Executive Summary

Policy makers, researchers, advocates and an array of service providers have long lamented the dearth of support for rural victims of domestic violence. Victims living in remote rural communities prove particularly difficult to reach and help. They face major obstacles related to their geographical and social isolation, challenges with transportation, sometimes a hostile old boys network that works against their interests, and a scarcity of job opportunities, childcare and other essential services. Among possible sources of support are women’s faith communities, although we know little about how battered women’s faith affects their survival in domestic violence relationships.

The Faith and Community Technical Support (FACTS) project sought to provide small community and faith-based organizations with funds to assist rural victims of domestic violence. FACTS essentially comprised a sixteen-month project funded by the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) through its Rural Pilot Program. FACTS acted as an intermediary between OVW and small community and faith-based programs in order to locate potential grantees (June 2006), oversee a national grant competition (July 2006), disseminate grant awards (September 2006) and provide technical assistance to sub-awardees in rural communities throughout the United States (September 2006-October 2007). Organizationally, FACTS involved collaboration between staff at the Office of Victim Services (OVS), Helena, Montana, and the principal project staff at Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

We launched FACTS at a conference for the 39 sub-awardee programs in Denver, Colorado in September 2006. We designed the Denver workshops to provide FACTS programs with a baseline of operational functionality, especially with regard to serving victims of domestic violence in a safe, non-judgmental manner and to holding batterers accountable. Workshops addressed topics related to the statutory guidelines in the original RFP issued by OVW, including working with battered women, domestic violence in rural settings, faith and domestic violence, and risk and safety planning.

We base our report of activities on the following interactions with the 39 sub-awardees: monthly progress reports; our ongoing contacts with programs including weekly regional teleconferences; the outcomes of four regional meetings with sub-awardees where
program representatives presented and discussed in detail their activities; information gleaned from site visits to fifteen programs during which we toured facilities, interviewed program staff, and conducted and transcribed focus group interviews with clients; and the programmatic and other materials produced by sub-awardees during the life of the grant.

The 39 rural programs funded by OVW via FACTS are scattered across diverse regions of the country. These regions display tremendous geographical, cultural, and economic variation. The FACTS programs reflect this diversity. Notwithstanding this diversity, the programs offer a common core of essential services, often where none existed before. These services were complex and multifaceted and designed to address the intricate and multifarious difficulties rural victims faced. In the report, we discuss the way programs combated isolation, overcame transportation difficulties, offered specific material, legal, and emotional supports, and ensured the safety and security of victims and their families.

FACTS funds served an estimated 23,999 victims although we have no way of knowing whether programs offered services to the same or different victims. The data suggest that the number of victims served increased significantly as a result of the infusion of FACTS funds, although the magnitude of this increase is difficult to discern. It is not really appropriate to compare the periods before and during the FACTS funding in terms of service deliverables because there are so many confounding variables. Based on available evidence, however, it is reasonable to suggest that victims served increased by at least 20 percent across the 39 programs and probably much more.

The 39 programs report highly significant increases in services offered. Before the FACTS grant, from February to September 2006, the 39 grantees offered an average of 310 services per month. During the 13 month period of the FACTS grant, the 39 grantees offered an average of 650 services per site. These expanded offerings reflect an increased delivery of existing services and the creation of new services. Our field interviews confirm that clients have enthusiastically taken advantage of many of these services. We have spoken face-to-face with over 100 clients in different settings and most appreciate and utilize FACTS program services.

It is difficult to track precisely the number of inquiries/requests for service that arose because of FACTS funding. Program workers sometimes feel it is inappropriate to ask prospective clients how and where they learned about the program. However, program personnel clearly report an increase in inquiries/requests consequent upon the arrival of FACTS funds. FACTS programs have expanded existing services in rural communities and created services where none existed. Victims greatly appreciate this expansion and outreach. They then pass on word of their positive experiences to others. Faith communities played an important part in this outreach, serving as staging posts for public education, expansion of volunteer bases, a source of direct service, and so on. These faith entities seem to have worked well with secular service providers. The 39 programs virtually doubled their community education programs offered compared to the pre-FACTS period, rising from an average of 128 to 216 per month, a 69 percent increase. This trend is also evident in brochure production and distribution with the 39 programs increasing production/distribution
from 2,277 before FACTS to 9,129 during the 13 months FACTS grant, reflecting a 301 percent increase.

Every FACTS sub-awardee has developed working relationships and partnerships with other agencies during the course of the grant. These collaborations enabled better communication and understanding between those charged with supporting and protecting battered women and their families and holding perpetrators accountable. Often these agencies stand in different positions to the violence and have sometimes coexisted in a state of tension. The collaborations catalyzed through the FACTS project have broken down many barriers, enhanced communication, and improved the handling of cases, including safety planning and risk management. In sum, the FACTS program and the 39 sub-awardees enhanced coordinated community responses to domestic violence, developing new partnerships and networks, all of which made it possible to effectively serve more victims with a vigor and passion that otherwise is difficult to realize in rural and isolated communities.

The infusion of FACTS funds allowed programs to hire new staff that in turn recruited significant numbers of volunteers to work with them. The reporting forms captured these details under the combined heading of “staff and volunteer labor.” The prestige of winning a federal grant brought much needed recognition to the program, often elevating its standing in the community, thereby making it more attractive as a place for volunteers to commit their time and energy. The work of staff and volunteers is one of the highlights of the FACTS project.

FACTS programs’ interactions with faith communities have been extensive and rewarding. The faith communities linked to the FACTS sites provided enormous amounts of volunteer labor, essential resources, and often provided spiritual support as women moved forward.

FACTS was designed to kick-start a number of supportive interventions for battered women in rural regions that have hitherto received no federal funding. By definition, these operations had small budgets and a limited infrastructure. Nevertheless, many of the 39 sub-awardees used FACTS funds to write other grants and raise funds. Overall, programs raised roughly half of what was initially granted to them in federal funds.

In spite of the plethora of successes, FACTS programs faced a number of difficulties and challenges. These included matters related to: training volunteers, mentoring, cross training between clergy and domestic violence advocates, working with victims with limited English proficiency, transitional housing, childcare, virtual visitation and human trafficking.
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FAITH AND COMMUNITY TECHNICAL SUPPORT: FINAL REPORT

THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Policy makers, researchers, advocates and an array of service providers have long lamented the dearth of support for rural victims of domestic violence. Victims living in remote rural communities prove particularly difficult to reach and help. What little we knew told us rural victims talked of physical and geographical isolation. Some complained of having no friends. Public transportation is limited, and it is sometimes difficult to engage in community life, especially if a batterer controls access to the family vehicle or the woman cannot drive. Indeed, sometimes batterers select the social and physical isolation in rural settings to make it easier to regulate their partners and families.

Isolation also affects how battered women deal with their abusive situations. Fleeing a home in a remote rural location is a very different proposition than leaving an urban residence. Without a telephone or with limited cell phone reception, calling the police is often more challenging for a rural battered woman. These effects of isolation vary greatly by region. For example, battered women living up a hollow in rural Kentucky will face challenges different from those living in rural Montana or upstate New York. In parts of rural Alaska, regardless of whether battered women have access to a phone, it may take police up to a week to reach a remote location if the weather is severe. Isolation clearly affects battered women's survivability. The longer it takes emergency medical personnel to attend a life threatening act of domestic violence, the greater a woman's chance of dying.

