

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
Department of Economic Security and Administrative Office of the Courts
JLBC/OSPB Joint SPAR Report

OVERVIEW - This Strategic Program Area Review (SPAR) combines reviews of the Department of Economic Security's (DES) Domestic Violence program and the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Domestic Violence subprogram. Because these programs are the only two Domestic Violence programs specifically defined in the Master List of State Government Programs, this SPAR only formally reviews these programs. Since six other state agencies provide domestic violence services as well, this SPAR also addresses the statewide system of domestic violence programs. Although those agencies, such as the Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention (ODVP) and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC), did not need to submit a formal self-assessment, some submitted additional comments on the SPAR. This joint report is an update with some information repeated from the last Program Authorization Review (PAR) on these two programs.

The Domestic Violence program within DES's Community Services Administration contracts with private nonprofit shelters to provide a continuum of direct services to victims of domestic violence, their families, and perpetrators. DES also supports a statewide network of service providers and offers technical assistance to contract providers and other members of the domestic violence network. The Domestic Violence program's mission is to protect the victims of domestic violence and their children.

The mission of AOC's Domestic Violence subprogram is to improve the administration of justice in Arizona communities by assessing state and local court proceedings and services as related to the issues of domestic violence and to make recommendations for judicial system changes that promote safety for victims and those who interact with them in the courts.

DES's Self-Assessment met the submittal requirements and contained the required information. DES staff were helpful in providing additional information to the staffs at JLBC and OSPB. AOC's Self-Assessment complied with the SPAR guidelines and was generally well-written.

After reviewing the agency Self-Assessments, JLBC Staff and OSPB reached the following conclusions:

JLBC Staff Findings and Recommendations

- **Despite some instances of increased collaboration, lack of coordination between state agencies still inhibits the efficient allocation of resources among domestic violence shelters.**
- **OSPB recommends that funding agencies participate in a new collaborative initiative to divide their resources amongst the shelters so that each shelter receives the appropriate level of funding. JLBC Staff believes that coordination of these resources cannot eliminate the inherent inefficiency of six different agencies providing direct services to domestic violence victims.**
- ✓ **Recommendation:** JLBC Staff recommends modifying the program by consolidating resources related to direct services to domestic violence victims in DES and consolidating of some law enforcement/prosecution monies in ACJC as follows:

- ODVP would transfer direct administration of direct service and law enforcement grants to DES and ACJC, respectively. ODVP would remain responsible only for policy coordination, prevention, and training.
 - The Legislature should appropriate the portion of the federal domestic violence funding that allows states discretion in allocating these monies to direct services or law enforcement.
 - The Department of Public Safety (DPS) would transfer the direct services component of the federal Victims of Crime Act program (approximately 40% of the grant) to DES.
 - ACJC would transfer the direct services component of its Victim Assistance appropriation (approximately 35% of the grant) to DES.
 - The Department of Health Services (DHS) would transfer the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Program grant to DES.
- **Although the total amount of funding for domestic violence has increased since the 1998 PAR, there have been few, if any, increases in shelters for categories such as beds available, counseling, and education and outreach.**
- ✓ **Recommendation:** JLBC Staff recommends that any administrative savings generated from consolidating resources to domestic violence victims be redirected at increasing those services.

OSPB Findings and Recommendations

- **Since the original PAR in 1998, progress has been made; however, enhanced collaboration between agencies providing domestic violence services would increase efficiency.**
- ✓ **Recommendation:** OSPB recommends that funding agencies participate in a new collaborative initiative to divide the resources that are available to them amongst shelters so that each shelter receives the appropriate amount of funding.

Joint Findings and Recommendations

- **The lack of outcome measures makes it difficult to evaluate overall effectiveness of the system.**
- ✓ **Recommendation:** OSPB and JLBC Staff recommend that DES report to the Governor and the Legislature by June 30, 2000 on the baseline cost-effectiveness information being collected and on other recommended outcome measures that should be developed in consultation with other state agencies and interested stakeholders.

Program Description - Because of the statewide nature of the domestic violence system, we will discuss the DES and AOC programs first and then the programs of the other six agencies.

DES's Domestic Violence program protects victims of domestic violence and their children by providing shelter and supportive services through private nonprofit facilities and safe houses.

