

**REPORT ON  
COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES  
USED BY CVSD GRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK  
July 2012-June 2013**



**January 2014**

**Prepared by:**

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

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**10,532 victims/survivors completed client surveys in FY 2012-13. Ninety-four percent (94%) indicate that the services provided helped them make informed choices.**

Since January 2006, the Crime Victims' Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) has required that the approximately 120 victim services providers receiving CVSD-administered grant funds collect and report quarterly with regard to three outcome measures. All grantees use a single outcome measure, as well as two additional measures that are specific to the services they provide.

This annual report analyzes the client data collected from July 2012 through June 2013. It also compares the data with that collected for prior years. The data presented in this report provides both qualitative and quantitative evidence of the positive impact of the federal and state funding CVSD administers.

Recognizing that grantees work with victims/survivors of crime who may be in crisis or experiencing trauma, they are given wide latitude in assessing which clients may be able to provide feedback at a given point in time. CVSD stresses that clients in crisis are not expected to participate in the satisfaction survey. Grantees are required to collect feedback from at least 10% of their targeted group.

### **Rate of Return**

During this reporting year, grantees distributed **31,157** survey forms with a return of **10,532**. This **33.8% return rate** exceeds the 10% return rate requirement. The return rate increased for each provider group to: 67% for Domestic and Sexual Violence services providers (DV/SA); 34% for Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAIC); 16% for District Attorney-based Victim Assistance Programs (DA/VAP); and 54% for Other providers.

---

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

---

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

- Across all years of outcome data reporting and across all grantee provider groups, victim/survivor responses are overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-four percent (94%) of all victims/survivors responding in the current reporting year agreed that ***"The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation."***
- Ninety-five percent (95%) of CAIC clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that ***"I have received information that has helped me understand how I can best keep my child safe in the future."***
- Ninety-three percent (93%) of DV/SA clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that ***"After working with this agency, I have some new ideas on how to stay safe."***
- Ninety-three percent (93%) of DA/VAP clients responding strongly agreed or agreed that ***"As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime."***

**REPORT ON COMMON OUTCOME MEASURES  
USED BY CVSD GRANTEES TO COLLECT CLIENT FEEDBACK  
July 2012 - June 2013**

**I. BACKGROUND**

The Crime Victims Services Division of the Oregon Department of Justice (CVSD) administers the individual Crime Victims’ Compensation Program and also administers seven state and federal grant programs to more than 120 victim service provider agencies serving victims/survivors in every Oregon County.

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

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

---

*“I feel now that I am on the road to living, not just surviving.”*

---

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

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

One common outcome measure was identified that could be used by all CVSD grantees, coupled with additional measures for each of the three major grantee groups (DV/SAs, DA/VAPs and CAICs). In 2011, CVSD agreed that eleven CAICs would participate in a two-year pilot of outcome measures for the National Alliance for Children. Three research questions were substituted for the CVSD common outcome measures. This report includes the client response to both sets of questions.

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

**Table 2: Common Outcomes Tracked by CVSD Grantees**

<b>Grantees Required to Use Outcome</b>	<b>Outcome Measure (Question)</b>
All CVSD Grantees	The services provided by this program helped me <b>make informed choices</b> about my situation.
DV/SAs	After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about <b>how to stay safe</b> .
	After working with this agency, I know more about <b>resources</b> that may be available, including how to access them.
DA/VAPs	As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand <b>my rights as a victim of crime</b> .
	The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand <b>the criminal justice system process</b> as it relates to my case.
Other Grantees	Law enforcement and other grantees track the same outcomes as the DA/VAPs.
	(this chart continues on the next page)

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

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

Child Abuse Intervention Centers (CAICs)	The staff of this agency treated my family with <b>sensitivity and respect</b> .
	The staff of this agency were supportive in helping me to <b>access treatment services</b> for my child and family.
National Child Alliance (NCA) Research Question <sup>4</sup>	I feel I have received information that has helped me understand how I can best <b>keep my child safe</b> in the future.
NCA Research Question	Overall, the staff and volunteers at the center have been <b>friendly and pleasant</b> .
NCA Research Question	I have been <b>referred to services</b> and/or programs that have helped me deal with my child's situation.