There is often a presumption that rural regions are more tranquil and less violent. While it is clear crimes such as robbery and aggravated assault are much lower in rural communities, intimate partner violence occurs at rates similar to those found in urban centers. It is also the case that rural women earn less in comparison with rural men and that this wage differential is more acute than that between urban men and women. Rural women’s limited economic opportunities may limit their ability to survive independently of a violent man. Given the lack of well paid jobs in rural communities and the rise of the service sector over the last generation, economic opportunities for battered women who want to break free of violence leave a lot to be desired.

Beliefs in stereotypical gender roles sometimes influence rural police officers, especially those working for smaller, more poorly trained departments. These officers may
be more likely than their urban peers to believe it is a man's right to control his wife or partner's behavior, at times condoning or turning a blind eye to violence. Ethnographic research from Kentucky supports this observation.

The illegal drug trade can also affect the policing of domestic violence cases. If police officers ignore this trade or, worse still, are somehow corruptly involved in it, then it becomes more difficult for them to arrest domestic violence offenders who know of the officer’s nonchalance or complicity. Such compromises in policing have been reported by battered women in states such as Arizona, where in some areas bordering Mexico men who batter women know corrupt police officers who then find it difficult or impossible to arrest those men for domestic violence. We find similar compromises in other acutely impoverished areas of rural America.

An “ol’ boys network” is alive and well in parts of rural America and sometimes works against the interests of battered women. Many men have known each other for very long periods of time and if friendly with each other may be reluctant to enforce the law, jail an offender, or provide various supports for women attempting to escape violent relationships. We see these compromises more often with elected sheriffs and, probably to a lesser extent, with elected judges. Both groups may be less willing to enforce domestic violence laws if they depend upon an abuser’s family for votes at the next election.

With a much lower tax base, many rural communities suffer from a dearth of health and social services. Battered women may have considerable distances to travel before reaching the nearest shelter. In rural communities where people know each other well, some women report difficulties with keeping their personal information private. Word can get back to an abusive husband that his wife has shared her plight with a social worker or health worker, thus endangering her and making the construction of safety plans more challenging. With limited childcare facilities in rural communities, it is more challenging for abused women to become economically independent.

Undocumented female farm workers, many of whom live and work in isolated rural communities, face unique challenges when confronted with domestic violence. They often report feeling reluctant to call the police, perhaps because they fear deportation, or perhaps because they have a fear of the police from earlier experiences in the countries from which they came. In some cases men who abuse migrant women claim that they are “disciplining” their wives rather than abusing them and that such behavior is a part of traditional cultural heritages.

Churches constitute one of the principal sources of community organization in rural communities. Victims’ involvement in their faith communities constitutes an important and meaningful aspect of their lives. To date, faith communities have been underutilized in the struggle against domestic violence. However, prior to the establishment of FACTS, we discerned a growing interest in the relationship between domestic violence and faith/belief systems and groups. Such a relationship is clearly an important aspect of social life in rural America.
In the years immediately preceding the establishment of FACTS, journalists and scholars began to explore some of the connections between domestic violence, religion, and spirituality. Scholars identified various statements from the Hebrew Bible, Christian scriptures and the Quran that contribute to or appear to justify a man’s right to beat or discipline his wife. With respect to Hinduism, Singh and Unnithan suggest that cultural norms that see marriage as a sacrament underwritten by religious values lie at the heart of the rare practice of wife burning. Many of these same scholars also point out that these religions also condemn intimate partner violence and abuse and recommend harmonious and respectful relations between partners.

Weaver contends that family violence is the primary mental health problem facing the contemporary church. His observation does not mean family violence is more prevalent among those attending church. In fact, the opposite appears true. According to Ellison and Anderson, there is an inverse relationship between church attendance and family violence. These researchers find that this inverse relationship also holds true when they control for social integration and social support, alcohol and substance abuse, and low self-esteem and depression. Examining the behavior of evangelical men, including their deployment of physical violence, Wilcox concludes that the lowest rate of reported domestic violence was among active church going husbands as opposed to those who attend church less regularly.

Unfortunately only a small body of research highlights the meaningfulness of religion and spirituality in the lives of survivors of domestic violence. Using a questionnaire, Gillum, Sullivan and Bybee interviewed a community sample of 151 battered women. These authors note that 97 percent of their sample of battered women reported, “Spirituality or God was a source of strength or comfort for them.” However, as the authors acknowledge, they did “not ask women to identify their religions affiliations nor to provide information about how their religious communities had been supportive or unsupportive of them.”

We do know that victims of such abuse face challenges that sometimes lead them to question their faith, their sense of hope and purpose, their capacities for love and forgiveness, and their much broader sense of what it is to live meaningful, purposeful, compassionate, and liberated lives. Using in-depth interviews with five survivors of domestic violence, Giesbrecht and Sevcik note the way conservative Christian evangelical women use their spiritual and religious beliefs to negotiate recovery and healing. In particular the authors report the way women’s faith operates as a socially situated system of meanings that either “engender shame or guilt or inspire hope and empower transformative change.”

According to Mattis, some African American women deploy religion and spirituality, “to cope and to construct meaning in times of adversity.” The 23 women interviewed in this qualitative study identified intimate partner violence as one form of adversity they faced. Mattis randomly selected interviewees from a larger convenience sample of 128 African American women surveyed to learn how they coped with stress. Although Mattis does not address the specific links between intimate partner violence and religion/spirituality, she does identify connections between religion/spirituality and coping that have clear relevance to the way survivors of domestic violence might negotiate their own situations. Specifically, she notes, “contrary to traditional social scientific perspectives that posit that individuals use
religion and spirituality exclusively as sources of emotional comfort or to shield themselves from the realities of their circumstances, the participants in this study suggested that religion/spirituality help them to confront and accept reality. Religion and spirituality are described by these women as analytic devices that promote rational and critical thought.\textsuperscript{17}

Notwithstanding this plethora of difficulties rural victims face, many people in rural communities have a suspicion of government, believing strongly in self-sufficiency and rights to privacy and self-determination. This makes interventions difficult to craft and implement. From its point of inception, the Faith and Community Technical Support project (FACTS) used these difficulties victims face and the aforementioned characteristics of rural life as an important frame of reference. The original request for proposals required the development of a project that would harness local energies in combination with an intermediary entity and the Office on Violence Against Women.

BACKGROUND ON FACTS

The Faith and Community Technical Support (FACTS) project comprised a sixteen-month project funded by the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) through its Rural Pilot Program. FACTS acted as an intermediary between OVW and small community and faith-based programs in order to locate potential grantees (July 2006), oversee a national grant competition (August 2006), disseminate grant awards (September 2006), and provide technical assistance to sub-awardees in rural communities throughout the United States (September 2006-October 2007). Organizationally, FACTS involved collaboration between staff at the Office of Victim Services (OVS), Helena, Montana, and the principal project staff at Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Matthew Dale served as the project liaison and the bridge between OVW, the rural state of Montana, and the principal FACTS project staff at Baylor University. Byron Johnson directed FACTS at Baylor University. FACTS team members brought extensive experience working with rural programs and small faith-based and/or community organizations serving victims of domestic violence and child abuse.\textsuperscript{18} In addition, FACTS personnel had published extensively in these areas, producing materials utilized widely by federal programs working with the issues of domestic violence and child victimization.\textsuperscript{19}