Supportive services include crisis intervention, transitional shelter, case management, intervention, guidance counseling, and coordination of a service provider network. The program also concentrates its efforts on program development and interagency collaboration with other state agencies associated with domestic violence prevention. These services are described in greater detail below:

- **Direct Services** - Community-based organizations provide a continuum of direct services for victims of domestic violence through contracts with DES. These services include crisis intervention (shelter and counseling for 30-90 days after victims flee an abusive situation), transitional shelter (requiring more than 90 days of services), case management, and counseling.
- **Program Development** - Program development activities include data collection, analysis, and statewide distribution of information regarding shelter programs throughout the state; resource development for domestic violence programs through grant writing; and analysis of domestic violence legislation.
- **Interagency Collaboration and Coordination** - DES is one of eight members of the START task force, an interagency domestic violence task force created to address the issue of coordination between agencies and make recommendations for improvement of service.

The AOC established the Domestic Violence subprogram to assist in the education of judges and court personnel on domestic violence issues. The subprogram was established to identify inconsistent practices and adopt standardized policies to be followed by courts statewide in handling domestic violence cases. The subprogram also monitors Arizona judicial proceedings and provides training to judges and court personnel in the appropriate handling of domestic violence cases. It monitors the implementation of victims' rights statutes regarding notification, probation modifications, minimizing contact between victims and perpetrators, and courtroom safety procedures.

In addition to DES and AOC, six other agencies provide domestic violence services. The DES and AOC programs were formally the subject of the SPAR since they are the only ones identified as discrete programs in the Master List of State Government Programs. The other agencies are:

- **Office of Domestic Violence Prevention (ODVP)**: Provides a broad array of services including direct services to victims, law enforcement and prosecution grants, and prevention and training services. Located within the Governor's Office, ODVP uses federal STOP grant monies and General Fund monies passed through from DES.
- **Department of Health Services (DHS)**: Provides some direct services to victims, as well as prevention and training services. The department uses primarily Federal Funds.
- **Department of Commerce**: Provides monies for capital expenditures to shelters. The department uses primarily federal Home Investment Partnership Program and Housing Trust Fund monies.
- **Department of Public Safety (DPS)**: Provides direct (supportive) services to victims and uses federal Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) monies.
- **Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC)**: Provides funds for direct services to victims, as well as victim compensation monies. The ACJC uses monies from parole fees and Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund (CJEF) monies.
- **Attorney General**: Provides funds for victims rights services. They primarily use CJEF and General Fund monies.

Table 1: FY 1999 Personnel and Facility Utilization

Agency	Personnel	Facilities	Equipment
Department of Economic Security	5.2 FTE	for those employees	for those employees
Administrative Office of the Courts	1.0 FTE	for one employee	for one employee

Program Funding - In FY 1998, DES administered about 40% of the \$10 million designated specifically for domestic violence services (see Table 3). DES' funds come from a variety of federal and state dollars. The following is a brief description of the sources of funding:

- **General Fund** - Appropriations from the General Fund include dollars from the “Domestic Violence Prevention” and the “Coordinated Homeless Program” Special Line Items in the DES budget. The Domestic Violence Prevention line item funds domestic violence services and related prevention activities. The Coordinated Homeless Program line item pays for the general operating cost of the shelter facilities.
- **Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant** - Provides temporary assistance to a household who has an emergency need which cannot be met by its own resources. Contractors utilize these funds to pay service costs for qualifying clients.
- **Title XX Social Services Block Grant** - This grant comes from a Federal Fund source that supports a broad variety of social services. Domestic violence programs are among the eligible uses of these monies. A state match is not required to leverage these funds.
- **Emergency Shelter Grant** - Federal program that provides funds for the renovation and rehabilitation of shelter facilities and/or general operating expenses.
- **Domestic Violence Shelter Fund** - DES administers a portion of state marriage and divorce fees collected under A.R.S. § 36-3002. These funds are placed in the appropriated Domestic Violence Shelter Fund and distributed to domestic violence shelters in accordance with statute.