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

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

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

---

## II. OUTCOME RESULTS for July 2012 – June 2013

*“In an effort to increase the return of evaluations, we utilized volunteers. Over-the- phone evaluations did seem to make a difference and put us in more contact with the victims.”*

---

### A. Rate of Return

Grantees are required to collect feedback from a minimum of 10% of the clients surveyed. If a grantee's return rate is lower than 10%, they are required to explain what they have done/will do to increase the return rate. Surveys were distributed and collected through a range of methods, and the method used often had an impact on the rate of return achieved. In general, on-site client feedback has a higher rate of return than mailed surveys, but is not always possible or appropriate to collect. The overall return rate increased to 33.8%. Along with English, client feedback forms were completed in Arabic, Burmese, Chinese, French, Khmer, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.

---

<sup>4</sup> Eleven CAICs are participating in a two-year National Child Alliance (NCA) project and are substituting three similar questions to the common outcome measures.

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

---

*“We know we can never repay everyone for all you have done for our family. Therefore, as a family we will “pay it forward” by continuing to support the fight against domestic violence in memory of ...”*

---

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

Overall, the return rate increased this year by nearly 4%, the highest return to date, with increases noted in each program category: DV/SA, DA/VAP, CAIC, and Other. CAIC programs continued to increase their distribution, collection, and return rate. While DV/SA’s distributed fewer forms, they collected a much larger portion. DA/VAP distribution continued to drop, but the return increased. For the second year, the client response to grantees categorized as “Other” was reported separately from the DA/VAP programs. Added together for comparison with previous years, the return rate would have been 17.9% even though the combined distribution and return levels were lower.

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

**Table 3: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: All Grantees<sup>5</sup>**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	31,426	8,680	27.6%
7/10-6/11	34,631	10,148	29.3%
7/11-6/12	31,009	9,592	30.9%
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>31,157</b>	<b>10,532</b>	<b>33.8%</b>

**Table 4: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: DV/SA Providers**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	7,001	4,225	60.8%
7/10-6/11	8,484	5,537	65.3%
7/11-6/12	8,946	5,396	60.3%
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>8,824</b>	<b>5,910</b>	<b>67.0%</b>

**Table 5: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: DA/VAPs**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	20,441	3,269	16.0%
7/10-6/11	22,636	3,743	16.5%
7/11-6/12	17,618	2,734	15.5%
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>17,500</b>	<b>2,775</b>	<b>15.9%</b>

**Table 6: Distribution, Collection & Return Rate: Other Grantees  
(Reported with the DA/VAP data until 7/2011)**

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/11-6/12	809	411	50.8%
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>1,002</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>54.0%</b>

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

Reporting Period	# Forms Distributed	# Forms Returned	Rate of Return
7/09-6/10	3,984	1,156	29.0%
7/10-6/11	3,511	868	27.7%
7/11-6/12	3,636	1,051	28.9%
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>3,831</b>	<b>1,310</b>	<b>34.2%</b>

---

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

---

<sup>5</sup> The totals in Table 3 may be slightly higher than the sum of the totals shown in Tables 4-7 due to the how the data from a small number of grantee agencies classified as “other” was counted. This is the second year “other” is treated as a separate category and counted independently of the DA/VAP data.

## B. Victim Response to Individual Outcome Measures

The Tables that follow summarize the responses reported for each of the outcomes in 2012-13 compared to prior years. Across all grantee groups, all quarters and all years, feedback continues to be overwhelmingly positive.

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

- Tables 8: All Grantees Client Response
- Tables 9-11: DV/SA Client Responses
- Tables 12-14: DA/VAP Client Responses
- Tables 15-17 Other Grantees' Client Responses
- Tables 18-20: CAIC Client Responses
- Tables 21-24: Portland Women's Crisis Line Caller Responses

### 1. All Grantees Client Response

**Table 8: All Grantees Client Response – *The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	8,457	5,457 (65 %)	2,373 (28%)	119 (1%)	97 (1%)	411 (5%)
7/10-6/11	9,875	6,363 (65%)	2,892 (29%)	114 (1%)	86 (1%)	420 (4%)
7/11-6/12	9,460	6,299 (67%)	2,576 (27%)	97 (1%)	88 (1%)	400 (4%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>10,298</b>	<b>7,218 (70%)</b>	<b>2,458 (24%)</b>	<b>111 (1%)</b>	<b>102 (1%)</b>	<b>409 (4%)</b>

---

*“[This program] ...saved me from 5 full years of a very violent man and being in and out of hospitals. The help I received gave me a fresh start. I got counseling and even a medical exam and each woman that worked there changed my life. Now, because of them, I have a permanent home and a case manager who is always there with a positive attitude to assist me and care. I can imagine what my life would be without their help and I am so glad I don't have to live that same way any more.”*