In collaboration with OVW, the FACTS grant competition and solicitation process generated thousands of emails, letters, and calls as well as notification through a dedicated website (www.FACTSDV.org). We included as many organizations as possible in our solicitation mailing. Many states have an office on faith- and community-based initiatives and we contacted each to inform them of our solicitation and gain their support for dissemination purposes. Faith-based groups were obvious targets for the solicitation,\textsuperscript{20} but we also reached out to many community-based organizations\textsuperscript{21} as well as each state’s coalition(s) against sexual assault and domestic violence. We made concerted efforts to connect with rural agencies and organizations, knowing that many of them would have extensive mail lists.\textsuperscript{22} Each of the organizations we contacted was emailed the grant solicitation to include on their website and listserv.
To be as exhaustive as possible in reaching out to community- and faith-based organizations in rural areas we also contacted groups that served as bridges to these communities,\textsuperscript{23} as well as domestic violence organizations for immigrants, minorities, the deaf, and the blind. Additionally, organizations reaching out to or providing services to children were notified of the grant solicitation.\textsuperscript{24} Finally, in conjunction with OVW, as a last attempt to identify additional organizations our search may not have captured, we ran our comprehensive list of faith- and community-based organizations by appropriate contacts within each of the Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives housed within the U.S. Departments of Justice, Labor, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Education, Agriculture, Commerce, Veterans Affairs, and the Small Business Administration. In total, over 1000 emails and listserv notices were included in the solicitation as well as 2,340 pieces of mail. In an effort to reach rural areas, GIS graphing software was used to verify rural areas across the United States and reinforce the effort to get solicitations to those identified.

We launched FACTS at a conference in Denver, Colorado in September 2006. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) arranged the conference to inform all sub-awardees of their responsibilities in the official NIJ evaluation of this groundbreaking project. OVW staff also attended and actively participated in these meetings. The FACTS team used this opportunity to initiate what would become its own ongoing close contact with constituent sub-awardee programs. Representatives from each of chosen 39 sites attended the launch in Denver, and sub-awardees provided brief overviews of their programs.

At this launching conference, Matthew Dale overviewed the legal and administrative elements of the FACTS project. He also outlined the FACTS team’s experience working with small community- and faith-based groups, our specialized skills in serving victims of domestic violence, and our extensive outreach capabilities and networks.

In accordance with our original responsibilities laid out in the FACTS grant proposal, Dale highlighted the key content areas for the Denver agenda. Content areas comprised the principal substantive foci of the pilot project and included: basic and advanced domestic violence training such as risk and safety planning, rural issues, working with battered women, and coordinating community responses to domestic violence; legal, business and organizational assistance, especially concerning startup and building infrastructure; and the relationship between religion and domestic violence. Sub-awardees learned of their reporting responsibilities and were introduced to the FACTS website including its principal features and a sense of how it might evolve.

We designed the Denver workshops to provide FACTS programs with a baseline of operational functionality. Essentially, we tried to put them on the same page regarding matters essential to programmatic integrity. Our bottom line was and remains the need to serve victims of domestic violence in a safe, non-judgmental manner and to hold batterers accountable. The workshops addressed topics such as:

- \textit{Listening to and Working with Battered Women}
To re-emphasize the importance of safety issues, we engaged attendees in a detailed mock domestic violence fatality review as a practical and interactive means of working through the issues presented at the launch conference. We presented attendees with a baseline packet of learning materials to take back to their respective programs. The launch curriculum consisted of materials addressing domestic violence, safety planning, risk, and the role of religion and faith communities in relationship to domestic violence.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES

In what follows, we report our activities during the cycle of the FACTS grant. We direct readers to the ongoing official NIJ evaluation of the FACTS project headed by Andy Klein and his team. Where possible, we make rough comparisons between pre- and post-FACTS periods at the 39 sites, remaining aware that these comparisons are illustrative of rough trends rather than scientifically verifiable information. Our purpose in making these comparisons is to point to the potential of programs like FACTS for harnessing local energies. We are well aware that the pre-FACTS data is unscientific and that it should be read cautiously.

In order to highlight the deployment of FACTS funds, we focus on the following topics:

* Types of support.
* Number of clients served.
* Number of services offered.
* Inquiries/requests for program services.
* Reaching communities and building awareness of domestic violence.
* Interagency liaisons and partnerships.
* Staff and volunteer labor.
* Faith communities.
* Building capacity/sustainability.
* Difficulties and challenges.

Sources of Information

We base our report of activities on the following interactions with the 39 sub-awardees: monthly progress reports that speak to the aforementioned topics; our ongoing contacts with programs including weekly regional teleconferences; the outcomes of four regional meetings with sub-awardees where program representatives presented and discussed in detail their activities; information gleaned from site visits to fifteen programs during which we toured facilities, interviewed program staff, and conducted and transcribed focus
group interviews with clients; and the programmatic and other materials produced by sub-awardees during the life of the grant.

TYPES OF SUPPORT

The 39 rural programs funded by OVW via FACTS are scattered across diverse regions of the country (see Figure 1: Map of Program locations). These regions display tremendous geographical, cultural, and economic variation. The FACTS programs reflect this diversity. Notwithstanding this diversity, the programs offer a common core of essential services, sometimes where none existed before.

From the monthly reporting forms we learned about the offering of various supports at each of the 39 sites. The word offered allowed us to count the provision not the receipt or complete utilization of services. There is an important distinction to be made here between the offering of a service and its utilization. The former is easier to count while the latter may take considerable time. Discerning whether a client received or utilized a particular form of support is more difficult to ascertain. We relied upon our focus group interviews at the 15 sites to elaborate upon how clients received a particular form of support, what difference it made in their lives, and what it meant to clients.

Before proceeding to explore the nature, form, and extent of supports offered, it is important to note that these supports are complex and multifaceted. Superficially, supports offered may appear as unitary countable items on monthly progress reports but in reality they overlap, complement each other, and often come from different sources. Supports offered therefore correspond to the complexity and multiple challenges rural battered women and their families face. Field reports illustrate this complexity and the multiple services needed and offered. These field reports constitute the principal sources of information. Excerpts appear as case studies, commencing with the one below from the Interfaith Hospitality Network, Johnson City, Tennessee.33

* Rachel called our hotline several weeks prior to coming to shelter. She is married and has four children. She moved to this area to be near her husband’s family. Her husband moved them into a house with no running water or a stove, with the intentions of remodeling. In addition to the deplorable conditions in the house and being isolated from her family, Rachel’s husband has begun drinking heavily and she suspects he may be using drugs. Rachel called the hotline to explore her options because she was planning to file for divorce and was afraid her husband would become physically violent. A few weeks later, Rachel called the Abuse Alternatives hotline again to say that she and the children had left the home and were staying in a motel. She was now being physically abused by her husband and fled for the safety of herself, her children, and her unborn child. She was accepted into our shelter program and immediately began to work on goals of providing for her family. Rachel has received clothing, furniture, and school supplies through donations given to Abuse Alternatives. She has also been approved for public housing and will be moving into her new apartment in the next few days. Abuse Alternatives will assist her with the security deposit upon signing the lease with funds through the Baylor grant.
Rachel has begun the healing process as well. She has received counseling with the licensed
privy counselor provided through the Baylor grant, as well as individual counseling and support
group services provided by Abuse Alternatives. She has filed for divorce and recently
worked out custody and visitation issues with her husband. Rachel still has many struggles
ahead, but looks forward to living in her new home and a life free of domestic violence
(Interfaith Hospitality Network; Monthly Report (hereafter MR), October 2006).