Table 2: Program Expenditures

Expenditures	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
Department of Economic Security			
State Funds	\$1,108,800	\$1,111,100	\$2,257,900
Federal Funds	1,805,900	2,111,500	2,624,200
Other Funds	<u>1,096,300</u>	<u>1,294,900</u>	<u>1,509,100</u>
Total Expenditures	\$4,011,000	\$4,517,500	\$6,391,200 ^{1/}
Administrative Office of the Courts			
State Funds	\$45,000	\$64,100	\$51,200
Federal Funds	0	0	250,000
Other Funds	<u>25,000</u>	<u>54,400</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Expenditures	\$70,000	\$118,500	\$301,200

^{1/} DES's FY 2000 amount includes an increase of \$1,100,000 from the General Fund. This amount is also included in the FY 2001 appropriation.

Table 3: Domestic Violence Funding by State Agency

Agency (Program)	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998
General Crime Victim Funding Used for Domestic Violence Victims			
Attorney General (Office of Victim Services) ^{1/}	\$157,300	\$193,000	\$198,700
ACJC (Victim Assistance) ^{2/}	208,500	203,100	204,800
ACJC (Compensation) ^{3/}	91,000	114,000	100,100
DPS (Victims of Crime Act)	<u>524,400</u>	<u>967,400</u>	<u>1,129,700</u>
Subtotal (estimated)	981,200	1,477,500	1,633,300
Domestic Violence Victims Only			
Commerce	1,014,700	1,190,800	1,182,800
Economic Security	3,599,300	3,449,900	3,885,800
Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention	564,400	1,463,200	2,444,100
Health Services	178,400	553,400	520,600
Supreme Court ^{4/}	<u>52,500</u>	<u>108,500</u>	<u>70,000</u>
Subtotal	<u>5,409,300</u>	<u>6,765,800</u>	<u>8,103,300</u>
TOTAL	\$6,390,500	\$8,243,300	\$9,736,600

1/ Consists of an estimated 13% of Victims' Rights Fund expenditures, excluding monies spent by the juvenile courts, Department of Juvenile Corrections, and Department of Corrections.

2/ Includes monies directly awarded to domestic violence programs, as well as an estimated 13% of monies awarded to multiple services programs that provide services to all types of crime victims.

3/ FY 1996 data are from Federal Fiscal Year 1996; other data are from the State Fiscal Year.

4/ Does not include monies passed through from other state government entities.

◆ ***How does the program mission fit within the agency's overall mission and the program's enabling authority? Is it still necessary?***

The DES Domestic Violence program's mission is to protect the victims of domestic violence and their children and to improve the comprehensive domestic violence program in Arizona. In the 1998 PAR, we found that the DES Domestic Violence program's mission - to work with people they serve to achieve their self-sufficiency - fits well within DES's mission because the services provided in the shelters helped clients achieve self-sufficient outcomes. The program mission also fits well within the program's enabling authority. A.R.S. § 41-1954A.1(b) allows DES to provide individual and family services under Title XX of the Social Security Act. Since the Domestic Violence program's mission is unchanged, the mission still fits within the agency's overall mission and the program's enabling authority.

The AOC Domestic Violence subprogram was created by Administrative Order (No. 94-14) of the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court. In the 1998 PAR, we found that the subprogram's mission - to improve the administration of justice in Arizona communities as related to the issues of domestic violence - fits well within the Judicial System's mission to provide judicial and administrative functions mandated by Arizona law and the Constitution. The SPAR team still believes that the subprogram's mission fits within the Judicial System's overall mission.

The problem of domestic violence has received increased attention in recent years. The number of persons being arrested for domestic violence offenses is higher than just a few years ago. Domestic violence shelters report that they are unable to provide shelter beds for every person that requests one. These trends have led DES to provide funding, both state-appropriated and non-appropriated, to shelters to help with the costs of providing services to domestic violence victims. The AOC instituted its domestic violence subprogram to improve processing of domestic violence cases. Both the DES and AOC programs are necessary to help address the problem of domestic violence.

- ◆ *Does the program meet its mission and goals efficiently and effectively, including comparisons with other jurisdictions? Do the program's performance measures and performance targets adequately capture these results?*

Because the issues of efficiency and effectiveness in domestic violence programs are complex, we have organized the discussion in this section into two parts, each addressing one of those issues.

Efficiency

The five agencies that provide funding directly to domestic violence shelters for ongoing shelter costs (DES, DHS, DPS, ODVP, ACJC) process their own applications for funding without formally consulting with the other state agencies that provide these funds. Under these circumstances, shelters may not receive the appropriate amount of funding. Between FY 1993 and FY 1998, shelters' expenditures of DES funds increased by 86%, from \$2.1 million to \$3.9 million. Shelters used some of these increases to provide additional services, but they may also have used these monies to offset decreases in their other sources of funding. The grants made by the five agencies listed above are not formally coordinated with the mostly capital grants for shelters made by the Department of Commerce.