---



## 2. Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Programs – DV/SAs: Client Responses

**Table 9: DV/SA Client Response - *The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.***

Year/Type of Service	Total Collected	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<b>Non-Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	3,108	2,274 (73%)	736 (24%)	11 (0%)	5 (0%)	82 (3%)
2011-12	2,438	1,872 (77%)	472 (19%)	15(1%)	4 (0%)	75 (3%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>3,011</b>	<b>2236 (74%)</b>	<b>664 (22%)</b>	<b>17 (1%)</b>	<b>10 (0%)</b>	<b>84 (3%)</b>
<b>Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	1,067	740 (70%)	268 (25%)	16 (2%)	8 (1%)	35 (3%)
2011-12	955	662 (69%)	236 (25%)	9 (1%)	8 (1%)	40 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>802 (68%)</b>	<b>294 (25%)</b>	<b>15 (1%)</b>	<b>15 (1%)</b>	<b>49 (4%)</b>
<b>Support Group</b> 2010-11	1,187	770 (65%)	376 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	29 (2%)
2011-12	2,002	1,367 (68%)	571 (29%)	3 (0%)	6 (0%)	55 (3%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,724</b>	<b>1,190 (69%)</b>	<b>425 (25%)</b>	<b>10 (1%)</b>	<b>5 (0%)</b>	<b>94 (5%)</b>
Grand Total 2010-11:	5,362	3,784 (71%)	1,380 (26%)	36 (1%)	16 (0%)	146 (3%)
Grand Total 2011-12:	5,395	3,901 (72%)	1,279 (24%)	27 (1%)	18 (0%)	170 (3%)
<b>Grand Total 2012-13</b>	<b>5,910</b>	<b>4,228 (72%)</b>	<b>1,383 (23%)</b>	<b>42 (0.7%)</b>	<b>30 (0.5%)</b>	<b>227 (4%)</b>

**Table 10: DV/SA Client Response - *After working with this agency, I have some new ideas about how to stay safe.***

Year/Type of Service	Total Collected	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<b>Non-Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	3,106	2,120 (68%)	789 (25%)	28 (1%)	4 (0%)	165 (5%)
2011-12	2,438	1,810 (74%)	484 (20%)	21 (1%)	7 (0%)	116 (5%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>3,011</b>	<b>2,076 (69%)</b>	<b>757(25%)</b>	<b>16 (1%)</b>	<b>22 (1%)</b>	<b>140 (5%)</b>
<b>Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	1,017	653 (64%)	290 (29%)	21(2%)	8 (1%)	45 (4%)
2011-12	956	634 (66%)	260 (27%)	15 (2%)	9 (1%)	35 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>764 (65%)</b>	<b>311 (26%)</b>	<b>27 (2%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>64 (5%)</b>
<b>Support Group</b> 2010-11	1,177	732 (62%)	379 (32%)	9 (1%)	3 (0%)	54 (5%)
2011-12	1,980	1,359 (69%)	533 (27%)	8 (0%)	5 (0%)	75 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,724</b>	<b>1,172 (68%)</b>	<b>432(25%)</b>	<b>7 (0%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>104 (6%)</b>
Grand Total 2010-11	5,300	3,505 (66%)	1458 (28%)	58 (1%)	15 (0%)	264 (5%)
Grand Total 2011-12	5,374	3,803 (71%)	1277 (24%)	44(1%)	21 (0%)	229 (4%)
<b>Grand Total 2012-13</b>	<b>5,910</b>	<b>4012 (68%)</b>	<b>1500 (25%)</b>	<b>50 (1%)</b>	<b>40 (1%)</b>	<b>308 (5%)</b>

**Table 11: DV/SA Client Response - After working with this agency, I know more about resources that may be available, including how to access them.**