A later case from the same program illustrates how a victim of domestic violence,
close to rock bottom, seized the opportunities and used them to confront simultaneously her
material difficulties and emotional demons. Importantly, the efficacy of her family unit was
reestablished through the prudent use of FACTS funding.

* When Cindy first came to the shelter, she had totally given up on herself. Cindy had lost
everything, her job, apartment, car, and her children had moved away. On top of all the
negatives created by the domestic violence, she had begun to try to forget her sorrows
through the use of alcohol. Realizing there was no other way, she checked herself into a
rehab program where she found out about the Safe Passage domestic violence shelter.
Thanks to the assistance provided through the FACTS grant, and the services provided
through the shelter, she is using her skills, and working at a job, making a sustainable living.
Cindy has been able to reacquire her car, find an apartment, and is reestablishing contact
with her children. She has refrained from the use of alcohol, and is making friends in the
area. Without meeting the economic barriers such as rental and utility deposits, Cindy may
have been stuck in a homeless shelter for an extended period of time, making the likelihood
of her success questionable at best (Interfaith Hospitality Network, Johnson City, TN; MR
July 2007).

Across the 39 sites, victims moved quickly to take advantage of these new service
offerings. One report captures the alacrity with which one woman moved to seize the
complex and multifaceted opportunities rendered available by FACTS.

* A 33-yr-old Spanish lady, six months pregnant and with three children came into our
shelter. She was in a domestic violence relationship. Within the first seven days in the
shelter she got a job, placed her children in school and day care and applied for housing.
Within 21 days she received her HUD voucher and found a house. She received 26 hours of
group counseling, parenting classes, 46 hours of individual counseling, met with 21 other
Social Services agencies, and received financial assistance. She moved into her house on her
33rd day in the shelter (YWCA, Oak Ridge, TN; MR, August 2007).

It would be misleading to suggest that FACTS funds merely facilitated the extended
use of existing services. Clearly, FACTS funding also enabled programs to expand their
horizons, offer new services, tap into a broader array of resources and community services,
and thereby meet the eclectic needs of clients in ever-more individualized, personal, and
comprehensive ways. Case studies help illustrate this important point about the ingenuity
and creativity of the programs.
The array of services Elijah Haven has offered has been enhanced beyond measure due to the FACTS funding. Child care for women attending group, transportation to and from collaborative services, additional awareness for those women not familiar with local accessibility and increased ability of staff to provide those services because of the contacts and technical service/advice available through FACTS has been priceless. How could this small rural Indiana Amish country agency have had the capacity to deal with an immigrant Chinese woman being battered by her husband 28 days after her marriage without FACTS funding and technical assistance? (Elijah Haven House, LaGrange, IN; MR, October 2007).

When I first came to Safeline our knowledge of resources was limited. Safeline staff never had the time or energy to research thoroughly area resources and services. The FACTS grant has made this research and outreach possible. I have built an extensive resource database and cultivated relationships and partnerships with area faith communities, transportation providers and community programs. We now have viable options to present to service users facing housing and transportation issues. Previously, these problems perplexed Safeline staff (Safeline Incorporated, Chelsea, VT; MR, July 2007).

Safeline Inc., highlighted above, deliberately created a client services coordinator to manage the delivery of complex and multifaceted services. A number of programs acted likewise. This seems particularly important in rural communities where the scarcity and geographical dispersal of available services presents special difficulties. We know that if presented with viable alternatives in a humane, respectful, and non-judgmental manner, many battered women will not tolerate violence in the long-term. However, it takes time and care for them to establish an independent, relatively autonomous lifestyle. The following excerpt shows how this development enhanced service delivery:

Since the creation of the Client Services Coordinator (CSC) position made possible by the FACTS grant, Safeline, Inc. has greatly improved its ability to serve victims of domestic abuse. For example, the CSC has assisted one service user in purchasing an automobile, applying for and receiving a Section 8 Housing Voucher, paying off high interest credit card debt, navigating the Economic Services System, designing a realistic and sustainable budget, and brainstorming short- and long-term goals. The CSC has also provided numerous resources and advocated on her behalf to several organizations including: the Department of Children and Families, Legal Aid, the Vermont Housing Authority, and Community Action. Before she could purchase a vehicle, the CSC provided direct service transportation for her and her family to medical appointments, court dates, grocery stores, and numerous other locations related to achieving her goals of remaining safe and independent from her abusive situation. In addition to these economic services, the CSC also provided continued emotional support. Today, less than three months after this survivor started working with the CSC, she has made tremendous progress towards achieving economic stability and meeting many of her goals.

Although the NIJ reporting forms required programs to inform us of specific countable services offered, our intent here is to convey a sense of the interconnectedness between these services. At some level, material and emotional supports cannot be separated. In what follows, we provide a sense of the kinds of supports offered, bearing in mind the
links and overlaps between them and the overarching philosophical theme of helping people in need. We offer excerpts that speak to support regarding combating isolation, transportation, specific material support, the augmentation of safety and security, legal support and the provision of emotional support in all its guises from simply being emotionally available to making available more formal services.

COMBATING ISOLATION

Geographical isolation and loneliness are often prominent and debilitating experiences for rural battered women. The geographical isolation of rural regions makes it easier for batterers to regulate, intimidate, threaten and otherwise abuse their intimate female partners. This isolation dovetails with the loneliness and emotional seclusion women feel. One of the great successes of FACTS has been the ability of programs to reach unusually remote pockets of human habitation. A number of programs report the infusion of FACTS funds enabled them to address these challenges, often for the first time. As one director put it, “the FACTS grant has provided much-needed staff that interface with women in more remote areas.” (YWCA Oak Ridge, TN; MR, March 2007).

We hear time and again that FACTS workers encountered battered women who never knew services existed for them. In a number of cases it is indeed the case that until FACTS came along there were no services.

The San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center, Alamosa, Colorado, is typical of this outreach to remote locales. The program director notes:

* We have been providing services to the hardest to reach communities in our county. There were a couple of women who lived in very precarious conditions. These two clients lived in a state of constant fear. Our outreach workers found out about these women through referrals from a local health rural clinic. The women presented at the clinic with a variety of bruises. They were so poor that they did not wear shoes and had only a few changes of clothes. Fortunately with the collaboration of social services, we were able to get them out of that situation. (MR, April 2007).

Another example concerns a battered woman from a remote and deeply impoverished area of Indiana. The program director informed us:

* Kim is a 44 year-old workingwoman who has lived in an abusive marriage for 12 years. Kim lives in an extremely impoverished area that is inaccessible when it rains because of the hills and mud. There are no mailing addresses where Kim lives. People pick their mail up at boxes located a mile from their homes. Kim has called the Sheriff before when she was beaten. Either the deputies could not find her trailer or they did not try. No one came to help her. Her abusive husband used isolation to his advantage, repeatedly telling her that no one would ever come and help her. He told her he was free to do whatever he wanted with her. She believed him.
Local police brought Kim to the FACTS program where she received an array of services. Sheriff's deputies returned to interview Kim. Program staff took photographs of Kim's injuries using a camera purchased through the FACTS grant. (Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence (JCCDV), Vernon, IN; MR, May 2007).

The Women's Crisis Center of Northeast Arkansas, Jonesboro, Arkansas, found itself reaching out to battered women in increasingly remote rural areas. Staff note:

* For example, a teacher contacted us about a student in her class who was showing signs of abuse (This was after we conducted training for school personnel in her community). The mother did not have access to a phone or vehicle. One of our advocates went to the home with the teacher to speak to her (we did this knowing her husband was a truck driver and gone for the week). The house was unbearable to say the least. There was no air conditioning and what is worse is there were five other children living in the home aged 1, 2, 4, 6, & 8. They are now residing in our shelter until we can get them into affordable and livable housing. The mother is a victim of domestic violence, but did not have any idea how to get out with all of these children. Because of FACTS we are encountering more and more of these types of situations due to the expansion in our outreach activities.