Agencies and organizations that distribute domestic violence funds have reported some increases in collaboration as a result of the original 1998 PAR. ODVP indicated that DPS and ACJC combined their annual performance reports; DHS and DES collaborated to develop an Request for Proposal (RFP) for shelter services and to improve the annual shelter data report; DES assisted ODVP with the planning and development of a joint cross training project on the impact of the family violence option; and DHS reported that the Governor's Staff Technical Assistance Response Team (START) meetings provided opportunities to share programmatic information. There is also some informal collaboration between individual START members.

JLBC Staff Perspective

Despite some instances of increased collaboration, lack of coordination between state agencies still inhibits the efficient allocation of resources among domestic violence shelters. JLBC Staff recommends modifying the program by consolidating resources related to direct services to domestic violence victims in DES and consolidating of some law enforcement/prosecution monies in ACJC. Specific recommended consolidations are discussed throughout the text below.

There are numerous examples of overlap between agencies providing domestic violence services. The Governor's Office, through the ODVP, provided nearly \$1 million in grants for direct services to domestic violence victims and nearly \$400,000 in law enforcement and prosecution grants in FY 1998. The ODVP also spent more than \$1 million of prevention, training, and administration in FY 1998.

These monies include the federal Services, Training, Officers, Prosecution (STOP) grant and General Fund monies passed through DES. The federal government requires 25% of the federal STOP grant to be used for victim services, 50% for law enforcement and prosecution, and 25% at the discretion of the state. DES passes through approximately \$500,000 in General Fund monies to ODVP, which then uses approximately half of the monies to provide direct services to domestic violence victims. Most of the General Fund monies spent on direct services by ODVP are used for supportive services, which DES does not spend much money on. However, these counseling, case management, and legal advocacy services are an integral part of the shelter activities which DES funds. ODVP also uses federal monies for these purposes, although some of these services may be provided in settings other than shelters.

The mission of ACJC is to sustain and enhance the cohesiveness, effectiveness, and coordination of the criminal justice system in Arizona. In FY 1998, however, ACJC did not distribute funds for law enforcement and prosecutorial services solely targeted at domestic violence victims, but did distribute such monies to county attorneys for general crime victims. Further, ACJC spent more than \$150,000 on direct services to domestic violence victims, or 35% of its overall Victim Assistance program. In FY 1998, ODVP spent nearly \$400,000 of federal STOP monies on law enforcement and prosecutorial services. JLBC Staff believes that the distribution of federal STOP monies for law enforcement and prosecutorial services is more appropriately done by ACJC than by the ODVP.

JLBC Staff recommends the ODVP provide services related to policy coordination and not direct services or law enforcement and prosecution services. To do this, JLBC Staff recommends the following modifications:

- ODVP would transfer direct administration of direct service and law enforcement grants to DES and ACJC, respectively. ODVP would remain responsible only for policy coordination, prevention, and training.
- The Legislature should appropriate the portion of the federal domestic violence funding that allows states discretion in allocating these monies to direct services or law enforcement.

A similar overlap occurs between DPS and DES. DPS receives the federal VOCA grant, which is intended to serve all crime victims. DPS spent more than \$1.1 million of federal VOCA grant funds on direct services to domestic violence victims in FY 1998, or 41% of its total VOCA grant. Approximately 40% of the VOCA grant from FY 1997 to FY 1999 was distributed to agencies providing direct domestic violence services. As with the ODVP, the services provided with the grant monies are provided in the same shelters that DES funds in addition to other settings. JLBC Staff recommends that DPS would transfer the direct services component of the federal VOCA program (approximately 40% of the grant) to DES.

ACJC's Victim Assistance program is similar to the VOCA grant in DPS. Monies are used by public and private non-profit agencies that deliver services to crime victims. ACJC spent more than \$150,000 on direct services to domestic violence victims, or 35% of its overall Victim Assistance program, in FY 1998. Most of these monies were spent on programs specifically targeted at domestic violence victims. JLBC Staff recommends that ACJC would transfer the direct services component of its Victim Assistance appropriation (approximately 35% of the grant) to DES. This recommendation does not address grants made to programs serving all types of crime victims, including domestic violence victims. We also cannot determine how much of this money is being spent on legal advocacy. We believe legal advocacy may be better classified as "law enforcement/prosecution" monies rather than "supportive

services” as they are currently classified. Legal advocacy monies may be better administered by ACJC; without additional information on amounts and sources of revenue, JLBC Staff does not make any recommendation on this issue.

