

⁹ This is a requirement of the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA) funding administered by DHS, and included in the single combined allocation with CVSD noncompetitive Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault VOCA, VAWA and ODSVS funds.

“The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.”

Table 14(a): DVSA Client Response about Making Informed Choices (7/09-6/10)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	2,229	1,741 (78%)	428 (19%)	7 (0%)	6 (0%)	47 (2%)
Shelter Services	1,165	802 (69%)	299 (26%)	8 (1%)	10 (1%)	46 (4%)
Support Group	783	536 (70%)	214 (27%)	8 (1%)	0 (0%)	24 (3%)
Not Indicated	73	53 (73%)	15 (21%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)
Grand Total:	4,250	3,132 (73.7%)	956 (22.5%)	23 (.5%)	17 (.4%)	121 (2.8%)

Table 14(b): DVSA Client Response about Making Informed Choices (7/10-6/11)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	3,108	2,274 (73%)	736 (24%)	11 (0%)	5 (0%)	82 (3%)
Shelter Services	1,067	740 (70%)	268 (25%)	16 (2%)	8 (1%)	35 (3%)
Support Group	1,187	770 (65%)	376 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	29 (2%)
Grand Total:	5,362	3,784 (71%)	1,380 (26%)	36 (1%)	16 (0%)	146 (3%)

“After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about how to stay safe.”

Table 15(a): DVSA Client Response about Ideas for Safety (7/09-6/10)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	2,217	1,639 (74%)	495 (22%)	11 (1%)	4 (0%)	68 (3%)
Shelter Services	1,164	775 (67%)	310 (27%)	10 (1%)	11 (1%)	58 (5%)
Support Group	772	488 (64%)	236 (31%)	5 (1%)	2 (0%)	41 (5%)
Non-Shelter Services	72	56 (78%)	9 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (11%)
Grand Total:	4,225	2,958 (70%)	1,050 (25%)	26 (1%)	17 (0%)	174 (4%)

Table 15(b): DVSA Client Response about Ideas for Safety (7/10-6/11)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	3,106	2,120 (68%)	789 (25%)	28 (1%)	4 (0%)	165 (5%)
Shelter Services	1,017	653 (64%)	290 (29%)	21(2%)	8 (1%)	45 (4%)
Support Group	1,177	732 (62%)	379 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	54 (5%)
Grand Total:	5,300	3,505 (66%)	1,458 (28%)	58 (1%)	15 (0%)	264 (5%)

“After working with this agency, I know more about resources that may be available, including how to access them.”

Table 16(a): DVSA Client Response about Accessing Resources (7/09-6/10)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	2,122	1,650 (75%)	482 (22%)	11 (1%)	5 (0%)	64 (3%)
Shelter Services	1,166	771 (66%)	312 (27%)	8 (1%)	7 (1%)	63 (5%)
Support Group	780	481 (62%)	233 (30%)	16 (2%)	4 (1%)	46 (6%)
Not Indicated	74	47 (64%)	14 (19%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	11 (15%)
Grand Total:	4,232	2,949 (70%)	1,041 (25%)	35 (1%)	17 (0%)	189 (4%)

Table 16(b): DVSA Client Response about Accessing Resources (7/10-6/11)

Type of Service	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Non-Shelter Services	3,085	2,167,(70%)	729 (24%)	31 (1%)	7 (0%)	151 (5%)
Shelter Services	1,066	687 (64%)	304 (29%)	27 (3%)	9 (1%)	39 (4%)
Support Group	1,184	708 (60%)	403 (34%)	19 (2%)	11(1%)	43 (4%)
Grand Total:	5,335	3,562 (67%)	1,436 (27%)	77 (2%)	27 (0%)	233 (4%)

The Portland Women’s Crisis Line handles the largest crisis call volume in the state. In October 2009, they began collecting feedback from callers on three questions on the scale indicated in Table 18, below. The questions reflect the two DVSA-specific measures that are also the ones required by the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Act funding (FVPSA).¹⁰ Table 17 shows the rate of response by callers. As is the case with other providers, crisis line responders ask for feedback only from callers who are not in crisis. Table 18 indicates the range of response. Presumably, the lower number of responses about safety reflects the percentage of Crisis Line calls that are specifically about identifying and accessing resources. Responses with regard to resources are highly positive, while the negative and “somewhat” responses for safety were significantly higher. The data in Tables 17 and 18 are in addition to that included in Tables 14-16, above.