TRANSPORTATION

Rural battered women face enormous challenges. Transportation is often one of those challenges. Numerous FACTS sub-awardees offered assistance with transportation.

* Due to FACTS grant funding, we were able to remove a victim of domestic violence to a shelter out of our area. She and her two children were staying with her parents after leaving her abuser. The abuser called the parent’s home as many as fifty times every night. The victim’s father works for the telephone company and could not change his number nor fail to answer the phone when it rang since he was on call. This annoyance continued even after a Protective Order was issued. The abuser’s number no longer appeared on caller ID but many calls labeled “Private” were noted. The victim felt that she and her children (as well as her parents) were in jeopardy and would only be safe out of the area. ACCADV worked with a shelter two hours away and was able to transport the victim and the children there. This would not have been possible without the funding for transportation under the grant (Amherst County Against Domestic Violence, Amherst, VA; MR, August 2007).

Transportation support proved crucial in cases such as medical emergencies. A couple of examples suffice:

* A client has a son that needed surgery to replace tubes in his ears. They had become infected and there was a loss of hearing. Because of our increase in staff we were able to provide transportation for this family to and from the hospital. (Macoupin County Community Health Centers, Carlinville, IL; MR, April 2007)
Safe Haven staff was paged by Cameron Hospital at 3:30 AM because LaGrange County Sheriff’s Department had brought a woman in who had been severely beaten, had multiple facial fractures and needed to see a plastic surgeon for an 8:00 AM appointment in Fort Wayne. Because of the FACTS funding Safe Haven staff could transport this victim to and from her appointment. (Elijah Haven House, LaGrange, IN; MR, April 2007).

In cases where women relocated across state lines, they sometimes had to return to the state where they suffered abuse to attend court. Such travel is often expensive and beyond the means of battered women moving toward self-sufficiency. FACTS funds enabled Safeline staff in Vermont to find a creative way around this difficulty for one of their clients.

Prior to the infusion of FACTS funding, we had no way of flying individuals with no money in or out of the state. Through my research, I discovered Mercy Medical Airlift, an organization that works with the commercial airline Frontier to transport women and children out of abusive situations at no cost. One of our service users had relocated to Florida, but needed to return to Vermont to attend court. She could not afford to fly or drive back for the hearing. We directed her to Mercy Medical Airlift and she got a free ticket that made it possible for her to attend court and fly safely back to Florida. This resource made a dramatic difference in her life (Safeline Incorporated, Chelsea, VT; MR, July 2007).

SPECIFIC MATERIAL SUPPORTS

With the infusion of FACTS funds, programs expanded their material supports. These included down payments on rent, help with utilities and the basic provision of food and clothing. The Women’s Shelter of Hope, Hialeah, Florida, offered bus tokens to enable women to overcome transportation difficulties and phone cards to help them to make and keep appointments. Numerous programs offered assistance as women moved into housing of their own.

One client was further down the road to independence and had her own vehicle, an income, and a babysitter lined up. In this case, FACTS program staff provided material supports that dovetailed with those furnished through the woman’s church. The Director of the Desert Rose, Indiana, program explains:

She worked two jobs and saved her money until she was at a point she was able to move out of the shelter to a different town. There she found an affordable apartment and had the help of her church family. She did not have any furniture and we were fortunate to find a couple of mattresses that we took to her last weekend as she and the children were sleeping on the floor. We tried to help with some dishes and pots and pans, linens, etc. that had been donated to the shelter (Desert Rose Foundation, Inc., Martinsville, IN; MR, March 2007).

Another program helped a woman in dire straits. The director explains:

We have a mother with 6 children and with our increased resources we were able to put her in a hotel for a couple of nights until she could go to a shelter. We were able to provide
her food and transportation during this time. This is a woman that has been a client for some time and felt she was finally prepared and had the resources to leave (Macoupin County Community Health Centers, Carlinville, IL; MR, March 2007).

AUGMENTING SAFETY AND SECURITY

Research tells us that those victims seeking shelter services are often among the most severely abused battered women and children. In addition to providing material and emotional support, the FACTS infusion of funds and technical support provided safety and security. Some programs used FACTS funds to augment these crucial security services.

For example, the YWCA in Oak Ridge, Tennessee relies upon a retired engineer for essential maintenance work. On a site visit, we met this man and talked with him about shelter security. He donates 60 hours a week to the shelter. Writing of his recent progress he notes:

*I have been a full-time volunteer with the YWCA since 1996 and I have been involved with the Domestic Violence Program for the last 10 or so years. During this period, I have been responsible for the maintenance, safety and security of the YWCA facilities, including the shelter facility for our clients. Prior to the FACTS grant, we struggled to maintain the shelter. Since the Grant, we have been able to make significant repairs and greatly improve safety and security. (YWCA Oak Ridge, TN; MR, May 2007).

LEGAL SUPPORT

Providing legal technical assistance to FACTS sub-awardees emerged as one of the key components of the overall technical assistance offerings. We provided this by retaining Barbara Hart J.D. as a consultant. Many programs called seeking advice on a variety of legal matters. Ms. Hart fielded these questions and provided technical assistance. Sub-awardees reported enormous satisfaction with Ms. Hart’s knowledge, expertise, and wisdom. Among the issues she tackled, we note the following:

* The plight of Asian Pacific Islander battered women and the dangers they may face in returning to their countries of origin.
* Preferences and Priorities in Public and Subsidized Housing for Battered Women.
* The batterer accountability checklist developed for the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
* Immigration and trafficking issues and specific referrals to ASISTA.
* Technical assistance regarding the expunging of arrest records.
* Information on "Rent Bank" that allows victims to flee domestic violence in Canada.
* Protection of battered women from unfair eviction.
* The issuance of protection orders, violation of protection orders, criminal and civil remedies, and other strategies to protect FACTS clients.
* Virtual Visitation.
FACTS funded programs themselves provided highly meaningful legal support to clients.

* We connected a client with a faith community recently. She has been a client for a year and a half and was recently diagnosed with Stage 2 breast cancer. She came to me concerned about whether her husband could come back and take her children because of her illness if her medical diagnosis became terminal. We then contacted Legal Action of Wisconsin. This organization told us it did not write wills or deal with matters relating to probate. Consequently, we connected her with a local attorney who constructed a will for her on a pro bono basis. I also connected her with a pastor because she requested some faith community support (Western Racine, WI; MR, September 2007).

The FACTS program in Jennings County, Indiana, notes two situations:

* We have been advocating for a young woman who is in the process of a divorce. We have traveled out of county to attend her hearings, secured legal counseling, shelter and counseling for her (JCCDV, IN; MR, March 2007).

* Tina has been a client of ours for some time now. Her case is ongoing because of the continued harassment of her ex-husband. This man also molested her 3-year-old daughter. Tina and her daughter are in counseling. We are working with the legal system to guarantee that Tina's child will not have unsupervised contact with her father. There have been no charges filed against her husband because the molestation cannot be proven. We have arranged for Tina to have new legal counsel (JCCDV, IN; MR, March 2007).

