



# **SURVEY OF STATE COALITIONS AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

## ***State Coalitions Shelter Standards Legislation***

15511

**COMPILED BY THE**

**NATIONAL COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Suite 305**

**Washington, D.C. 20037**

**(202) 293-8860**

This survey was made possible through a cooperative agreement between the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) and the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice (Cooperative Agreement #85-SN-CX-KO36)

115541

# **SURVEY OF STATE COALITIONS AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

## ***State Coalitions Shelter Standards Legislation***

NCJRS

FEB 10 Rec.

ACQUISITIONS

**COMPILED BY THE  
NATIONAL COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Suite 305  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
(202) 293-8860**

This survey was made possible through a cooperative agreement between the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) and the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice (Cooperative Agreement #85-SN-CX-KO36)

115541

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/Office of Justice  
Programs/US Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

## FORWARD

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is a national, grassroots, membership organization of battered women's shelters, safe homes and advocacy programs, and concerned individuals. NCADV provides information on domestic violence, referrals, and technical assistance to domestic violence programs nationwide. NCADV also serves as a resource for the State Coalitions Against Domestic Violence that are active in most of the States.

Through its work, NCADV has seen the need for more extensive national research on many issues in the field of domestic violence. Frequent requests for information from reporters, other researchers, battered women's advocates, service providers, legislators and concerned citizens are received by NCADV.

As the work to end violence against women continues to expand at the state and local level, the need for centralized national information becomes even more crucial. National attention has been focused on the tragedy that the violence in our homes has created. The result has been increased funding of local programs, improvements in domestic violence legislation and criminal justice policies, expansion of service provision, and an increased awareness that we must work even harder to end the violence that has remained hidden among family members for so long.

In order to continue to improve the strategies for ending domestic violence, vital information about the early struggles, successes, and even failures must be shared on an ongoing basis. This exchange of information must include new legislative action, improved domestic violence programming, resource evaluation, and innovative law enforcement and criminal justice practices. Each state and local domestic violence coalition or program can benefit by learning from the experiences of others in attempting new strategies in those and other areas.

In July 1986, NCADV, with funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, began a process of collecting information from each of the State Coalitions Against Domestic Violence. The information compiled in this report, along with other data collected by the Coalition, is the beginning formation of a "state-of-the-states" data base on domestic violence activities nationwide.

### METHODOLOGY

In July 1986, NCADV mailed three separate surveys to each of the State Coalitions Against Domestic Violence (a total of 53 Coalitions; California has three regional coalitions) covering the following areas:

- o State Coalition Activities
- o State Domestic Violence Legislation
  - Law Enforcement Training
  - Funding of Domestic Violence Programs
  - Data Collection/Reporting of Domestic Violence
- o Standards For Shelters

Surveys were mailed to each Coalition requesting completion and return by August 29, 1986.

In early September, with only sixteen of the surveys returned, a follow-up mailing was sent to the remaining thirty-seven Coalitions requesting their response by the end of September. Additionally, at their September meeting, the NCADV Steering Committee (Board of Directors) was read a list of those states who had not yet completed the surveys. Duplicate copies of the survey were distributed and the help of each state representative was solicited to encourage a more widespread response.

In order to complete the tabulation of the data by the Project's end date (October 31, 1986), a cut-off date for receipt/inclusion of the survey in the report was selected. Surveys received by October 28, 1986 (all three completed) are included in the report. Surveys received after the cut-off date will be used in any follow-up work done by NCADV.

Thirty-six State Coalitions (a return rate of 68%) were able to complete the forms and return them to NCADV in time to be included in this report. (The Southern California Coalition surveys were used for statewide information included in the report.) Responses for each question are, therefore, based on thirty-six responses, unless noted otherwise.

Out of respect for the privacy of the State Coalitions, very limited raw data is highlighted in this report. Instead, the report is a composite of all of the data received through the surveys. Data that is attributed to the individual coalitions is usually of a "public nature" (i.e., legislation) and was thought to be more useful to other programs/coalitions if identified by state. Oral permission was obtained from each of the Coalitions appearing in the report regarding the inclusion of data specific to the Coalition.

Because a pre-test was not conducted, NCADV was unable to correct the design of a number of questions that appeared to confuse the respondents. In instances where this confusion was noted in their responses, great care was taken during the tabulation phase to ascertain the best response for each question.

Finally, the following reports of each of the three surveys simply documents the collected data. The reported information, however, is, and will be, valuable to Coalitions/Programs around the country as it enables them to identify those states who have shelter standards, legislatively mandated training of law enforcement officers on domestic violence, and various types of funding for domestic violence programs. By sharing this information, NCADV hopes to increase networking and communication among Coalitions and Programs as they seek to develop new and more effective strategies for ending domestic violence.

STATE COALITIONS

Thirty-three State Coalitions completed the Survey on State Coalitions Activities. Two of those were completed by a State Domestic Violence Task Force or Advisory Committee in the absence of a State Coalition. Since their role was quite different from the State Coalitions, they were not included in the data compilation. The following figures are, therefore, based on 31 respondents except when noted:

1. Year when State Coalition was Established:

1976 - Two  
1977 - Two  
1978 - Twelve  
1979 - Four  
1980 - Five  
1981 - Three  
1982 - Two  
(Three states did not respond.)

2. Staffing of Coalition.

The majority of State Coalitions operate with a very small number of staff (16 of the 33 reporting coalitions had 2 or fewer staff) or simply through the efforts of board members/member programs. Seven (7) of the 33 Coalitions responding had no paid staff and six (6) additional Coalitions with a small size staff reported that the board helped to run the Coalition.

The range of staff level of reporting Coalitions was from zero (0) staff to fourteen (14) full time staff. (See Chart A for a breakdown by state.)

3. Eligibility for Membership in State Coalition.

The eligibility for membership was generally uniform with slight variations in specific membership requirements. Most of the State Coalitions are open for membership to those involved in domestic violence work plus anyone concerned with the issue of domestic violence. Some of those Coalitions do differentiate between active members (domestic violence programs) and supportive members (others interested in domestic violence). Coalitions reported the following regarding membership requirements:

- o All domestic violence programs plus individual members. (6)
- o Open to anyone but only shelter members can vote. (5)
- o Programs primarily serving battered women and their children. (4)
- o Shelter programs, agencies working with battered women and their children, and concerned individuals. (2)
- o Active - provide direct services to battered women, and supportive - other organizations and individuals. (4)
- o Any organization with goals consistent with the coalition, but final vote by current membership determines admission. (1)
- o Nonprofit, community-based, grassroots, feminist organizations whose primary purpose is to end violence in the lives of women. (1)
- o Open to all Program staff. (1)
- o Any domestic violence or sexual assault program. (1)

- o Any concerned citizen.(2)
- o Only battered women's program or formerly battered women can be active members -- others can join as associate or supportive members.(1)
- o Paid members of area task forces.(1)
- o Anyone interested in domestic violence.(2)

#### 4 & 5. Coalition Funding.

Coalitions were asked for their annual budget, as well as the breakdown (%) of that budget according to funding source.

Thirty-two Coalitions responded to the question on overall annual budget. The range of budgets for those Coalitions reporting is from zero (0) to \$5,109,792. Eighteen of those responding reported budgets of \$45,000 or less. Twenty-seven (27) of the 32 respondents completed the question requesting the breakdown of budget funding sources.

Of those states responding, two (2) relied entirely (100%) upon membership dues for funding of the coalition. All 27 respondents relied on membership dues to compose a part of their overall budget, with percentages ranging from .005% to 100%.

Fifteen (15) of the respondents received funding from the State for Coalition activities. Fourteen (14) of those State Coalitions relied on state funding for 30% or more of their annual budget, with ten (10) of those relying on State funding for 47% or more of their budget.

Six (6) of the twenty-seven respondents received federal funding for their Coalition. Federal funding accounted for 5.5%, 10%, 22%, 23%, 32%, and 46% of their budgets.

Foundations ranked second highest as financial supporters of the Coalitions, with nineteen (19) of the States reporting a percentage of their budget as foundation dollars. The percentage of overall budgets consisting of foundation money ranged from 5% to 97%. Six (6) of the 27 Coalitions reporting relied on foundation support for over 86% of their budget, with thirteen (13) using foundation funding for a third or more of their budget.

Sixteen (16) of the reporting Coalitions use memberships/donations/contributions as a source of funding, however. The range of percentage of budget is from .003% to 20% with sixteen (16) of the eighteen (18) reporting 5% or greater.

Two (2) of the nineteen coalitions reporting count Combined Federal Campaign or United Way Contributions as a part of their budget. The percentage of overall budget was 3.6% and 5%.