Year/Type of Service	Total Collected	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<b>Non-Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	3,085	2,167 (70%)	729 (24%)	31 (1%)	7 (0%)	151 (5%)
2011-12	2,438	1846 (76%)	482 (20%)	13 (1%)	7 (0%)	90 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>3,011</b>	<b>2,117 (70%)</b>	<b>726 (24%)</b>	<b>28 (1%)</b>	<b>9 (0%)</b>	<b>131 (4%)</b>
<b>Shelter Services</b> 2010-11	1,066	687 (64%)	304 (29%)	27 (3%)	9 (1%)	39 (4%)
2011-12	956	661 (69%)	238 (25%)	10(1%)	8 (1%)	39 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>789 (67%)</b>	<b>292 (25%)</b>	<b>30 (3%)</b>	<b>14 (1%)</b>	<b>50(4%)</b>
<b>Support Group</b> 2010-11	1,184	708 (60%)	403 (34%)	19 (2%)	11(1%)	43 (4%)
2011-12	1,588	1000 (63%)	474 (30%)	17 (1%)	5 (0%)	92 (6%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>1,724</b>	<b>1,153 (67%)</b>	<b>425 (25%)</b>	<b>22 (1%)</b>	<b>6 (0%)</b>	<b>118 (7%)</b>
Grand Total 2010-11	5,335	3,562 (67%)	1,436 (27%)	77 (2%)	27 (0%)	233 (4%)
Grand Total 2011-12	4,982	3,507 (70%)	1,194 (24%)	40 (1%)	20 (0%)	221 (4%)
<b>Grand Total 2012-13</b>	<b>5,910</b>	<b>4059 (69%)</b>	<b>1443 (24%)</b>	<b>80 (1%)</b>	<b>29 (0%)</b>	<b>299 (5%)</b>

---

*“I felt very safe here. I never had to wonder about my safety, or peace of mind. Knowing that the ex couldn’t find me even if he wanted to, or searched for me, was INCREDIBLY stress-relieving, unlike living with friends or parents.”*

---

### 3. District Attorney Victim Assistance Programs - DA/VAPs: Client Responses

**Table 12: DA/VAPs Client Response - *The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	3,066	1,648 (54%)	1,077 (35%)	76 (3%)	63 (2%)	202 (7%)
7/10-6/11	3,665	2,054 (56%)	1,270 (35%)	64 (2%)	59 (2%)	218 (6%)
7/11-6/12	2,687	1,470 (55%)	974 (36%)	48 (2%)	57 (2%)	138 (5%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>2,775</b>	<b>1,691 (61%)</b>	<b>855 (31%)</b>	<b>55 (2%)</b>	<b>52 (2%)</b>	<b>122 (4%)</b>

“They contacted me before the court case... I needed more assistance than I thought, and had more questions.”

**Table 13: DA/VAPs Client Response - *As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	2,949	1,635 (55%)	1,029 (35%)	66 (2%)	63 (2%)	156 (5%)
7/10-6/11	3,655	2,049 (56%)	1,324 (36%)	69 (2%)	47 (1%)	166 (5%)
7/11-6/12	2,694	1562 (58%)	941 (35%)	46 (2%)	46 (2%)	99 (4%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>2,775</b>	<b>1608 (58%)</b>	<b>981 (35%)</b>	<b>58 (2%)</b>	<b>41 (1%)</b>	<b>87 (3%)</b>

**Table 14: DA/VAPs Client Response - *The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand the criminal justice system process as it relates to my case.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	2,873	1,519 (53%)	1,013 (35%)	91 (3%)	65 (2%)	185 (6%)
7/10-6/11	3,605	1,948 (54%)	1,285 (36%)	102 (3%)	65 (2%)	205 (6%)
7/11-6/12	2688	1434 (53%)	1017 (38%)	51 (2%)	65 (2%)	121 (5%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>2773</b>	<b>1534 (55%)</b>	<b>999 (36%)</b>	<b>73 (3%)</b>	<b>44 (2%)</b>	<b>123 (4%)</b>

“I would like to thank the DA’s Office for their swift action on this case....Thank you for following up with us at every step in this process. It is never a pleasant experience to have to go through something like this..., but it was necessary and we appreciate your professional assistance.”

#### 4. Other Programs: Client Response

Law enforcement and other grantees providing services to victims of crime track the same outcomes as the DA/VAPs. Until 7/2011, this data was reported in combination with the DA/VAP responses.

**Table 15: Other Grantees Client Response - *The services provided by this program helped me make informed choices about my situation.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/11-6/12	402	265 (66%)	97 (24%)	9 (2%)	2 (0%)	29 (7%)
7/12-6/13	539	396 (73%)	102(19%)	5 (0.9%)	5 (0.9%)	31 (6%)

**Table 16: Other Grantees Client Response - *As a result of the information I received from this agency, I better understand my rights as a victim of crime.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/11-6/12	402	265 (66%)	97 (24%)	9 (2%)	2 (0%)	29 (7%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>385 (71%)</b>	<b>100(18%)</b>	<b>13 (2%)</b>	<b>3 (1%)</b>	<b>40 (7%)</b>

**Table 17: Other Grantees Client Response - *The information given to me by this agency helped me better understand the criminal justice system process as it relates to my case.***