At a number of sites in states such as Indiana, Colorado, and California, we increasingly noticed an overlap between domestic violence and human trafficking. Ms. Hart assisted programs with legal advice on these matters. Some programs networked to extend their services. The San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center’s rich experience working with battered women enabled it to work more closely with the Catholic Church. One client reported that she learned a lot from the program about how to interpret her faith in a way that did not reinforce her vulnerability to domestic violence. Back-to-back reports from the director inform us of this progress:

* I received a phone call on July 17, 2007 from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, stating that our contract has been approved to provide services to victims of human trafficking. This is a huge addition to our domestic violence program and we are excited to take on this new challenge. Our agency will be able to identify and provide services to this population (San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center, Alamosa, CO; MR, July 2007).

* Our contract with the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Migration and Refugee Services was approved on July 20, 2007, as a subcontractor to provide services to survivors of human trafficking. We have signed the contract and have received our first training on completing paperwork. So we are now able to provide services to human trafficking victims. We are very excited about this new addition to our domestic violence
EMOTIONAL SUPPORT

Many sub-awardees offer personal and emotional support or, as one FACTS-funded program worker put it, heart support.

* Our Client Services Manager (paid for by the FACTS grant) is from Germany. We had a client from Holland who married a soldier she met while he was stationed overseas. They have three children and have had very complicated child custody issues which stem from the abuse and their divorce. Her family and friends are overseas. Because we had someone who could speak her native language she was able to have advocacy as well as “heart” support (Iva’s Place, Lenoir City, TN; MR, March 2007).

FACTS funding literally freed up program staff to spend more time with clients, listening to them, helping them, and caring for them. These supports are not easy to measure but are crucial to the kind of non-judgmental advocacy climate many sub-awardees created. On practically every site visit, women told us that but for the FACTS project they would not have been able to extricate themselves from their violent home life. At a focus group in Gun Barrel City, Texas, three women told us that if not for FACTS they would have been on the streets with their children. These women used words like “homey” to describe their new residence. FACTS funds paid the rent for this rural shelter. Off the beaten track, this shelter blends into the landscape of rural Texas. It did not exist prior to the FACTS infusion.

In a related example, another program gave heart to a woman who courageously chose to press charges against her abuser. Again, this giving of heart and fortitude was linked to a multitude of overlapping services coming into play. In this case a good working relationship between the sub-awardee and local police worked in favor of the victim. FACTS program staff note:

* We helped a client get a police escort to court and would not have been able to do that without the FACTS grant. This particular abuser has already been in prison once and is currently wanted for questioning about a murder in Pine Bluff. He is very dangerous and the victim would have been too scared to press charges without our assistance (CASA Women's Shelter, Pine Bluff, AR; MR, March 2007).

The same theme of spending more and “better” time with clients permeates the entire pilot project. It is as if the infusion of funds created a space for advocates and volunteers to work in a more concentrated way with clients. An example from the Macoupin County program in Carlinville, Illinois further illustrates this point. One client was beaten so badly by her boyfriend that she required hospitalization. An appreciative advocate wrote,

* Because of our increased staff size, we were able to spend quality time with her during her hospital stay and court processes. We also provided transportation to our support group as
well as her follow up doctor's appointments (Macoupin County Community Health Center, Carlinville, IL; MR, January 2007).

Operating in crisis mode is not conducive to good interpersonal advocacy. This is particularly true in rural communities where geographical isolation makes it harder to survive and tap into the various services women need to live free of violence. In at least one instance, programs used FACTS funds to create a position of Client Services Coordinator (CSC). Such a development recognizes the complex needs of rural battered women. It also reflects an organizational awareness of the need to better manage and orchestrate employee and volunteer time. The Safeline program in Chelsea, Vermont, for example, used FACTS funds to create a CSC position.

A plethora of studies indicate that living in a domestic violence home can result in enormous, potentially long-term trauma for children. However, evidence also suggests that the provision of emotional support to children enhances their resiliency, offsetting these deleterious effects. Some programs used FACTS funds to enhance the resiliency of children exposed to domestic violence alongside providing emotional support to victims.

* Terri completes the Upward and Away Family Program this month. She is a mother of one preschooler. She was married to a man who is violent and is self-employed, not bringing in enough money to support the family. Terri separated from him with the support of her parents who are both professional people living in Houston.

Terri’s husband had insisted on getting a three-bedroom apartment that was over $600 a month. After he left, we tried to advocate for Terri and get the apartment management to allow her to move to a smaller apartment or break her lease without penalties. They would not do so. We placed Terri in the Upward and Away Family Program and assisted with the rent for the last six months, allowing Terri to finish the lease that is up this month. We also helped with daycare for her son and counseling for her son. Her son had been acting out at his first daycare and was expelled. The father showed up on the premises and the police had to be called. With counseling, the child’s behavior has improved markedly and he has been successful at the new daycare.

Terri’s parents helped her financially and emotionally with the divorce. She attended counseling with our domestic violence counselor and also met with our case manager. This month Terri is moving back to Houston to live with her parents and to begin going to college. She is happy and hopeful about the future for herself and her son (Hill Country Community Needs Council, Fredericksburg, TX; MR, September 2007).

Other programs provided support to mothers and children by using FACTS funds to create or strengthen child exchange programs. For example, in April 2007, the Western Racine County Family Violence Community Coalition in Wisconsin began building the first child safe exchange program in that region.

An Alabama sub-awardee began working with children in April 2007. The program director explained:
* The first Kids Support Group for child victims of Domestic Violence commenced this month. The next month will be spent educating the public as to what the Kids Support Group offers to children of our area. For the first time ever, these child victims will have a place to begin healing. Working hand in hand with the Children’s Advocacy Center, we are endeavoring to make changes in the way domestic violence cases involving children are handled. (Blount County CASA, Alabama; MR, April 2007).

A program in a remote part of rural Colorado reported the following:

* With the FACTS grant, children are able to attend a support group while their mothers are receiving information and support in the women’s support group. One particular boy, age 5, was exposed to horrific violence against his mother at the hands of his father. The boy’s trauma and distrust of people was readily apparent. In coordination with professional therapy, his participation in the children’s support group slowly opened another world for him. This new world does not accept domestic violence and is able to protect and care for him. It is a world willing to teach him alternatives to tension and explosions of violence. Each session revealed a boy learning to trust. He opened up more, allowing our facilitator to gently guide him (Archuleta County Victim Assistance Program; MR, March 2007).

Many FACTS programs provided important counseling services on an individual basis or in a group setting. Again, such counseling interventions appear most effective when offered alongside material supports. Counseling was important to Violet, a client at the Interfaith Hospitality program in Johnson City, Tennessee.

* Violet is a 50-year old lady who moved to our area recently from another state. She sought shelter in a nearby town after her partner hit her during an argument. This was not the first time Violet had been assaulted, so she made the decision to seek help before the violence became worse. After entering the local domestic violence shelter, Violet was still not safe because of her dependence on public transportation. Violet’s abuser also uses the public transportation system in that city, so Violet transferred to Abuse Alternatives. During her time here, Violet has made significant progress. She found a job, applied for housing, and has taken care of several personal financial issues. Violet has met several times with the therapist we provided through the Baylor grant. Violet is now showing more self-confidence and strength in dealing with her situation. She hopes to be in housing within the next few weeks and looks forward to a fresh start in our area. (MR, April 2007).

Iva’s Place, Lenoir City, Tennessee, reports a particularly powerful support group among women.