Special events provided funding for seven (7) of the Coalitions with an average percentage of 13%. The range was from 1% to 37%.

Sale of publications or materials funded seven (7) of the Coalitions at an average 5.6% of the overall budget. Six (6) Coalitions reported that a percentage of their budget came from "Other" sources. The range was from .5% to 16%, with an average 8.2%.

For a breakdown of the 27 reported budgets (unidentified by state) see Chart B.

6. Primary Role of the Coalition

Thirty-two (32) Coalitions responded to the question regarding the primary role of the Coalition. While the responses were diverse in their style, they were fairly uniform in substance. Each of the respondents shared similar goals/purposes for their coalition activities.

Coordination of statewide activities appeared most frequently in the responses of the Coalitions regarding their primary role, albeit in a number of different forms.

Information Sharing/Networking Among Programs was reported as one of the primary goals by sixteen (16) Coalitions; and Coordination of statewide activities by seven (7) Coalitions. Nineteen (19) Coalitions provide conferences, technical assistance and training as a major function of the Coalition. Nineteen (19) Coalitions work toward legislative and public policy change.

Serving as the public voice on issues relating to Domestic Violence/Battered Women/Public Awareness was mentioned as a primary role by ten (10).

For a breakdown of those activities reported as primary functions of the Coalitions see Chart C.

7. Does the State Coalition have a mission statement?

Twenty-three (23) of the reporting Coalitions stated that they do have a mission statement and ten (10) Coalitions reported that they did not.

8. Does the State Coalition have by-laws?

Thirty-two (32) Coalitions reported that they do have by-laws and one (1) Coalition reported that they did not.

9. Composition of State Coalition Board

Primarily, the boards of the State Coalition are composed of representatives of member domestic violence programs/and/or representatives of those programs elected on a regional basis. Many of the State Coalitions also include representatives of the community/community groups or agencies on their boards. For a listing of the different types of boards reported by the State Coalitions, please see Chart D.

10. Coalition State Task Forces

Thirty-two Coalitions responded to the question requesting information on Coalition Task Forces. Sixteen (16) of those did have at least one Task Force, and sixteen (16) did not. The following is a breakdown of the Task Forces in existence (several Coalitions responded yes to the question, but did not list out the specific Task Forces).

Women of Color	(12)
Formerly Battered Women	(9)
Lesbian	(6)
Child Advocacy	(5)
Rural	(4)
Community Response Program	(2)
Legislative	(2)
Anti-Racism	(1)

Welfare Advocacy	(1)
Advocacy	(1)
Coordinating Responses to Domestic Violence	(1)
Homophobia & Racism Action	(1)
Men's Programs Task Force	(1)

#### 11. Coalition Services to Members

The thirty-three coalitions responding provided a broad range of services. It should be noted that the amount and variety of services provided by the Coalitions did correspond with the number of staff and size of budget of the Coalition. Quite obviously, a Coalition with a zero budget and no full time staff cannot provide the range of services that a well-funded Coalition is able to. The Coalitions with few or no staff and limited financial resources did provide a wide array of services to their members, however, particularly considering their economic status.

The services provided most often by State Coalitions include:

- o Networking (31)
- o Lobbying/Advocacy (31)
- o Technical Assistance (29)
- o Training (25)

For a breakdown of the services provided by the Coalitions to their members, see Chart E.

#### 12. Training Provided to Members

Twenty-one (21) of the thirty-three Coalitions responding provided at least one or more trainings to their membership during the previous year. Seven Coalitions reported that they did not provide any training and five additional Coalitions gave no answer.

Frequently mentioned types/topics of training included:

- o Conferences (4)
- o Lobbying (3)
- o Empowerment of Battered Women (3)
- o Fundraising (3)
- o Racism and Homophobia (3)
- o Board Training (3)
- o Workshops and Site Visits (3)
- o Legal Issues (3)
- o Management Issues (3)

For a breakdown of the topic areas covered by State Coalition sponsored trainings for member programs, see Chart F.

#### 13. Coalition developed materials

The survey asked State Coalitions if they developed publications, resources or brochures.

Of the thirty-three respondents, eight (8) Coalitions reported that they had developed publications, twelve (12) developed resources, and twenty (20) had developed brochures.

#### 14. Training Provided by Coalitions to Others

Coalitions were asked to identify groups (other than members) that they provided training to on domestic violence. Many of the Coalitions indicated that trainings to other groups was only

provided by their local member programs and not by the Coalition directly. Other Coalitions did provide trainings to a range of professional and community groups. Only those providing training through the Coalition are included in the tally.

Sixteen (16) of the Coalitions provided training to social service providers; fifteen (15) provided training to Legislators (although this was reported as being informal education/advocacy); fourteen (14) Coalitions provided training to community groups and fifteen (15) provided training to Law Enforcement.

For a breakdown of State Coalition training of "others", see Chart G.

#### 15. State Hotlines

Eight (8) of the thirty-three respondents reported having a state hotline for domestic violence (one is a multipurpose hotline): Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Indiana, North Dakota, New York, and Oklahoma. Three of those Coalitions reported that they administer the hotline: New York, Indiana, and Nevada.

All eight hotlines are toll-free and are accessible only to callers from within the state. Two are accessible to the hearing impaired and two are multi-lingual.

#### 16 & 17. Statewide Program Statistics

Twenty (20) of the Coalitions stated that they do keep statewide program statistics, two of which were in process and one collected data on a one-time-only basis. Thirteen Coalitions responded that they did not collect this data; however four of those receive statewide statistics compiled by a state agency. Additionally, many of the Coalitions who answered yes to the question, actually received that information from a state agency.

Twenty-six (26) states outlined their method of collecting statewide statistics. Ten (10) of those received the information from a state agency; twelve (12) collected their own statistics through monthly, or quarterly reports or a newsletter questionnaire; and one (1) conducted a one-time survey with follow-up phone calls. Additionally, in one (1) state, shelters completed their monthly report for the state agency and submitted copies to the Coalition.

#### 18. Confidentiality of program records in statewide statistics

Twenty (20) states responded to the question asking if program records that are included in statewide statistics are kept confidential. Fourteen (14) states responded affirmatively. Three states reported that no program records were included in the statistics.

Seven states responded that the records were covered by existing confidentiality laws with five (5) states responding that they were not. Those states not covered by a confidentiality law stated that the following bodies had access to those records: Courts (3); Prosecutors (2); Attorneys (2); Judges (1); Anyone (1); State government (1).

It should be noted that the question regarding confidentiality of program records in statistics appeared to confuse respondents. Most statistical counts were only numbers and, therefore, concern about confidentiality was simply not an issue.

19.-25. Statistical Information on Domestic Violence

The questions requesting statewide statistics proved troublesome to both the respondents and the survey tabulator. Many states only had statistics for programs that received State funding and many kept records on a fiscal rather than calendar year (statistics, therefore, covered a one year period but encompassed two separate years). Many states did not keep records of the number of women and children who were turned away, or of the number of batterers who received services. Additionally, volunteer hours were either not kept or were recorded as the number of volunteers, and some states kept their figures on residential and nonresidential services separate while others combined those figures.

Therefore, the tabulated numbers that appear under each separate statistical question are at best a reflection of the amount of services provided in the responding states and not an accurate overall count. Furthermore, the figures are reflective of a one year time frame that may actually cover a two year period (i.e., numbers of women served [question #19] may be for 1985 or for FY 85-86). Tabulated answers are for 1985 only, as there was a very limited number of respondents who had statistics for 1984.

19. Number of Battered Women Served by Shelters/Domestic Violence Programs. (1985)  
133,316 Women Served (23 respondents)
20. Number of Battered Women's Children Served by Shelters/Domestic Violence Programs.  
85,404 Children Served (20 respondents)
21. Number of Battered Women Unable to Obtain Immediate Shelter Due to Lack of Space  
52,136 Women Turned Away (9 respondents)  
\*3 additional respondents gave percentages: 14% and 56% of those requesting services; and for every one family sheltered, two families are turned away.
22. Number of Children Unable to Obtain Shelter Due to Lack of Space  
26,216 Children Turned Away (5 respondents)
23. Number of Volunteer Hours Used by Shelter/Domestic Violence Programs  
1,230,545 Volunteer Hours (9 respondents)  
\*2 additional respondents listed the number of volunteers rather than volunteer hours: # of volunteers = 157,445. An additional respondent stated that their volunteer ratio is 15 volunteers to every one paid staff.
24. Number of People who Received Non-Residential Domestic Violence Services  
421,275 People Received Non-Residential Services (17 respondents)
25. Number of Batterers who Received Services  
5,039 Batterers Received Services (8 respondents)

26. Most Significant Accomplishment of the State Coalition

Thirty-two States reported on what they felt were the Coalition's most significant accomplishments during the last two years, with most states highlighting at least two to three accomplishments that most reflected their achievements.