Table 17: Rate of Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Response (7/10-6/11)

Total Calls Answered	Total Callers Asked
23,607	7,355 (31%)

Table 18: Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Response (7/10-6/11)

Question	Yes	Somewhat	No	Total
1. After calling PWCL, I feel safer.	4,049 (87%)	541 (9%)	224 (4%)	5,814
2. After calling PWCL, I know more about the available resources.	6,941 (94%)	307 (4%)	139 (2%)	7,487
3. After calling PWCL, I know more about how to access resources.	6,954 (95%)	216 (3%)	128 (2%)	7,398

3. Victim Response to Measures Used by DA/VAPs Only

Tables 19 & 20 below, show the responses reported to the two measures used by DA/VAP program grantees only. Each measure is repeated in a box above the table to which it corresponds. DA/VAPs collected significantly more responses than in the prior years, while those respondents strongly agreeing with positive outcomes increased slightly for both measures.

¹⁰ Portland Women’s Crisis Line complies with the Common Outcome Measures requirement by also submitting data collected from support group participants.

“As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime.”

Table 19: DA/VAP Client Response about Understanding Crime Victims’ Rights

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	3,070	1,649 (54%)	1,140 (37%)	57 (2%)	62 (2%)	162 (5%)
7/09-6/10	2,949	1,635 (55.4%)	1,029 (34.9%)	66 (2.2%)	63 (2.1%)	156 (5.3%)
7/10-6/11	3,655	2,049 (56.1%)	1,324 (36.2%)	69 (1.9%)	47 (1.3%)	166 (4.5%)

“The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand the criminal justice system process as it relates to my case.”

Table 20: DA/VAP Client Response about Understanding the Criminal Justice System

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	3,068	1,544 (50%)	1,149 (37%)	83 (3%)	74 (2%)	218 (7%)
7/09-6/10	2,873	1,519 (52.9%)	1,013 (35.3%)	91 (3.2%)	65 (2.3%)	185 (6.4%)
7/10-6/11	3,605	1,948 (54%)	1,285 (35.6%)	102 (2.8%)	65 (1.8%)	205 (5.7%)

In addition to the data collected through the E-Grants and paper grantee reporting system, CVSD collects feedback on the DA/VAPs Common Outcome Measures through a Web-based Crime Victims’ Rights survey (“Web Survey”) distributed to victims of person crimes who have applied for Crime Victims’ Compensation Program benefits administered by CVSD, and have not opted out of research studies. CVSD began collecting this additional data in October 2010 as part of an effort to evaluate whether constitutional and statutory crime victims’ rights are being honored, to identify areas of the criminal and juvenile justice systems needing improvement, and to collect information on satisfaction with the services provided by the DA/VAPs. As with the data collected by the DA/VAPs and reported above, the majority of victims responding to the Web Survey “agree” or “strongly agree” that the DA/VAPs helped them 1) make informed choices about their situations, 2) better understand their rights as victims of crime and 3) better understand the criminal justice system process.¹¹

In addition to the data collected through the Web Survey, the Crime Victims’ Rights Section of CVSD receives complaints from victims who believe their rights have not

¹¹ The aggregate data from this survey is not included in this report, as it is only available for part of this reporting year (10/10-6/11) and because it is likely that many victims participating in the Web Survey also responded to DA/VAPs, thus duplicating the data shown above.

been honored. For the 22 months in which data has been collected, (January 2010 through October 2011) very few of the over 150 calls received by Crime Victims' Rights Section staff have been actual constitutional or statutory rights violations. Of the calls that constituted violations, only a few were complaints about a DA/VAP office, including violations such as not being notified of critical stage hearings, not being accompanied for a court hearing, restitution not being ordered, and not being provided other resource information. The Crime Victims' Rights Section reports that those complaints were easily remedied through conversations with the DA/VAP staff. The DA/VAPs have been very receptive to questions regarding their practices as related to the complaints, and open to changes in practice where needed. Correspondingly, victims have been satisfied with the responses from those programs.

4. Victim Response to Measures Used by CAIC's Only

Tables 21 & 22, below, show the responses reported to the two measures used by CAIC program grantees only. Each measure is repeated in a box above the table to which it corresponds. In 2010-11, CAICs collected fewer responses but with a slightly higher rate of strong agreement.

“The staff of this agency treated my family with sensitivity and respect.”

Table 21: CAIC Client Response about Sensitivity & Respect

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	948	756 (80%)	159 (17%)	10 (1%)	6 (1%)	17 (2%)
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%)

“The staff of this agency were supportive in helping me to access recommended treatment services for my child and family.”