* Our support group for young mothers reached much farther than the regular Tuesday night session at our shelter site. One of the participants was in the hospital after her delivering her baby. She was court ordered to attend our support group. The group decided to go to the hospital so “Shelly” wouldn’t “miss out.” They sat in the waiting area with “Shelly” and had a group discussion about healthy relationships. Someone who was also in the waiting area joined in and was so relieved to get to “just talk” to somebody who understood how hard it is
to make good choices for herself and her child. She is now part of the Tuesday group and can't thank them enough for being at the hospital just when she was at the end of her rope. We are proud of the facilitator for being willing to do what she does so well wherever she is. Her pay comes from the FACTS grant and from the hearts of the women in the group.

Some FACTS sub-awardees began to consider setting up mentoring programs. The issue of mentoring battered women surfaced on a number of our weekly teleconference calls. Discussions about this topic centered on providing mentorship in a non-judgmental manner and with an approach that sought to help rather than rescue women. Programs report some success with their mentoring programs although most report they are only beginning this potentially important work. One sub-awardee reported the ongoing nature of these endeavors:

*We received a phone call from a member of a women’s group in a local church. They are thinking of starting a women’s mentoring program* (Hill Country Community Needs Council, Fredericksburg, TX; MR, April 2007).

**NUMBER OF VICTIMS SERVED**

FACTS funds served an estimated 25,649 victims. We have no way of knowing whether programs offered services to the same or different victims. For example, in any month at any of the 39 sites, it is possible that if the same victim was offered services on each of 30 days that she might appear to represent 30 victims rather than the same victim. Clearly, this is problematic and cautions us to pay much more attention to the qualitative as opposed to the quantitative data. In addition, as already mentioned, we might know that programs offered victims services, but we have no way of knowing whether victims utilized those services. Notwithstanding these obvious shortcomings in the statistical data gathering, it is possible to engage in a certain amount of speculation about the statistical impact of the FACTS program.

Graph 1 reveals that in the 13 month period during which the 39 programs received FACTS funds, they served an average of 1,973 victims per month, or 50.6 victims per program. This compares with the average 1,655 victims served by the 39 programs in the seven month period prior to the FACTS infusion for which we have been able to collect data. Prior to FACTS, the number of victims served averaged 42.4 victims per program. It is impossible tell from the data gathering tools whether programs served distinctive victims or the same victim on many occasions.

Comparing these two sets of numbers is akin to comparing apples and oranges. The pre-FACTS data on victims served reflects the numbers of victims served absent FACTS dollars. It is entirely inappropriate to compare these numbers of victims with the numbers of victims served as a result of FACTS funding. Notwithstanding these methodological challenges, it is clear that overall, even if we compare FACTS funded victims served with previous total service levels, the FACTS infusion led to a something in the region of a 20 percent increase.
Put differently, the pre- and post-FACTS data we report in the graphs, including graph one, ought to be seen as a rough guide to changes in services rather than a specific measure of the precise effects of the FACTS infusion. A better, albeit more qualitative measure, is to compare how specific programs served more victims as a direct result of their FACTS funded services. A few examples illustrate this important point.

The Hawaii Family Law Clinic (Ala Kuola), in Mililani, Hawaii offered victims assistance in acquiring orders of protection, essentially extending the time frame within which those seeking orders might apply for them. Prior to the FACTS infusion, Ala Kuola served an average of 9 clients per month. On average, during the 13 month period the program received FACTS funds the program served 77 clients per months. Escalations such as these identify a significant reservoir of local need around the receipt of particular service for victims. The massive increase highlights the refinement of local services and victims’ desire to take advantage of such offerings.

The Interfaith Hospitality Network, Johnson City, Tennessee, registered one of the most significant increases in victims served. Prior to FACTS the program averaged one client per month. The FACTS infusion led to IHN partnering with two local shelters, making domestic violence services part of their offerings to homeless women and increasing their average number of victims served to 99 per month. The enormous increase reflects the introduction of life skills courses, job readiness initiatives, transportation services, and extensive counseling and emotional support services for battered women. The director commented:

* We are able to offer transportation to our clients (sheltered or non-sheltered) and their children as well as provide a worker in Greene County to assist clients in that area. Our services have more than doubled in Greene County because of the FACTS grant (Interfaith Hospitality Network, Johnson City, TN; MR, June 2007).

The Park County Crisis Center, nestled in the remote mountainous terrain of Colorado, reports something similar.

* With our improved capacity, we are able to serve more people and meet more of their needs from day to day. This translates into increased safety for our residents. (MR, April 2007).

The Zoe Institute, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, was already serving 326 victims per month, offering things like assistance with rent and utility deposits. The FACTS infusion enhanced such offerings, resulting in the program serving 402 clients per month. Put differently, FACTS funding augmented existing services, allowing the program to reach more clients.
What happened in and around Johnson City, Tennessee seems to have happened at a number of the FACTS sites. Simply put, programs report highly significant increases in services offered. These expanded offerings reflect an increased delivery of existing services and the creation of new services. Our field interviews confirm that clients have enthusiastically taken advantage of many of these services. We have now spoken face-to-face with over 100 clients in different settings and most appreciate and utilize FACTS program services. We re-emphasize, however, that we have no way of knowing precisely how many distinctive victims received the offer of services.

Notwithstanding the many methodological and data gathering difficulties, Graph 2 reflects the apparent surge in services offered to clients since the infusion of FACTS funds. Before the FACTS grant, from February to September 2006, the 39 grantees offered an average of 310 services per month. During the 13 month period of the FACTS grant, the 39 grantees offered an average of 650 services per site.
The Zoë Institute, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, succinctly articulated what we hear across the 39 programs and what Graph 2 captures:

* Before this grant, we were only able to help with items for setting up a new home. Now we can offer a much more comprehensive system of assistance by volunteers and staff now trained in domestic violence issues. (MR, June 2007).

**INQUIRIES/REQUESTS FOR PROGRAM SERVICES**

It is difficult to track precisely the number of inquiries/requests for service that arose because of FACTS funding. Program workers sometimes feel it is inappropriate to ask prospective clients how and where they learned about the program. However, program personnel clearly report an increase in inquiries/requests consequent upon the arrival of FACTS funds. Some examples help clarify how FACTS program workers arrive at this attribution. The first two illustrations come from a shelter program in Arkansas. We toured this shelter earlier in the project and conducted a focus group there. We can vouch for the firm relationship between the program staff and the local and regional faith community. As the excerpts show, the faith community appears central to generating inquiries and requests for service.

* Our shelter has been full to capacity. We have received at least eight victims as a direct result of the victim learning about our services from a brochure they received from a church or a pastor from one of the churches that we contacted through this FACTS grant project. (CASA Women’s Shelter of Pine Bluff, AR; MR, May 2007).
*We have had an increase in hotline calls this month. We feel that this is a direct result of the FACTS grant. At least 6 of the rural victims we provided services and/or hotline services to indicated that they learned about our program from either a brochure or a church where we had placed brochures. We had a client come into the shelter that said she had been abused for months but felt like she had nowhere to go. She went to a church and asked for help and the pastor of the church told her about us. We had previously visited the church and explained our services and left some brochures. This is a direct link to the FACTS grant. (CASA Women’s Shelter of Pine Bluff, AR; MR, April 2007).

The Southwest Arkansas Domestic Violence Center, DeQueen, Arkansas, cites two specific examples of clients contacting the program.