Achieving positive changes in domestic violence legislation was the most frequently reported accomplishment, with fifteen (15) Coalitions noting such changes. Obtaining state funding or funding increases for programs was mentioned by nine (9) of the Coalitions as was the sponsoring of state conferences.

For a breakdown of reported significant accomplishments, see Chart H.

## CHART A

STAFFING OF COALITION

COALITION	# OF FULL TIME STAFF	# OF PART TIME STAFF	RUN BY BOARD/MEMBERS	# OF VOLUNTEERS
ALABAMA		1	X	
ARIZONA			X	
ARKANSAS	1	1		20
GEORGIA	2	1		
HAWAII		1	X	
INDIANA	3	1	X	VARIES
ILLINOIS	14	2		
IOWA			X	
KENTUCKY			X	
LOUISIANA			X	
MAINE			X	
MICHIGAN	2	3		1
MINNESOTA	6	1 CONSULT.		1
MISSISSIPPI			X	
MISSOURI			X	
NEBRASKA		1		
NEVADA		1		1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	2		
NEW JERSEY	4	3		
NEW MEXICO		1		
NEW YORK	4	1		10
NORTH CAROLINA		2		
NORTH DAKOTA	2	1		

continued

STAFFING OF COALITION

COALITION	# OF FULL TIME STAFF	# OF PART TIME STAFF	RUN BY BOARD/MEMBERS	# OF VOLUNTEERS
OKLAHOMA			X	
OREGON	2	2	X	
PENNSYLVANIA	12			
RHODE ISLAND	1		X	
SOUTH DAKOTA		1	X	10
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	2	1		
TENNESSEE	1			
TEXAS	2	3		1
VIRGINIA	1			15
WISCONSIN	3	1		

CHART B

STATE COALITION BUDGETS

0 (3 States)  
350  
1,000  
1,500  
4,150  
5,400  
7,000  
9,000  
19,000  
20,000  
20,809  
23,300  
33,000  
35,000  
45,000  
45,000  
64,775  
85,652  
96,600  
100,000  
120,000  
137,000  
139,168  
150,000  
156,000  
202,268  
205,000  
421,703  
537,320  
5,109,792

\* 32 States reporting

PRIMARY ROLE OF STATE COALITION

Conferences, Technical Assistance or Training	19
Legislative Advocacy and Impact Public Policy	19
Information Sharing/Networking Among Domestic Violence Programs	16
Public Voice on Domestic Violence Issues/ Public Awareness	10
Coordinate State-Wide Activities	7
Promote Quality Services to Battered Women and Advocate for Battered Women	7
To Eliminate Domestic Violence	3
Develop Educational Materials/ Special Projects	2
Address Needs of Membership	1
Advocate with State Agencies	1
Representation at NCADV Meetings	1
Shelter Development and Support	1
Management of Funding Contracts	1
Ensure Accountability of Services to Battered Women	1
Allocate State Funding to Service Programs	1
Set Standards for Service Delivery	1
Data Collection	1

\* 32 respondents

STATE COALITIONS  
COMPOSITION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- o One representative from each member program (6)
  - o All Shelter Directors (1)
  - o Two representatives from each member program (1)
  - o 75%-representatives of domestic violence programs and 25% community representatives (1)
  - o Five officers, Six regional representatives, Five Task Force Chairs and the Coalition Executive Director (1)
  - o 13 member board - primarily shelter directors (1)
  - o Open to one representative from all local organizations working on domestic violence in the state (1)
  - o Shelter directors, Women of Color, Formerly Battered Women, Line Staff, community representatives and lawyers (1)
  - o One elected representative from each of the state's seven regions (1)
  - o Representatives of shelters, safe homes, batterer's programs and child advocates (1)
  - o Representatives of Domestic Violence Programs, plus four at-large members including attorney, Bureau of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Counselor, and past director of the Coalition (1)
  - o 7 members - all full-time staff of member programs (1)
  - o Representatives of urban, rural areas, funding source/state employee, and university (1)
  - o Representative from each shelter or domestic violence program, plus 12 at-large members (1)
  - o One representative from each member program, plus 3 ad-hoc supporting members (1)
  - o 19 member board - 4 officers, 12 regional representatives (3 each from 4 regions), and 3 caucus members (1)
  - o 21 member board representing 11 regions (a specific number of battered women and women of color are required from each region) (1)
  - o Two representatives from each member project (1)
  - o No board (1)
  - o Coalition has no board. The state of officers are representatives of as many geographic regions of the state as possible (1)
  - o Seven-member board (1)
  - o Each member program has one voting delegate to the Board. Each voting member program must participate on at least one of the Coalition's twelve standing committees, although many programs participate in additional committees. (1)
  - o Board is all program people. (1)
  - o One delegate from each member program; one delegate from all standing caucuses; one staff delegate (1)
  - o 40 - total membership; all women; 13% are women of color; 48% are battered/formerly battered women (1)
  - o Board officers - 4 seats (organizational members); 40 pen seats (organizational or active individuals); NCADV representative; task force and committee chairs (1)
  - o No Answer (2)
- \* 32 respondents

COALITION SERVICES TO MEMBERS

Networking	31
Lobbying/Advocacy	31
Technical Assistance	29
Training	25
Conferences	23
Newsletters	23
Resource Development	20
Monitors Shelter Standards	8
Legal Assistance	7
Administers State Funding	7 *
Administers State Hotline	5
** Other	
Public Awareness	2
Coordinates Projects	2
Clearinghouse	1
Information Dissemination	1
Resource Library	1
Prevention	1
Statistical Compilation	1
Coordinates Media/Public Relations Activities	1

\* Rape funds only

\*\* The "Other" category of services provided allowed space for Coalitions to write in additional services not listed on the Questionnaire. Only those Coalitions writing in extra responses are shown in the count, however, other Coalitions do provide those services. For example, many Coalitions do collect statistical data as evidenced by the responses to question #16 of the survey.

STATE COALITION TRAINING  
PROVIDED TO MEMBER PROGRAMS

TYPE/TOPIC OF TRAININGS PROVIDED	
Conferences	4
Legal Issues	4
Lobbying	3
Board Training	3
Empowerment of Battered Women	3
Fundraising	3
Racism and Homophobia	3
Board Training	3
Workshops and Site Visits (topics unspecified)	3
Children's Programs	2
Volunteer Management	2
Recruiting/Retraining Volunteers	2
Confidentiality of Shelter Workers	2
Management Issues	2
Advocacy	1
For New and Emerging Shelters	1
Organizing Formerly Battered Women	1
Training on Victims	1
Working with Batterers	1
Prevention	1
Retreat	1
Marital Rape	1
Volunteer Development	1

continued

STATE COALITION TRAINING  
PROVIDED TO MEMBER PROGRAMS

TYPE/TOPIC OF TRAININGS PROVIDED	
Program Development	1
Grant Writing	1
Consensus Decision Making	1
Privilege Legislation	1
Batterer's Program	1
Board/Staff Relations	1
Coalition Building	1
Training the Police	1
Using Music to Work with Children	1
Major Donor Fundraising	1
Police Response to Domestic Violence	1
Child Custody Issues	1
Institutional Racism	1
Counseling/Case Management	1
Health Issues	1
Women of Color Forums	1
Child Abuse	1
No training provided	7
No answer	4

Number indicates the number of Coalitions that provided training on that topic.

STATE COALITION TRAINING  
TO GROUPS OTHER THAN  
COALITION MEMBERS

Social Service Providers	16
*Legislators	15
Law Enforcement	15
Community Groups	14
Mental Health Workers	12
Child Protection Workers	12
Legal/Court Advocates	11
Hospital Personnel	9
Probation and Parole	9
Judges	9
Victim Assistance Programs	7
Welfare Personnel	6
Shelter Workers	1
Youth and School Workers	1
Teachers	1
Employee Assistance Program Coordinators	1

\* Most Coalitions noted on the survey form that their training of legislators was more akin to informal education or advocacy.

\*\* Numbers represent the number of Coalitions reporting providing training to that group. Based on 25 respondents.