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/11-6/12	405	230 (57%)	124 (31%)	8 (2%)	2 (0%)	41 (10%)
<b>7/12-6/13</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>360 (67%)</b>	<b>110 (20%)</b>	<b>12 (2%)</b>	<b>5 (1%)</b>	<b>53 (10%)</b>

---

*“They were very helpful, and made me realize how much help is out there for women that have been abused. They always were positive and were available when I needed them. They made me realize that I was a victim and it was and is okay to speak out.”*

---

## 5. Child Abuse Intervention Centers – CAICs: Client Response

Oregon is one of 20 states participating in a national research project sponsored by the National Child Alliance (NCA). Oregon DOJ agreed to suspend the current outcome measure (COM) requirement for VOCA and CAMI recipients over a two-year period for these Centers and allow them to substitute similar research questions in their client surveys. Eleven of twenty Centers in Oregon have committed to gather this feedback from their clients in order to measure outcomes for children and families served by child advocacy centers across the country.

**Table 18: CAICs Client Response**

COM: *The services provided by this program helped me make **informed choices** about my situation.*

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/12-6/13	284	215 (76%)	52 (18%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	12 (4%)

---

*“My child has found his voice again and is getting back to the happy child he used to be.”*

---

NCA Research Question: *I feel I have received information that has helped me understand how I can best **keep my child safe** in the future.*

7/12-6/13	790	688 (87%)	66 (8%)	7 (1%)	12 (2%)	17 (2%)
-----------	-----	-----------	---------	--------	---------	---------

**COM and NCA Research Questions combined**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,141	677 (60%)	340 (30%)	20 (2%)	16 (1%)	88 (7%)
7/10-6/11	848	525 (62%)	242 (28%)	14 (2%)	11 (1%)	56 (7%)
7/11-6/12	976	663 (68%)	226 (23%)	13 (1%)	11 (1%)	63 (6%)
7/12-6/13	1,074	903(84%)	118(11%)	9 (1%)	15 (1%)	29 (3%)

**Table 19: CAIC Client Response**

COM: *The staff of this agency treated my family with sensitivity and respect.*

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/12-6/13	287	250(87%)	26 (9%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	8 (3%)

NCA Research question: *Overall, the staff and volunteers at the center have been friendly and pleasant.*

7/12-6/13	1275	1193(94%)	52 (4%)	3 (0%)	7 (0%)	31 (2%)
-----------	------	-----------	---------	--------	--------	---------

**COM and NCA Research Questions combined**

*"This program has helped me at the worst time in my life. It (they) gave me support, resources, and helped me and my daughter to move ahead in our lives."*

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,107	893 (81%)	174(16%)	4 (0%)	9 (1%)	27 (2%)
7/10-6/11	865	709 (82%)	116 (13%)	10 (1%)	7 (.8%)	23 (3%)
7/11-6/12	1,039	905 (87%)	108 (10%)	6 (1%)	5 (0%)	15 (1%)
7/12-6/13	1562	1443(92%)	78 (5%)	3 (0%)	7 (0%)	31 (2%)

**Table 20: CAIC Client Response**

COM: *The staff of this agency were supportive in helping me to access treatment services for my child and family.*

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/12-6/13	286	223(78%)	48 (17%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	12 (4%)

NCA Research Question: *I have been referred to services and/or programs that have helped me deal with my child's situation.*

7/12-6/13	790	634(80%)	88 (11%)	25 (3%)	12(1.5%)	31 (4%)
-----------	-----	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------

**COM and NCA Research Questions combined**

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7/09-6/10	1,053	687 (65%)	266 (25%)	15 (1%)	15 (1%)	14 (1%)
7/10-6/11	845	574 (68%)	206 (24%)	12 (1%)	10 (1%)	43 (5%)
7/11-6/12	975	717 (74%)	189 (19%)	8 (1%)	12 (1%)	49 (5%)
7/12-6/13	1076	857(80%)	136(13%)	25 (2%)	15 (1%)	43 (5%)

## 6. Portland Women’s Crisis Line

The Portland Women’s Crisis Line handles the largest crisis call volume in the state. Reporting this survey data separately gives greater clarity to client responses regarding shelter, non-shelter, and support group services throughout the state. The data in Tables 21 - 24 are in addition to the Common Outcome data included above. In January 2011, PWCL began to use the same common outcome measures as other DV/SA grantees.