DHS and DES provide similar emergency shelter services to victims. Starting in FY 1998, DHS used its monies from the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Program primarily to fund emergency shelter-type services. Approximately \$540,000 of the nearly \$1 million spent by DHS from this grant in FFY 1999 was for emergency shelters provided in rural areas of the state; the remaining funds are used for assorted training and shelter development. Since the emergency shelter services provided by this grant are similar to those already provided by DES, JLBC Staff recommends that DHS would transfer the federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Program grant to DES. DES may wish to reserve a portion of the grant for training purposes.

Other programs within the Department of Commerce, ACJC, the Attorney General, and AOC are either properly located, too difficult to move to a different agency, or have little information. For example, the Department of Commerce has in recent years provided capital and some start-up operational funding to a few shelters serving domestic violence victims. JLBC Staff believes that moving these funds to DES could provide greater control over the development of domestic violence shelters, but the relatively small percentage of grants that go to domestic violence shelters would make such a recommendation impractical.

Therefore, JLBC Staff recommends consolidation of resources related to direct services to domestic violence victims in the DES and consolidation of some law enforcement/prosecution monies in ACJC. **OSPB recommends that funding agencies participate in a new collaborative initiative to divide their resources amongst the shelters so that each shelter receives the appropriate level of funding. JLBC Staff believes that coordination of these resources cannot eliminate the inherent inefficiency of six different agencies providing direct services to domestic violence victims.**

Twenty-six providers of domestic violence services receive funding from two or more state agencies. JLBC Staff believes that this results in inefficiency not only on the agency side, but also on the provider side. If shelters have to fill out four RFPs, track four different funding sources, and provide four different agencies with four different reports, that will be more of a burden on shelters than if they only had to prepare information on one grant for one agency. Provider agencies indicated to us that multiple RFPs with multiple reporting requirements are burdensome. The START Task Force did not propose joint application for service provision in its January 1, 1999 report to the Legislature. We understand that there may be some interest now in developing a single application for funding. JLBC Staff believes, however, that simplifying this process for shelters and other providers will not occur without consolidation of resources within DES and ACJC.

JLBC Staff also acknowledges that consolidating every domestic violence dollar is impractical. For example, we would consolidate the direct service funds within DES and the prosecution/enforcement monies in ACJC. In addition, there are services within the Department of Commerce and AOC that are best left in their current department. Nonetheless, consolidation of the majority of the direct services and enforcement/prosecution within just two agencies would significantly streamline the current fragmented delivery system. For example, JLBC Staff believes that the fact that DPS is now funding a position in ODVP to better coordinate policy with victims’ services demonstrates the current

inefficiency of the delivery system. More dollars could be devoted to direct services and less to administrative coordinators if programs were consolidated in one agency.

JLBC Staff emphasizes that its recommendations are not intended to redirect monies for direct victim services into shelters and away from non-shelter-based providers. Shelters are an important part of the continuum of services provided to domestic violence victims, but should not be the only part. JLBC Staff does not believe that consolidating these monies should eliminate other non-shelter options for delivering services to victims.

JLBC Staff would also note that there has been little statewide policy determination regarding domestic violence services. A total of 25% of the federal STOP grant can be spent at the state's discretion. Because the Legislature is being asked to fund a broad range of domestic violence services, this portion of the STOP grant could be used to help address the issues the Legislature feels are most important to the state. At this time there is no such input sought by the ODVP.

OSPB Perspective

Since the original PAR in 1998, progress has been made; however, enhanced collaboration between agencies providing domestic violence services would increase efficiency. All agencies involved are committed to continuing these efforts. Clearly, better and more complete coordination among the state and local entities involved with domestic violence is needed.