COALITION'S SIGNIFICANT  
ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Positive Changes in Domestic Violence Legislation (15)  
 Obtaining State Funding or Funding Increase for Domestic Violence Programs (9)  
 State Conferences (6)  
 Participation in a Special Project (3)  
 Publication of New Manuals/Resource Materials (3)  
 New Domestic Violence Programs Started (3)  
 Establishment of Coalition Office (2)  
 Maintained Coalition Office (1)  
 Development of Standards (3)  
 Organizing (2)  
 Internal Coalition Development (3)  
 Increased involvement of programs in the Coalition (3)  
 Inclusion of Sexual Assault Services in the Coalition (1)  
 Avoided Cuts in State Funding (1)  
 Established Toll Free Line (1)  
 Increased Diversity of Coalition Board (1)  
 Obtaining Foundation Funding for all Member Programs for Community Education (1)  
 Receipt of a State Government Award (1)  
 Development of a New Training Program (1)  
 Dissemination of Information (1)  
 Prevention/Public Awareness Work (1)  
 Getting funding (1)  
 Training (1)  
 Site visits (1)  
 Technical assistance to new shelters (1)  
 Obtained judicial decision which permits battered women's syndrome testimony (1)  
 Getting state funding for a training project (1)  
 Developed batterers programs (1)  
 Established long range planning committee (1)  
 Progress toward state domestic violence plan (1)

\*Thirty-two respondents; more than one answer per respondent.

SHELTER STANDARDS

1. Are Standards for Shelters mandated within your state?  
 Yes (19)  
 No, but Coalition sponsors voluntary guidelines (6)  
 No (10)

- A. Standards are mandated by:
- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| State Legislation                                    | (2) |
| State Government Regulations                         | (3) |
| State Administrative Agency                          | (9) |
| State Legislation and State<br>Administrative Agency | (2) |
| Regulations and State<br>Administrative Agency       | (1) |
| State Coalition Voluntary Guidelines                 | (5) |

2. Did shelters participate in developing in the standards?  
 Yes (19)  
 No (3)\*\*

A. Type of input - see chart A

3. Brief history of how and why standards for shelters were developed.

Standards came into existence in the twenty-five states for several basic reasons: legislation required standards; funding agencies required standards, and concern among local programs that all battered women and their children receive quality services.

For a brief history of why shelter standards were developed in each of the twenty-five states, see chart B.

4. Areas Covered by Standards
- |  |      |
|--|------|
| Program Services   | (20) |
| Physical Plant/Facilities/<br>Equipment                          | (19) |
| Financial Procedures/Policies                                    | (18) |
| Personnel Policies   | (17) |
| Administrative Procedures/<br>Confidentiality of Shelter Records | (16) |
| Board of Directors<br>Policies                                   | (14) |
| Organizational Structure   | (9)  |
| Staff Certification  | (7)  |
| Volunteer Policies   | (4)  |
| Public Education   | (2)  |
| Evaluation Component   | (2)  |
| Mandatory Reporting of Suspected<br>Abuse & Neglect              | (2)  |
| Staff Training & Qualifications                                  | (2)  |
| Eligibility  | (1)  |
| Cooperation with Law Enforcement/<br>Criminal Justice            | (1)  |

Note: Responses to questions 1a. through 7a. are based on positive responses.

\*\*One coalition is having input during revision.

5. Are Specific Methods Mandated to Ensure Compliance with the Standards?

Yes (17)  
No (5)

A. Who Monitors Compliance with the Standards?

State Agency (12)  
Coalition (7)  
State Agency and Coalition (1)  
No monitoring (2)

B. Who Selects Monitors?

State Agency (11)  
Coalition (5)  
State Agency and Coalition (2)

C. Who Trains the Monitors?

State Agency (8)  
Coalition (2)  
On-the-Job Training (4)  
No Specific Training (2)  
On-the-Job Training with Coalition Direction (2)

D. How Often Does Monitoring Take Place

Annually (7)  
Quarterly (2)  
New programs at 6 months, then at 2 years (1)  
For Re-licensure (1)  
Every 2 years (3)  
Every 3 to 4 years (1)  
Monthly (1)  
Annually and upon receipt of a complaint (1)  
Still Defining (1)

C. Is Monitoring Done On-Site?

Yes (18)  
No (7)

How Often?

Annually (8)  
Quarterly (2)  
Undecided (1)  
Every 2 years (4)  
No Answer (3)

6. Are Sanctions used when Programs are Found not to be in Compliance with Standards?

- Yes (16)
- No (5)
- Don't Know (1)
- If there were severe problems, the options except fines would be explored. (1)
- No Answer (2)

A. What Types of Sanctions are Imposed?\*

- Loss of State Funding (13)
- Loss of Membership in State Coalition (1)
- Enforced Closing of Shelter (3)
- Disclosure of Information to Other Shelters (1)
- Service Improvement Plan is Negotiated (1)
- Revocation of Permit (1)
- No Answer (1)

7. Do the Standards Include a Process for Bringing a Shelter into Compliance When Standards Have Not Been Met?

- Yes (14)
- No (6)
- No Answer (2)

A. Describe the Process

Most of the states reported that every effort would be made to assist the shelter to comply with the standards prior to the imposition of a sanction for failure to comply. Even one state that reported no process for bringing a shelter into compliance noted that they were sure that the state would provide help.

Reported Methods of Compliance were:

- o Technical Assistance from the monitoring agency. (1)
- o State agency provides a written report with suggestions for improvement and then the shelter contacts the Coalition for technical assistance. (3)
- o Prospective suspension allows 30 days for improvement. (1)
- o Coalition provides technical assistance. (3)
- o A 90 day period is allowed for the program to come into compliance. (1)
- o Coalition may withhold reimbursement for services until compliance issues are resolved. (1)
- o Provisional licenses may be issued. (1)
- o Technical assistance, including subsidized on site management assistance. (1)
- o Technical assistance is offered and a timetable for compliance is established. (3)
- o No Answer. (1)

\* Some states had more than one type of sanction that could be imposed.

8. If Shelter Standards are not Mandated By the State or the State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, does the Coalition Offer a Set of Standards for Shelters to Use as Voluntary Guidelines?\*
- |                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Yes                       | (7) |
| No                        | (8) |
| Currently being developed | (4) |

\*See chart C for Breakdown by State.

CHART A

COALITION INPUT  
DEVELOPMENT OF SHELTER STANDARDS

STATE	METHOD OF SHELTER INPUT
Alabama	Coalition sent representatives to sit on the Standards Committee established by the State Agency.
Illinois	The Coalition Board of Directors developed the standards through its Committee system.
Indiana	Coalition developed the standards and the State Agency requires compliance in order to receive funding.
Kentucky	Limited input.
Maine	Developed by consensus of member programs.
Michigan	A draft of the standards was given to all shelters and the coalition for comments.
Minnesota	Participation on Department of Corrections Advisory Council on Battered Women, and standards were mailed to program for comments prior to implementation.
Missouri	A 40-member committee developed a draft of standards which were later reviewed and revised by each region of the Coalition.
Nevada	Standards were discussed for 2-3 network meetings (6-9 months) and revisions were made based on program suggestions.
New Jersey	3 shelter representatives on Governor's Advisory Council formed to draft standards.
New Hampshire	Standards developed by a committee of coalition members and staff.
North Dakota	Shelter programs, through the State Coalition, drafted standards and submitted them to the State Agency. Standards went through a public hearing process and were adopted basically as submitted.

CHART A (continued)

STATE	METHOD OF SHELTER INPUT
Oklahoma	Informally consulted with the State Agency in the initial formulation of standards. However, standards have evolved and changed without consultation with shelters or the State Coalition.
Oregon	Legislation required standards - specifics were developed by an Advisory Committee of the State Agency. Coalition members nominated persons for the Advisory Committee.
Pennsylvania	The PCADV Standards Committee is responsible for developing/revising the standards. The Committee is composed of 10-12 PCADV members representing urban and rural areas; shelters, counseling centers and safehome programs.
Southern California	Shelters participated in the development of standards over a 5 year period.
Tennessee	A committee consisting of Dept. of Human Services staff from the State office and representatives of the coalition worked together to draft standards. The State had control but the Coalition had substantial input.
Texas	Coalition requested revision of first set of standards developed by the State Agency. An Advisory Committee was formed and new standards are being reviewed by all shelters.
Utah	Shelter representatives on Domestic Violence Advisory Council review standards during annual revisions; draft revisions also are sent to service providers for review.
Wisconsin	A program self-evaluation tool for programs serving battered women.
Wyoming	Domestic Violence programs formed a committee and developed the standards.