Table 22: CAIC Client Response about Accessing Treatment Services

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/08-6/09	938	629 (66%)	232 (24%)	26 (3%)	5 (1%)	46 (4%)
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%)

IV. OPEN-ENDED VICTIM FEEDBACK

The reporting form also asks for any additional relevant information grantees wish to submit. As a rule, grantees use this space to include open-ended responses from clients who complete the survey forms. The overwhelming majority of the responses are positive, however grantees also include critical comments they receive. Some of these have to do with unmet needs that result from lack of grantee resources. A CAIC wrote:

Another parent [said] that the resources for counseling were too expensive to purchase and would like to see a lending library. We are looking at that but have had some books checked out and not returned.

A legal services (DVSA) grantee wrote:

One client was happy with the staff but unhappy that we were unable to assist her with a divorce due to funding constraints. It is true that much of our funding at this time limits services to emergency assistance with restraining orders. Although self-help dissolutions are available in Oregon, some of our clients are not strong enough emotionally to proceed on their own.

Some of the negative feedback received by the DA/VAPs reflects victim frustration with their case outcomes, rather than the program services. A DA/VAP noted:

Most of the negative responses received were usually victims who were unhappy with the plea bargains that the DA's offered and the defendants accepted.

A victim wrote:

Time consuming/ineffective disappointing--victims rights are totally disregarded in order to give criminals all the rights victims should get but don't.

A shelter resident's comment reflected one of the challenges of shared housing for families in crisis:

"The shelter was clean for the majority of my stay, when the population changes so did the physical state of the shelter. It became very dirty because of people not cleaning up after themselves."

A few of the many examples of the positive feedback reported by grantees include:

"Services were great and all the advocates were supportive, understanding and friendly. Made the experience of going through everything less stressful."

Thank you for this service! It really helped me get through my assault in a healthy way. You are all wonderful.” [DSVA]

“I appreciate the efforts by all parties in bringing justice to this case. Thanks to the Sheriff Deputy and the entire DA’s staff and the court.” [DA/VAP]

“Everyone treated me and my children with respect. The volunteers treated my children with kindness and respect. Thank you [Agency] and volunteers.” [CAIC]

“Thank you for being there and showing the softer side of the justice system. You were really appreciated.” [DA/VAP]

“Would I recommend these services to another survivor? Yes. If they can’t help with something they usually know where you can go to get the help and support you need.” [DVSA]

“Thank you [Agency], you really care. Thank you for the beautiful quilt and all of the kindness everyone here shared with us today. Maybe talking to people that wanna help and make things better is easier than I thought. Thanks a lot.” [CAIC]

“The services provided by the program really helped when we needed. If we had a question, [an] advocate was there to answer question.” [DA/VAP]

“I really was happy knowing there are people who are there to help. I was very scared and felt violated, but was very thankful for the help I received. They kept me informed very well.” [DA/VAP]

A number of the responses from DVSA programs specifically focused on their services to children whose parents seek safety in shelter:

“I loved how focused it is on the kids. They were acknowledged and respected rather than overlooked and shushed.”

“I am learning a lot about keeping me and my kids safe”

“[Male Advocate]! You are awesome, thanks for all the play times with my son.”

“Thank you everybody for being good to [my daughter] and helping me with her.”

“Tal vez el mundo no se pueda cambiar pero están hacienda la diferencia en mi y mi hija. Gracias!” (Maybe you can’t change the world, but you are making the difference for me and my daughter.)”

One youth participant in a DVSA program expressed her own gratitude:

“I was nervous at first but I felt more better after I could trust my advocate and I felt much better when I could get my feelings out and let them go. She was always a good listener and never made me feel scared or embarrassed. I learned new words to express my feelings and am able to understand my feelings, especially the strong feelings.”

VI. CONCLUSION

These Common Outcome Measures were developed both as a means for articulating key funding objectives and for measuring the success of grantee programs in meeting those objectives. 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 funding CVSD administers. 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 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 grantee narrative reports and grant applications submitted to CVSD include an update on grantee strategic and cultural competency/anti-oppression planning, including how survivor voices are incorporated. Non-profit grantees report that, in addition to these CVSD outcome surveys, they gather and incorporate survivor feedback through focus groups and interviews, while all grantees receive informal feedback from daily interactions. Additionally, many grantees include survivors as members of staff, volunteers and non-profit Boards of Directors. The ongoing role of CVSD is to be sure that survivors from all parts of the grantee communities are providing feedback about services they received – or did not receive – and that grantees continue to consider that information in all aspects of what they do.