OSPB recommends that funding agencies participate in a new collaborative initiative to divide the resources that are available to them amongst shelters so that each shelter receives the appropriate amount of funding. The eight agencies and organizations that distribute these funds should collaborate to ensure that the total amount of funding that each shelter receives is appropriate. DPS indicated that they are entering into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Governor's Community Policy Office to participate in a new collaborative initiative that will result in more streamlined and comprehensive services. All of the relevant agencies and organizations should participate, and they should divide the resources that are available to them amongst the shelters so that each shelter receives the appropriate amount of funding. As this collaborative effort continues in future years, shelters will not have to use increases in state funds to offset decreases in their other funding sources. These agencies may also be able to consolidate their procurement efforts with just one RFP. Shelters would only have to submit one application for funding, and this would also reduce the administrative burden that multiple reporting requirements create for the providers.

Effectiveness

Although JLBC Staff and OSPB have individually focused on issues of efficiency in the domestic violence system, it is also important to look at issues of effectiveness, which may be affected by efficiency. In the 1998 PAR, OSPB and JLBC Staff found that clients were satisfied with the services provided in domestic violence shelters. There were 143 respondents in the 23 shelters that administered the survey, and a score of three or higher indicated some satisfaction with the service. On average, 96% of the clients were satisfied with the services provided. We recognize that client satisfaction in shelters has been high. That statistic, however, deals with individuals' experiences within shelters and does not address the overall systemic effectiveness of the DES program.

To evaluate DES's domestic violence subprogram, OSPB and JLBC Staff collected data from all of the shelters that received DES funding between FY 1993 and FY 1999. Most of the data were taken from the Uniform Family Violence Program Report, a quarterly report that the shelters complete for DES. The services identified were provided with all of the shelters' funds, including DES funds, monies from other state agencies, and private sources of funding. With this information, OSPB and JLBC Staff observed the following trends:

- The number of shelter beds funded by DES increased from 336 in FY 1993 to 434 in FY 1999.
- The shelters are able to provide beds to only a small portion of victims who request shelter services.
- The amount of counseling provided to victims has remained fairly constant since FY 1993, though with significant variability from one quarter to the next.
- There was a significant increase in staff time spent on education, awareness, and outreach activities from FY 1993 through FY 1996; but there has been a significant decrease since FY 1996.
- The percentage of victims who had contacted the police when they were admitted to the shelters remained relatively constant at nearly 40% since FY 1993.
- There has been no increase since FY 1993 in the percentage of victims who moved away from the abusive situation when they left the shelters.

The above data can only provide a snapshot of services provided within shelters. Other data concerning different populations may reflect different trends that do not match those reported over the past several years by shelters. The data does indicate, however, that even though the total amount of funding in the domestic violence system has increased, the amount of services provided through shelters has not significantly increased. The above data also highlight the difficulty in selecting proper outcome measures. For example, if the percentage of victims moving away from the abusive situation decreases, it may not mean that the domestic violence provider is not doing a good job; the measure cannot take into account changes in the abusive situation. This second issue is addressed in the "Joint Perspective" discussion later in this section

OSPB Perspective

Additionally, OSPB believes there are other notable accomplishments since the 1998 PAR.

- Many of the additional beds were added to shelters as a result of the One Bed, One Life campaign, a public/private partnership in which all the state agencies participated. This innovative effort produced outstanding results that did not rely on public funds. The net result was that \$2 million was raised, with every dollar being matched by a private partner
- As a result of coordination in rural areas, each county now has an active Community Coordinated Response Team made up of providers, police, and court officials to enhance collaboration and develop a coordinated response to domestic violence. Each team has developed a strategic plan with action plans and measurable outcomes.
- With their VOCA grant, DPS is now funding a position in the Governor's Office of Domestic Violence Prevention to better coordinate policy with victims' services.
- The ODVP, the Mesa Police Department, and the Arizona Police Office Standards and Training office presented a three-day conference showcasing best practices in domestic violence for providers, court officials, and police officers throughout Arizona.
- The latest RFP issued for innovative responses to domestic violence included an additional \$50,000 from the Governor's Division for Children to address the needs of children who witness domestic

violence and \$150,000 from the Governor's Division of Drug Policy to address the substance abuse issues that are usually present with domestic violence.

- The ODVP applied for and received funds from the federal government to allow a victim advocate for each county. This individual is working with the various units of local government and the providers to ensure the coordinated response to domestic violence, and provide advocacy for victims before they need shelter care
- The Full Faith and Credit Team is made up of court, police, and Governor's Office officials to make sure orders of protection are honored across political boundaries.