CHART B

HISTORY HOW/WHY  
STANDARDS WERE DEVELOPED

STATE	HISTORY OF HOW/WHY STANDARDS WERE DEVELOPED
Alabama	State legislature wrote standards requirement into the law because shelters did not have an agency to monitor them. Alabama citizens, a State Agency and shelter representatives wrote the standards.
Arizona	The standards are the Department of Health Services' licensing standards for behavioral health programs.
Illinois	The Coalition developed its Evaluation Plan in February of 1983, after considerable discussion. The plan had gone through various committees and come to the full board for final decision. The standards are (except for the 24 hour hotline and 24 hour shelter coverage requirements) not specific. For example, standards require that programs have safety and security policies, but do not specify what they must be.
Indiana	Standards were requested by shelter directors to assure quality services to battered women. The Coalition board, staff and membership created, adopted and implemented the standards. State Agency requires compliance with standards to receive funding.
Kentucky	To ensure quality service delivery.
Louisiana	Minimum standards for family violence program were mandated by state legislature in 1981 (now expired). Marriage license surcharge law of 1986 also required standards which are being revised with Coalition and shelter input.
Maine	The State is in the process of developing standards for quality assurance and to avoid state from imposing their own standards on shelters.
Michigan	Broad standards were developed to ensure that shelter boards are responsible and that there are checks and balances in the system. Recommended by the Coalition to ensure that all battered women receive quality services.

CHART B (continued)

STATE	HISTORY OF HOW/WHY STANDARDS WERE DEVELOPED
Minnesota	In 1980, the State Agency was developing program evaluation materials and felt that shelter standards were necessary.
Missouri	With the possibility of federal funds forthcoming, the State wanted to their own standards rather than having someone else do it for them.
Nevada	Network recognized need for standards, particularly as the number and size of programs increased. Standards have never been officially implemented. Formal implementation is planned by Dec. 31, 1986.
New Hampshire	Coalition members recognized a need to look at programs. Since the Coalition is mandated by state funding legislation to educate services, this peer evaluation process seemed the most effective way.
New Jersey	Standards were drafted in response to a legislative mandate for Governors Advisory Committee on Domestic Violence to form for this purpose. Also shelter guidelines are included in the Coalition by-laws.
New York	Standards were developed for safety and protection of battered women and their children. Standards are for the licensing of shelters.
North Dakota	Programs recognized that rules for shelters would be drafted by someone and decided to initiate the process in order to have major input into what standards would be. Local programs also were concerned about consistency and quality of services statewide.
Oklahoma	Standards were being developed by the State Agency to regulate and control funded programs. The Coalition informally consulted with the State Agency to develop minimum standards. Many of the standards are those which are applied to all programs funded by the State Agency.

STATE	METHOD OF SHELTER INPUT
Oregon	Marriage license tax legislation required standards but did not specify them. State Agency administers the marriage license tax money using an Advisory Committee, consisting of a majority of people from Coalition member programs. The Committee developed minimal standards.
Pennsylvania	Standards were derived from Coalition membership standards which were developed prior to Title XX/Act 157 funding. They are updated regularly to reflect changes in State regulations and/or concerns of Coalition membership.
Southern California	Shelters felt pressure for more external monitoring of shelters and had a need for a self assessment system unique to shelters which ensured safe and quality programs.
Tennessee	The Department of Human Services requires contract agencies to be monitored by standards developed by the State.
Texas	Standards and licensing are required for programs through which services are purchased or provided to clients eligible for State services or in which children receive care.
Wisconsin	Developed in 1985 to identify programs strengths and weaknesses in order to improve services.
Wyoming	State office on Domestic Violence was created (lobbied for by the domestic violence programs) to administer state funds. Standards were developed after that because of mandate by the legislature.

## CHART C

STANDARDS FOR SHELTERS

STATE	STATE MANDATED STANDARDS	COALITION DEVELOPED STANDARDS
Alabama	Yes	
Arizona	Yes	
Arkansas	No	No
California	No	Yes - Southern California Coalition-Peer Review
Delaware	No	No
Georgia	Yes, But Not In Effect Yet	
Hawaii	No	No
Indiana	Yes	Yes
Illinois	No	Yes
Iowa	No	No
Kentucky	Yes	
Louisiana	Yes	
Maine	No	Coalition Developing Standards
Michigan	Yes	
Minnesota	Yes	
Mississippi	No	Yes - Coalition and State Agency Developing Standards to be Implemented in 1987.
Missouri	No	Yes - Coalition Has Voluntary Standards
Nebraska	No	No
Nevada	No	Yes

## CHART C (continued)

STATE	STATE MANDATED STANDARDS	COALITION DEVELOPED STANDARDS
New Hampshire	No	Yes - Coalition has developed a quality assurance model.
New Jersey	Yes	
New Mexico	No (But State Has Very <u>Limited</u> Standards For Those Receiving State Funds).	
New York	Yes	
North Carolina	No	N.C. Coalition is Exploring Developing Standards
North Dakota	Yes	
Oklahoma	Yes	
Oregon	Yes	
Pennsylvania	Yes	
Rhode Island	No	No
South Dakota	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	
Texas	Yes	
Utah	Yes	
Virginia	No	No
Wisconsin	No	Yes - Program Self Evaluation Tool
Wyoming	Yes	No

### State Coalition Developed Standards

The following state coalitions have developed their own standards/guidelines for domestic violence programs: New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Southern California Coalition on Battered Women, Maine Coalition for Family Crisis Services, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence, Indiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence.\* These standards/guidelines were developed to provide domestic violence programs with a mechanism to identify strengths and weakness in order to improve services. Drawing on the expertise of battered women's advocates in their states, these coalitions have developed self-assessment tools unique to the needs of battered women's shelters.

o New Hampshire - The Coalition is mandated by state funding legislation to evaluate domestic violence services. A comprehensive Quality Assurance model, coordinated by the Coalition, is used to conduct peer evaluations of domestic violence programs. The Quality Assurance model was developed by a committee of coalition members and staff.

The New Hampshire model evaluates the following areas: Board of Directors, Personnel Policies, Financial and Administrative Procedures/Policies, Organizational Structure, Physical Plant/Facilities/Equipment, Confidentiality of Shelter Records, Program Services, Research, Community Relations and Education, and Client Rights. Each program is evaluated biannually by members of the Quality Assurance Committee and Coalition members. This evaluation process offers assistance (through training, consultants, etc.) as a means of bringing programs into compliance with the guidelines.

o Missouri - The Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence began developing standards when it became apparent that federal funds might be available to states for domestic violence work. The Coalition wanted to set standards based on the expertise of battered women's advocates in Missouri.

A draft of suggested standards developed by the membership was reviewed and revised by each region of the State Coalition. The final product is a set of voluntary guidelines which the Missouri Coalition encourages all programs to meet.

The guidelines cover the following areas: Board of Directors, Personnel Policies, Staff Certification, Financial and Administrative Procedures/Policies, Organizational Structure, Physical Plant/Facilities/Equipment, Confidentiality of Shelter Records, and Program Services.

o Maine - The Maine Coalition for Family Crisis Services and its member shelters have been in an ongoing process of developing quality assurance guidelines for domestic violence shelters. At present these guidelines cover only program services.

\*Information in Indiana's standards appears in the state mandated section of the report.

o Southern California - As pressure for external monitoring of shelter programs grew, the Southern California Coalition on Battered Women (SC/CBW) saw a need to institute a self-assessment system that was unique to the shelters. Drawing on the experience and knowledge of member shelters and the Board, the SC/CBW developed the Peer Review and Assistance Project.

The Peer Review standards used by the Project cover the following areas: Board of Directors, Personnel Policies, Financial and Administrative Procedures/Policies, Organizational Structure, Physical Plant/Facilities/Equipment, Confidentiality of Shelter Records, and Program Services. Programs are reviewed once every two years with one follow-up visit after each on-site review. The Project offers the following technical assistance to evaluated programs: Program models, SC/CBW resources, training, referrals, and subsidized on-site management assistance.

o Nevada - The Nevada Network recognized the need for standards as the number and size of domestic violence programs increased. Voluntary guidelines were developed by the Network with formal implementation scheduled for December 31, 1986. These guidelines will cover the following areas: Personnel Policies, Financial Procedures/Policies, Administrative Procedures/Policies, Organizational Structure, Confidentiality of Shelter Records, and Program Services.

o Illinois - The Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence (ICADV) developed its Evaluation Plan of domestic violence programs in February of 1983. The Plan went through various committees and came to the full Board of Directors of ICADV for final approval. The standards continued in the Evaluation Plan are, except for the 24 hour hotline and 24 hour shelter coverage requirements, not specific. For example, the Evaluation Plan requires that programs have safety and security policies, but it does not specify what they must be.