Table 21 shows the rate of response by callers. Tables 22-24 indicate the range of response to the survey questions. As is the case with other providers, crisis line responders ask for feedback only from callers who are not in immediate crisis. A high percentage of crisis line calls are specifically about identifying and accessing resources, hence the lower number of responses about safety. For these callers the resources they most frequently want (i.e. shelter and housing) are often not available.

After 18 months of experience using these questions, PWCL is evaluating the usefulness of this data and the appropriateness of the methodology they follow. Seeing the significant increase in “no opinion” responses, PWCL is adding a clarification to their survey instrument for the advocate to distinguish callers that they did not ask from those who decline to respond to a specific question. Next year’s report will track this and other changes they institute.

**Table 21: Rate of Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Caller Response**

	<b>Total Callers Asked</b>	<b>Total Surveys Collected</b>
2010-11	23,607	7,355 (31%)
2011-12	21,364	6,761 (32%)
2012-13	22,448	7,279 (32%)

DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERNIGHT CALLS FROM 11PM-7AM

---

*“The hotline’s existence is making it possible for me to get through this initial part of the recovery process. Thank you!”*

---

**Table 22: Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Caller Response**

*The service provided by this program helped me make **informed choices** about my situation.*

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1546 (45%)	1561 (46%)	133 (4%)	63 (2%)	112(3%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>7275</b>	<b>1493 (21%)</b>	<b>3647 (50%)</b>	<b>91 (1%)</b>	<b>13 (0%)</b>	<b>2031 (28%)</b>

**Table 23: Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Caller Response**

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

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1393 (41%)	1660 (49%)	163 (5%)	68 (2%)	131 (4%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>7279</b>	<b>1432 (20%)</b>	<b>3270 (45%)</b>	<b>109 (1%)</b>	<b>14 (0%)</b>	<b>2454 (34%)</b>

**Table 24: Portland Women’s Crisis Line Telephone Caller Response**

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

Period	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
2011-12 Quarters 3&4	3415	1714 (50%)	1369 (40%)	144 (4%)	69 (2%)	119 (3%)
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>7266</b>	<b>1263 (17%)</b>	<b>2469 (34%)</b>	<b>128 (2%)</b>	<b>14 (0%)</b>	<b>3392 (47%)</b>

---

*“I am shocked yet grateful to learn that almost all the behaviors being used against me, that I never understood, are part of a real game-plan that an abuser uses called, “The 10 Warning Signs of an Abusive Relationship.” Now I know why I couldn’t succeed. This program was extremely helpful and is necessary.”*

---



### III. OPEN-ENDED FEEDBACK

Client feedback is highlighted throughout this document. Grantees often collect comments as well as survey data and include them on the CVSD report forms. Grantees also use the report form to discuss survey issues. Here is a sampling of the comments.

---

*“Usually, when our clients complete the common outcome measures form, they express their deepest gratitude for culturally specific services, on-going support, and encouragement that help them not only to become survivors but also become productive members of the society.”*

---

“Our client feedback form provides space for clients to express in their own words their impression about our services and the manner that they were treated by our staff. We receive much more feedback directly from victims vs getting responses to the outcome cards.”

“I’m beyond grateful for the nine months of rental assistance, but I’m only barely getting my head above water from years of abuse/depression. Two years or even 18 months would be more sufficient to fully overcome these obstacles.”

“Came broken...getting stronger”

---

“I know it’s very important to have a structured environment, but here they support and let us have the right to make our own decisions on how to raise our children and manage our lives. It gives us more of a feeling we CAN run our own lives without our abusers, like we’ve been told by them we CAN’T. It gives us more of a feeling of self-worth.”

“At this shelter I got to learn about healthy relationships and for the first time in my life, SEE them. It completely changed my life.”

“This shelter has been a positive experience for me and my children. The staff have addressed ALL my needs through counseling, education about domestic violence and providing for the safety of me and my children. I truly am amazed at all the real help I received here by a caring and thoughtful staff, from getting my children in school, clothes and so much more; most of all providing a safe environment so we can have a fresh start. My children are looking forward to safe place we can call home thanks to all of you.”

“Overnight staff is great to have someone to talk to in the night, I finally got to come unwound for the first time in years.”

“... went with me to the doctor and they listened this time! [She] didn’t even have to talk-just be there!”

The overwhelming majority of comments are very positive; those that are critical typically have an unmet need or a case outcome that was not in their favor.

“The one survivor who said strongly disagree in her responses wrote at the bottom, ‘Yes, (I would recommend these services) very safe and so helpful and the people here are so sincere.’”

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

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

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

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