JLBC Staff Perspective

Although the total amount of funding for domestic violence has increased since the 1998 PAR, there have been few, if any, increases in shelters for categories such as beds available, counseling, and education and outreach. While the activities discussed by OSPB in the above section may help address the problem of domestic violence, they have not had any impact on these performance measures. We believe that more progress on these measures can be made through the consolidation of resources previously discussed. In addition, JLBC Staff recommends that any administrative savings generated from consolidating resources to domestic violence victims be redirected at increasing those services.

Joint Perspective

The lack of outcome measures makes it difficult to evaluate overall effectiveness of the system.

DES is, however, collecting cost-effectiveness data. DES's performance measures include the appropriate output statistics. In the 1998 PAR, we reported that DES was gathering the data they needed to provide meaningful outcome measures. It does not appear that those measures have yet been developed. The domestic violence coordinator at DES is, however, discussing issues of outcome measures on the national level. Comparisons of output and cost will enable us to track the program's cost-effectiveness over time. DES will establish a baseline of the cost-effectiveness of shelter activities by June 30, 2000, and they plan to maintain that cost-effectiveness data through the end of FY 2002. Although outcome measures, such as the percentage of clients who remain in a non-abusive situation, could be useful to policymakers and stakeholders, they could potentially be very difficult to collect.

OSPB and JLBC Staff recommend that DES report to the Governor and the Legislature by June 30, 2000 on the baseline cost-effectiveness information being collected and on other recommended outcome measures that should be developed in consultation with other state agencies and interested stakeholders.

Compared to the DES Domestic Violence program, the AOC Domestic Violence subprogram is relatively small. The AOC subprogram plays a small but important part in the state's overall domestic violence system. In the 1998 PAR, we found that the AOC Domestic Violence subprogram did not provide domestic violence services duplicated by any other state agency. The subprogram targeted its mission and goals to educating, training, and assisting court personnel in processing domestic violence cases. The subprogram did not provide direct service to victims of domestic violence nor did it provide funding to shelters. We find that this is still the case.

The AOC Domestic Violence subprogram has taken steps to eliminate inconsistent handling of domestic violence cases and educate court personnel on domestic violence issues, while maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction. To assist in producing consistent treatment of domestic violence cases, the

Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court created the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts. This committee receives administrative and technical support from the Domestic Violence subprogram personnel, is charged with improving the administration of justice in Arizona related to domestic violence, and making recommendations to the courts and the Legislature for system changes to promote victim safety and the safety of providers who interact with domestic violence litigants.

◆ *Are there other cost-effective alternative methods of accomplishing the program's mission?*

The beds in domestic violence shelters are rarely vacant. If a client leaves the shelter, the shelter will usually be able to fill the empty bed by the end of the day. One shelter indicated that on occasion they may reserve a bed for a victim who does not arrive at the shelter. Another shelter said that once in a while there may be some empty beds due to an illness. If the shelters are at capacity, it is difficult for DES to increase the program's cost-effectiveness without reducing reimbursement rates to shelters.

JLBC Staff Perspective

One possible way of increasing cost-effectiveness for the system as a whole, however, is to consolidate the function of contracting with shelters within one agency. As noted above, JLBC Staff recommends that any administrative savings generated from consolidating resources to domestic violence victims be redirected at increasing those services.

◆ *Should the program area be consolidated into one budget unit if the area is administered by more than one budget unit?*

Eight state agencies and organizations administered almost \$10 million of domestic violence funding in FY 1998.

OSPB Perspective

OSPB believes that while there appears to be little coordination between these agencies, it would not be practical to consolidate all of the state's resources for domestic violence into one agency. By increasing coordination between agencies, the state could distribute these resources more efficiently without incurring the additional costs involved in reallocating domestic violence funds to one of the eight agencies. Please see the above discussion for further details.

JLBC Staff Perspective

JLBC Staff believes that the coordination of these resources cannot eliminate the inherent inefficiency of six different agencies providing direct services to domestic violence victims. As a result, JLBC Staff recommends the consolidation of resources related to direct services to domestic violence victims in DES. To eliminate inefficiencies in contracting for domestic violence-related law enforcement and prosecution monies, JLBC Staff recommends the consolidation of some of those monies in the ACJC. Please see the above discussion for further details.