The Illinois plan evaluates the following areas: Personnel Policies, Financial Procedures/Policies, Administrative Procedures/Policies, Organizational Structure, Physical Plant/Facilities/Equipment, Program Services, and Confidentiality of Shelter Records. Existing programs are reviewed once every two years and new programs are reviewed after six months. The Contracts Review Committee, which is responsible for monitoring, may recommend a site review at any time. In addition, the Service Standards' and Training Committee monitors 24 hour hotline accessibility by conducting phone checks on new programs within three months, and on existing programs every year. For programs not in compliance with the Evaluation Plan standards, a 30-day notice to improve is sent to the program noting problems and recommendations. This is followed up with a site visit by a staff person and a member of contracts review after 30 days expire. Another finding of noncompliance may result in defunding the program.

o Wisconsin - The Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence finalized a Program Self-Evaluation Tool for programs serving battered women in April 1985. The Self-Evaluation tool was developed by Coalition members to provide programs working with battered women a mechanism to identify program strengths and weaknesses in order to improve services.

The tool is divided into three parts for program evaluation - services to battered women, program management, and systems change. Each of the three parts go into further detail within the specific content areas (e.g. program management has sections on organizational design, board of directors, staffing, etc.). Also included are instructions on how to most effectively use the tool, with a design that allows for flexible use by different programs. The tool also includes Assessment Summary Forms and Program Improvement Planning worksheets.

I. Funding

1. Does Your State Appropriate Funds (other than federal pass-through funds such as VOCA monies) Specifically for Services to Battered Women and Their Children?

Yes (31)  
No (5)

2.&3. What is the Total Dollar Amount of State Funding of Services to Battered Women and their Children?

See Chart A for breakdown by state.

4. What State Budget Category Does the Funding for Domestic Violence Programs Fall Under?

Human Service (6)  
Social Services (5)  
Health and Human Services (3)  
Human Resources (2)  
Criminal Justice (1)  
Judiciary, Health, Social Services and Housing (1)  
Corrections (1)  
Health (1)  
Private Nonprofit Organizations (1)  
Office of Women's Services (1)  
Community Programs (1)  
Public Welfare-Domestic Violence Services (1)  
Mental Health (1)  
Department of Administration (1)  
Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Board (1)  
Public Aid (1)  
No Answer (1)

5. Does Your State Domestic Violence Coalition Administer Funds Appropriated for Domestic Violence Services?

Yes (4) (Maine, New Hampshire, Illinois, Pennsylvania)  
No (25)  
Partial (1) (Alabama)

6. If No, What State Agency Administers the Funds Appropriated for Domestic Violence Services?

Department of Social Services (5)  
Department of Human Services (5)  
Department of Health (2)  
Office of Prosecution Services (1-Partial)  
Office of Criminal Justice Planning (1)  
Department of Mental Health (1)  
Domestic Violence Prevention & Treatment Board (1)  
Advisory Board appointed by the Governor (1)

Council on Status of Women	(1)
Department of Corrections/ Battered Women's Program	(1)
Office of Women's Services	(1)
Department of Aging and Community Services	(1)
Department of Mental Health and Hygiene	(1)
Department of Human Resources	(1)
Department of Health and Social Services	(1)
Office on Family Violence and Sexual Assault	(1)

7. What is the Formula for Distributing State Funding to Domestic Violence Programs?

- o No fixed formula. (3)
- o Equal division. (2)
- o No formula - competitive grant process. (3)
- o Special education trust fund is split equally between Coalition member shelters, marriage license fees go to the shelters based upon the percentage of total state population residing in the judicial circuit where the district attorney has endorsed a specific shelter to serve his/her circuit. (1)
- o Equal division of funds to all programs meeting the criteria established in the funding legislation. (1)
- o Based on shelter operating budget and client numbers. (1)
- o Request for proposal process with 60% going to urban - 40% to rural. (1)
- o 60% match (hard or soft). (1)
- o \$20,000 base amount to each shelter if that does not exceed 75% of shelter's operating budget. The rest of dollars are distributed based on population, clients served, and geographic region. (1)
- o Based on bed capacity. (1)
- o Informal process based on population size of area served, plus present program needs and development. (1)
- o Ongoing commitment to maintain shelter funding at a stable level, then other dollars allocated. (1)

- o State Coalition recommends funding to state agency; also population and standards are used as criteria. (1)
- o State divided into seven geographic regions. Funding is allocated using a formula based on population (weighted 2X) and geographic region (weighted 1X) (1)
- o \$5,000 base amount to counties with less than 100,000 people; \$25,000 base amount if population more than 100,000; additional revenues allocated on per capita basis for all counties with population over 14,000. (1)
- o At discretion of state administrative agency with input from the monitors. (1)
- o Each agency uses its own funding process which takes into account need indicators, previous contracts, and whether there are existing services. (1)
- o Formula developed each according to identified needs in conjunction with Coalition. (1)
- o No set formula - Outside Allocations panel bases allocations on combination of criteria, including population, services provided in past, size of program. (1)
- o There is currently no formula. Shelters are continuing to develop in the state and there has been an effort to distribute funds as equally as possible across the state -- to continue to do this without cutting programs requires a significant increase in funds. (1)
- o Initial grant is competitive followed by a noncompetitive process among those receiving state dollars. Minimum grant awards have been set at \$40,000 for shelters, \$20,000 for non-shelters. (1)
- o \$12,500 base/program plus 50 cents/capita for crisis services; \$12,000 for prevention/education; shelter funds dependent on size of shelter. (1)
- o Don't know (1)
- o No answer (1)

8. Have You Been Notified of a Reduction in State Funding for Domestic Violence Programs?  
 Yes (9)  
 No (19)  
 Not sure (1)
9. What Source of State Funding will be Reduced, and By How Much?  
 o Special Education Trust Fund - .035% less.  
 o State Program funding reduced 3% across the board. (2)  
 o State revenue sharing cut by 3%.  
 o Marriage license fee dollars reduced due to overfunding in the past.  
 o 3% cut in all social service programs; in 87-88 there will be a 6% reduction.  
 o State funding of administering office budget was reduced for FY86-87 by 18%.  
 o Expended "cushion" from first year of marriage license fee, so reduced by 15%.  
 o All state agencies and those receiving state funds were cut approximately 7%.
10. Does Your State Income Tax Return Contain a Voluntary Check Off that Allows Taxpayers to Donate Money to a Domestic Violence Fund?  
 Yes (2) (child abuse prevention only)  
 No (34)  
 For a breakdown by state, see Chart B.
11. Does Your State Have a Marriage License Surcharge that is Used to Fund Domestic Violence Programs?  
 Yes (19)  
 No (17)\*  
 For a breakdown by state, see Chart B.
12. Does Your State Have a Divorce Surcharge that is Used to Fund Domestic Violence Programs?  
 Yes (5) No answer (1)  
 No (30)\*  
 For a breakdown by state, see Chart B.

\*Illinois had these surcharges but they were found to be unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court.

13. Does Your State Impose Fines on People Convicted of Domestic Violence Related Crimes that are Used to Fund Domestic Violence Programs?  
 Yes (3)  
 No (33)  
 For a breakdown by state, see Chart B.
14. Does Your State Have Other Surcharges that are Used to Fund Domestic Violence Programs?  
 Yes (0)  
 No (27)
15. What is the Amount of Each Surcharge?  
 A. Marriage License Fee: The range was from \$5 to \$25 (with no one answer).  
 B. Divorce Surcharge: The range was from \$10 to \$24.25.  
 C. Fines: One respondent = \$5.00
16. What is the Average Revenue Generated Annually By Each?  
 See Chart C for breakdown of amount of fee/surcharge/fine and amount generated annually by each.
17. Does Your State Pass through Federal Dollars for Domestic Violence Services?  
 Yes (34)  
 No (0)  
 Still pending (1)  
 No answer (1)
18. Does Your State Allocate Title XX for Services for Battered Women and their Children?  
 Yes (15)  
 No (17)  
 Don't know (1)  
 No answer (3)
19. Does Your State Allocate Victims of Crime Assistance Funds for Domestic Violence Services?  
 Yes (33)  
 No (1)  
 Still Pending (1)  
 No Answer (1)
20. Has Your State Applied for Family Violence Prevention and Services Act Funding?  
 Yes (34)  
 No (1)  
 No answer (1)

A. Which State Agency Will Administer the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act Funds?

Department of Human Services	(6)
Department of Social Services	(5)
Department of Human Resources	(3)
Department of Health	(3)
Department of Health and Social Services	(1)
Council/Commission on the Status of Women	(2)
Department of Corrections - Battered Women's Program	(1)
Law Enforcement Planning	(1)
Department of Community and Economic Development	(1)
Office of Criminal Justice Planning	(1)
Coalition (pass through from State H.H.S.)	(1)
Department of Mental Health	(1)
Department of Aging and Community Services	(1)
Office of Women's Services	(1)
Domestic Violence Prevention & Treatment Board	(1)
Department of Public Aid	(1)
Office of Policy and Planning	(1)
Department of Public Welfare	(1)
Division of Youth and Family Services	(1)
Department of Social Services, according to Coalition plan	(1)
Unknown	(1)

For a breakdown of federal pass through dollars used by states for domestic violence services (Victims of Crime Assistance, Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and Title XX) and the percentages (when available) of those dollars going to shelter/safe homes, see Chart D.

21. What Programs/Services are Eligible for State Domestic Violence Funding?

Shelters	(30)
Safe Home Networks	(24)
Local Crisis Line	(19)
Batterers Programs	(12)
Other:	
Special Projects	(5)
State Coalition	(3)
Prevention	(2)
State Hotline	(1)
Any Private Agency Serving Victims of Domestic Violence	(1)

\* Batterer's program only funded minimally (1); if connected to a shelter (1); if operated by a spouse abuse program (1).

\*\* Local Crisis lines only funded if connected to a shelter (1); if a part of full services (1).

22. If Your State Legislation Mandates Funding for Shelters, Is There a Maximum Number of Shelters Eligible for Funding?

Yes	(4)
No	(23)
No Answer	(1)
Not Applicable	(2)*
No Answer	(6)

\*Two special allocations only this year for troubled shelters and shelter start up, so not applicable (1); and state funding for start up services only (1)

A. If yes, how many?

13	(1)
----	-----

B. If yes, what is the maximum amount per shelter, per year?

\$25,000	(1)
\$50,000	(1)
\$100,000	(1)
Based on population	(1)

C. Is there a Maximum Percentage of a Shelter Budget that May be Covered by State Funds?

Yes	(10)
No	(11)
No answer	(9)

D. Percentage of A Shelter Budget That May Be Covered By State Funds:

40% - Shelter must have 60% soft or hard match	(1)
50%	(1)
60%	(1)
50% (total dollars - \$75,000)	(1)
70%	(1)
75%	(1)
75% - declines over 6 years to 50%	(1)
85%	(1)
87%	(1)
90%	(1)

## CHART A

STATE FUNDING LEVEL  
FOR SERVICES TO BATTERED WOMEN  
AND THEIR CHILDREN

STATE	FUNDING LEVEL
Alabama	\$371,127 (1986-1987); \$125,000 in 1985-86 from Special Education Trust Fund
Arizona	Not Available
Arkansas	0
California	\$1,600,000 (1986)
Delaware	0
Georgia	0
Hawaii	\$477,000 (FY 85-86)
Illinois	\$1,686,700 (FY 86-87)
Indiana	\$492,000 (FY 86-87)
Iowa	\$215,000 (FY 86-87)
Kentucky	\$1,800,000 (FY 86-87)
Louisiana	\$790,000 (FY 86-87)
Maine	\$733,000 (FY 86-87)
Michigan	\$2,500,000 (FY 86-87)
Minnesota	\$5,145,900 (FY 86-87)
Mississippi	\$300,000 (FY 86-87)
Missouri	Not available
Nebraska	\$450,000 (FY 86-87)
Nevada	\$550,000 (marriage license fee only)
New Hampshire	\$132,000 (through June 30, 1987)
New Jersey	Not available
New Mexico	\$135,000 (July 1, 1986 - June 30, 1987)
New York	\$1,000,000 annually, for start up services

STATE FUNDING LEVEL  
FOR SERVICES TO BATTERED WOMEN  
AND THEIR CHILDREN

STATE	FUNDING LEVEL
North Carolina	\$450,000 (FY 86-87)
North Dakota	Not available
Oklahoma	\$1,087,818 (FY 1986)
Oregon	\$375,000 (same each year since FY 1982)
Pennsylvania	\$4,385,000 (FY 86-87)
Rhode Island	\$150,000 (FY 85-86)
South Dakota	Not available
Tennessee	\$300,000 (FY 86-87)
Texas	\$2,556,700 (September 1985 to August 1986)
Utah	\$395,000 (FY 85-86) includes FFP
Virginia	\$400,000 (1986 - 1987)
Wisconsin	\$1,800,000 (1986 - 1987)
Wyoming	\$1,097,000 (1987)

CHART B

SURCHARGES, FINES, TAX RETURN  
CHECK OFFS TO FUNDS  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMS

STATE	TAX RETURN CHECK OFF FOR D.V.	MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE	DIVORCE SURCHARGE	CRIMINAL FINES
Alabama	Child Abuse Prevention Only	Yes	No	No
Arizona	No	Yes	Yes	No
Arkansas	No	No	No	No
California	No	Yes	No	No
Delaware	No	No	No	No
Georgia	No	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	No	No	No
Illinois	No	No	No	No
Indiana	No	Yes	Yes	Yes-All Crimes
Iowa	No	No	Yes	No
Kentucky	No	Yes	No	No
Louisiana	No	Yes	No	No
Maine	No	No	No	No
Michigan	Child abuse only	Yes	No	No
Minnesota	No	Yes	Yes	No
Mississippi	No	Yes	No	No
Missouri	No	*	*	No
Nebraska	No	No	No	No
Nevada	No	Yes	No	No
New Hampshire	No	Yes	No	No
New Jersey	No	Yes	No	No
New Mexico	No	No	No	No
New York	No	No	No	No

SURCHARGES, FINES, TAX RETURN  
CHECK OFFS TO FUNDS  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMS

STATE	TAX RETURN CHECK OFF FOR D.V.	MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE	DIVORCE SURCHARGE	CRIMINAL FINES
North Carolina	No	No	No	No
North Dakota	No	Yes	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No	No	No
Oregon	No	Yes	No	No
Pennsylvania	No	No	No	Yes
Rhode Island	No	No	No	No
South Dakota	No	Yes	No	No
Tennessee	No	Yes	No	No
Texas	No	Children's Trust Fund	No	No
Utah	No	No	No	No
Virginia	No	Yes**	No answr.	No
Wisconsin	No	No	No	Yes
Wyoming	No	No	No	No

\* Being voted on a county-by-county basis; not centralized.

\*\* Goes into general appropriations which is more than fee raises.

CHART C

AMOUNT OF SURCHARGE//FINES AND  
AMOUNT GENERATED ANNUALLY  
BY SURCHARGE/FINES

STATE	MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE	DIVORCE SURCHARGE	CRIMINAL FINES
Alabama	\$5 (\$250,000)		
Arizona	\$8 (\$570,000)*	\$16	
California	\$19 (\$4,000,000)		
Indiana	\$10 (unknown)	\$10 (unknown)	\$5 (unknown)
Iowa		\$15 (\$100,000)	
Kentucky	\$10 (\$350,000)		
Louisiana	\$12.50 (\$500,000)		
Michigan	\$15 Child Abuse (unknown)		
Minnesota	\$6.75 (\$224,000)	\$24.25 (\$403,000)	
Mississippi	\$14 (\$300,000)		
Missouri	\$5 (unknown)	\$10 (unknown)	
Nevada	\$5 (\$550,000)		
New Jersey	\$5 (\$325,000)		
New Hampshire	\$13 (\$150,000)		
North Dakota	\$19 (\$114,000)		
Oregon	\$20 (\$420,000)		
Pennsylvania			\$15 \$1,500,000
South Dakota	\$15 (\$123,000)		
Tennessee	\$10 (\$600,000)		

AMOUNT OF SURCHARGE//FINES AND  
AMOUNT GENERATED ANNUALLY  
BY SURCHARGE/FINES

STATE	MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE	DIVORCE SURCHARGE	CRIMINAL FINES
Texas	\$25 Childrens Trust (\$1,500,000)		
Wisconsin			10% of fine (\$4,000)

\* For combined marriage license fees & divorce surcharge

## CHART D

FEDERAL PASS THROUGH  
DOLLARS FOR DOMESTIC  
VIOLENCE SERVICES

STATE	VOCA	ANTICIPATED FVPS	TITLE XX	% OF FED DV \$ TO SHELTER
Alabama	\$700,000 (1986)	\$111,000	No	VOCA - 64%
Arizona	\$320,000 (1987)	\$85,000	\$486,000 (1986)	VOCA - 57.3% TIT. XX-100%
Arkansas	\$146,000 (1986)	\$65,000	Yes-amount not avail.	
California	Yes-amount not available	Yes-amount not avail.	No	
Delaware	No Answer	No Answer	No Answer	
Georgia	\$963,000 (1986)	\$160,000	No	VOCA - 33%
Hawaii	\$286,000 (1986)	Unknown	\$418,000 (1986)	VOCA - 12% TIT. XX-100%
Indiana	Yes-amount not available	\$154,000	\$720,000	
Iowa	\$538,000 (1986)	\$82,000	No	VOCA - 50%
Illinois	\$366,200 (FY 87)	\$307,870	Yes-amount not avail.	VOCA - 100% TIT. XX-100%
Kentucky	Yes-amount not available	\$100,000	No Answer	
Louisiana	\$300,300 (1986)	\$125,000	\$84,000	TIT. XX-100%
Maine	\$274,000 (86-87)	Yes-amount not avail.	No	VOCA - 30%
Michigan	Yes-amount not available	\$256,000	No	
Minnesota	\$125,000 (1986)	\$117,000	Yes-amount not avail.	VOCA - 100%
Mississippi	Yes-amount not available	\$72,000	\$200,000 (86) 0 (87)	

FEDERAL PASS THROUGH  
DOLLARS FOR DOMESTIC  
VIOLENCE SERVICES

STATE	VOCA	ANTICIPATED FVPS	TITLE XX	% OF FED DV \$ TO SHELTER
Missouri	Yes-amount not available	\$93,000	No	
Nebraska	No	\$50,000	No	
Nevada	Still Pending	\$50,000	No	
New Hampshire	\$250,000	\$50,000	No	VOCA - 37% FVPS - 76%
New Jersey	Yes-amount not available	\$209,000	Yes-amount not avail.	
New Mexico	Yes-not notified of amount yet	\$50,000	\$697,000 for 86&87	
New York*	\$2,800,000 (1986)	\$470,000	No Answer	
North Carolina	Yes-amount not available	\$160,000	Don't Know	
North Dakota	Yes-amount not available	\$50,000	No	
Oklahoma	Yes-amount not available	\$93,000	No	
Oregon	\$125,000 (FY 87)	\$75,000	No	FVPS - 100% VOCA - 25%
Pennsylvania	\$1,756,672 (86)	\$249,000	\$1,656,000 (85-86)	VOCA - 37% TIT. XX-100%
Rhode Island	\$39,000 (1986)	\$50,000		VOCA - 82%
South Dakota	\$206,000 (1986)	\$50,000	No	
Utah	\$85,000 (FY 86-87)	\$50,000	Yes-amount not avail.	
Tennessee	Yes-amount not available	\$132,000	No	
Texas	Yes-amount not available	\$436,000	Yes-amount not avail.	

FEDERAL PASS THROUGH  
DOLLARS FOR DOMESTIC  
VIOLENCE SERVICES

STATE	VOCA	ANTICIPATED FVPS	TITLE XX	% OF FED DV \$ TO SHELTER
Virginia	\$183,000 (1986)	\$158,000	Yes-amount not avail.	VOCA - 100%
Wisconsin	\$915,000 (1986)	\$130,000	No	VOCA - 9%
Wyoming	\$177,000 (1987)	\$50,000	No	VOCA - 100%

\* New York also utilizes Emergency Assistance to Families (50% Federal, 25% State, 25% County) per diem reimbursement for income eligible battered women and children staying at shelters.

## LEGISLATION

### II. Law Enforcement Training

1. Does Your State Have Legislation Mandating Training of Law Enforcement Personnel on Domestic Violence?

Eleven (11) states reported having legislation that mandates training of law enforcement personnel on domestic violence, and twenty-five (25) reported not having legislation in this areas. The eleven states with legislation in this area are: California, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New York, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin.

See Chart A.

2. Who is Required to Receive the Training?

Recruits	(11)
Line Officers	(7)
Sheriffs	(5)
Police Chiefs	(4)
Other:	
Administrative Officers	(1)
Highway Patrol	(1)

3. Does the Legislation Specify Where the Training is to Take Place?

Yes	(3)
No	(7)
Don't know	(1)

A. Where?

Sheriffs' Department	(0)
Police Academy	(2)
Police Station	(0)
Roll Call	(0)
Other:	
Central State Location	(1)

4. Is the Training Required on a One-Time Basis or as an Ongoing In-Service Training?

One-time basis	(8)
Ongoing	(1)
Not specified	(1)
No answer	(1)

A. If Ongoing, How Often is the Training Required?

40 hours per year	(1)
-------------------	-----

5. Does the Legislation Specify Who Must Be Involved as Trainers of Law Enforcement on Domestic Violence?

Yes	(3)
No	(8)

- A. Who is Specified?
- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| Battered Women's Advocate                       | (1) |
| Law Enforcement Personnel                       | (1) |
| Mental Health Workers                           | (0) |
| Social Service Workers                          | (0) |
| Hospital Personnel                              | (0) |
| Batterer's Program Workers                      | (0) |
| Victims Advocates                               | (0) |
| Institute on Family Enrichment<br>(by contract) | (1) |

6. Does the Legislation Mandate the Areas of Training to Be Covered?

- |     |     |                                  |
|-----|-----|----------------------------------|
| Yes | (3) | (Illinois, Maine and California) |
| No  | (5) |                                  |

- A. What areas are mandated?
- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| General Domestic Violence   | (3) |
| Legal Rights of Battered Women  | (3) |
| Statutory Requirements  | (2) |
| Police Procedures   | (2) |
| Enforcement of Domestic Violence<br>Laws  | (2) |
| Victim Assistance Programs  | (2) |
| Documentation/Record Keeping  | (2) |
| Development of Guidelines for<br>Law Enforcement Response to<br>Domestic Violence | (2) |
| Availability of Civil Remedies  | (2) |
| Legal Issues  | (1) |
| Use of Community Resources  | (1) |

## CHART A

STATES WITH LEGISLATION  
MANDATING LAW ENFORCEMENT  
TRAINING ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

State	Legislation Mandating Law Enforcement Training
Alabama	No
Arizona	No
Arkansas	No
California	Yes
Delaware	No
Georgia	No
Hawaii	Yes
Indiana	No
Illinois	Yes
Iowa	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	No
Maine	Yes
Michigan	No
Minnesota	Yes
Mississippi	Yes
Missouri	No
Nebraska	Yes
Nevada	No
New Hampshire	No
New Jersey	No

STATES WITH LEGISLATION  
MANDATING LAW ENFORCEMENT  
TRAINING ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

State	Legislation Mandating Law Enforcement Training
New Mexico	No
New York	Yes
North Carolina	No
North Dakota *	No
Oklahoma	No
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Dakota	No
Tennessee **	No
Texas	Yes
Utah	Yes
Virginia	No
Wisconsin	Yes
Wyoming	No

\* Training on domestic violence has been included in a 4 hour segment in the core curriculum for all new law enforcement officers.

\*\* But State law requires that the P.O.S.T. Commission establish police curriculum - they do require domestic violence training.

LEGISLATION

III Data Collection

1. By Law Which of the Following Agencies in Your State are Required to Collect Data on all Domestic Violence Cases?

Police	(13)
Shelters	(6)
State Administering Agency	(6)
Courts	(3)
Social Services	(1)
Hospitals	(0)
Other:	
Department of Public Safety/Law Enforcement	(1)
Office on Family Violence and Sexual Assault	(1)
Program Receiving Funding from Department of Social Services	(1)
None	(17)

2. Are the Police Required by Law to Use Special Record Keeping Forms for Domestic Violence Cases?

Yes	(2) (Maine and Iowa)
No	(32)
No answer	(2)

3. Which of the Following Agencies are Required to Prepare Statistical or Other Reports on Domestic Violence Cases?

State Administering Agency	(19)
Shelters	(10) *
Police	(1)
Courts	(1)
Hospitals	(0)
Social Services	(0)
Other:	
State Coalition	(1)
Crisis Programs	(1)
Department of Motor Vehicle and Public Safety	(1)
Department of Public Safety	(1)
Any Domestic Violence Program Receiving State Money	(1)
None	(11)

\* One by funder, not by law

A. Who are the Reports Distributed To?

Legislators	(8)
State Administrative Agency	(3)
Public	(3)
Police	(2)
Media	(2)
Battered Women Programs	(1)
Funders	(1)
State Coalition	(1)
Shelters	(2)
Governor's Staff	(1)
Local Social Service Offices	(1)
All State Funded Programs	(1)
Anyone on request	(1)

B. How Often are the Reports Distributed?

Annually	(7)
Monthly	(4)
Every two years	(3)
Quarterly	(2)
Variable	(1)

4. Who is Required by Law to Report Suspected Cases of Woman Abuse?

Police	(4)
Citizens	(2)
Social Workers	(1)
Hospital Workers	(1)
None	(28) (unless the woman is elderly or handicapped) (2)

5. What Interactions Between Domestic Violence Workers and Battered Women are Considered Confidential by Law?

Counseling session	(7)
Telephone conversation	(4)
Other:	
Written records	(3)
Protected only if worker is licensed	(1)
None	(10)
No answer marked	(5)
Don't know	(1)

\*\*\*Numbers in parenthesis represents the number of Coalitions responding.