*A woman approached the FACTS coordinator at the EZ Mart store in Horatio (Sevier County). The woman needed some help. She saw the coordinator placing brochures and cards on the counter. The woman did not want to come to the shelter at this time; however she did want information for future reference. The coordinator spoke with her for 30 minutes or so and gave her brochures and other information. The coordinator also let her know they were available 24 hours a day (MR, May 2007).

*Another woman came to shelter with her two children. She had seen one of the DV posters in a bathroom at a store in Wickes, 25 miles away, and picked up one the brochures at the front counter (MR, July 2007).

At Options Incorporated, Monticello, Arkansas, the director attributed the increase in crisis calls to the acquisition of FACTS funds. At our regional technical assistance meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas, on January 19, 2007 she commented: “Since FACTS, we’ve also received an increase in crisis calls because we’re out in isolated populations.” Attendees agreed that this was a positive development because it spoke to tapping into the needs of women in remote rural settings that advocates have been aware of for a long time. However, a number of attendees also pointed out that because of the short duration of the pilot funding, it would be most unfortunate to begin to tap into this need for service, raise women's hopes and then not be able to sustain the same or a higher level of services in the future.

REACHING COMMUNITIES AND BUILDING AWARENESS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

FACTS programs have expanded existing services in rural communities and created services where none existed. Victims greatly appreciate this expansion and outreach. They then pass on word of their positive experiences to others. Faith communities played an important part in this outreach, serving as staging posts for public education, expansion of volunteer bases, a source of direct service, and so on. These faith entities seem to have worked well with secular service providers. A couple of examples from the field illustrate this process of building community awareness, especially in remote rural locations.
* Because we were able to begin expansion into another county, one victim heard of services offered and was able to escape from her abuser and bring her three children with her to the shelter. She was able to find employment and establish independent housing. She has attended parenting classes regularly and reports improved ability to care for her children. She has been very grateful and shared her story with the media, giving Safe Passage further exposure in that community. (Safe Passages, Incorporated, Melbourne, AR; MR, April 2007).

The Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence puts this growing sense of awareness into the broader context of the FACTS grant and the community itself.

* JCCDV has been able to take the mystery, unanswered questions, and shame out of domestic violence. This is a rural area with generationally entrenched ideas about male rights. Through our education programs, networking with nearly every community organization in the county from churches to factories to schools, we have brought survivors and their children’s plights out into the light. We let the community know that “hitting your woman” is not acceptable behavior.

Most survivors never really thought anyone cared about their situations. That is the lie their abusers continually drill into them to keep them broken down. Concerned community members did not know how to reach out to people experiencing domestic violence issues. The FACTS grant helped make our organization a conduit between both groups. What a privilege it was for our staff. One woman said to me, “I have hope now.”

Your funds provided advertising so victims could easily find help closer to their homes. They did not know our free services were available. We were able to connect abused persons to every kind of education resource in the state, affordable medical care, legal representation, and job opportunities. But most importantly, we were able to provide 24 hour access to a real person in their county who would listen without judging. JCCDV helped them find their way out of the terror and horror they thought they were destined to live in for the rest of their lives (MR September 2007).

The Archuleta County Victim Assistance in Pagosa Springs, Colorado reported the following as the FACTS cycle ended.

* The FACTS Grant enabled a position to continue that would have otherwise been decreased. The Prevention Education Coordinator works with area youth workers and youth to prevent violence. Since September, four schools previously not receiving violence prevention education will now be incorporating our education into their modules. Additionally, the Prevention Education Coordinator has recruited three teen members to begin a Teen Mentor Program. (MR, October 2007).

The North Kingston United Methodist Church program in Rhode Island pioneered domestic violence awareness and outreach among Baptist Churches across the state. The program's most recent report informs us:
*The Faith Alliance adapted a protocol for faith leaders in South County, planning to distribute this protocol by a mass mailing. The Rhode Island Association of American Baptist Churches sends a quarterly resource packet to ALL Baptist churches in the state: before funding, the Faith Alliance did not have the resources to provide this important protocol for that many recipients. After South County's Baptist churches received the protocol, the head office of the RI Association of American Baptist Churches called and specially requested enough protocols to go to ALL the Baptist churches in the state, and since the Faith Alliance received this funding, they were able to comply with this request. Every Baptist church in RI received the protocol, endorsed by their leaders. (MR, October 2007).

As Graph 3 shows, FACTS sub-awardees expanded their support of rural communities through education and public awareness campaigns. The 39 programs virtually doubled their community education programs offered compared to the pre-FACTS period, rising from an average of 128 to 216 per month, a 69 percent increase.

Graph 3: Community Education Programs Offered Per Month by the 39 FACTS Sub-Awardees Before (2/2006-9/2006) and During (10/2006-10/2007) the FACTS funding cycle.

This trend is also evident in brochure production and distribution (Graph 4) with the 39 programs increasing production/distribution from 2,277 before FACTS to 9,129 during the 13 months FACTS grant, reflecting a 301 percent increase.
Graph 4: Brochures Produced and Distributed Per Month by the 39 FACTS Sub-Awardees Before (2/2006-9/2006) and During (10/2006-10/2007) the FACTS funding cycle.

As with other aspects of service delivery, programs displayed considerable variation in their outreach activities. Some highlights provide a sense of these outreach activities.

The Deaf Smith County Crisis Center, Hereford, Texas, noted:

* We were able to do 27 education programs for the month of April and go to some schools in the surrounding counties we serve. Altogether we presented our program to 590 students (MR, May 2007).

Let's Talk Incorporated, Chesapeake, Virginia, reported radio publicity associated with the distribution of 500 women's health postcards for a May 5, 2007 event. The director noted, “getting a 20-minute radio interview on the Clear Channel Network for 3 radio stations that broadcast from Virginia to North Carolina” (MR, May 2007).

Many of the programs attribute growing reports of abuse to increased awareness about the availability of services. The Women's Crisis Center of Northeast Arkansas attributes the doubling of reports of sexual assault/rape since the arrival of FACTS to the “increased awareness/education activities we have been able to do. We have learned that residents in our outlying counties were largely unaware that we provided these services” (MR, June 2007).

Again, this observation speaks to a level of abuse in rural communities that is endemic and only just beginning to receive the attention it warrants.
Some programs cleverly situated their publicity about domestic violence amidst already thriving safety and prevention initiatives. For example, the YWCA of Oak Ridge expanded the “Safety City” program to include Domestic Violence Safety, Children Safety Planning and Child Abuse. The above subjects were introduced for the first time this year. The director observes:

* This is a perfect example of how the FACTS grant has helped us to provide education on Domestic Violence for children at an early age. There were two 20-hour weeklong classes for this program. There were 42 children in attendance. (MR, June 2007).

INTERAGENCY LIAISONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Domestic violence is a community problem. It costs the community to enforce domestic violence laws. When battered women access emergency medical care, the community pays a price. When children witness domestic violence and grow up with a plethora of problems, their difficulties ripple throughout society. Coordinated community responses to domestic violence arose to address the reality that such abuse is multifaceted and complex. Orchestrating community-wide interventions and multi-agency responses is generally more challenging in rural communities. People must travel greater distances to meet. Rural communities are sometimes suspicious of government intervention and anything that flies in the face of self-sufficiency. It is also the case that the tentacles of government take longer to reach rural communities. For these reasons and others it is important to note the strident measures taken by FACTS sub-awardees to engage numerous community agencies in their support and prevention endeavors.

Every FACTS sub-awardee has developed liaisons and partnerships with other agencies during the course of the grant. These collaborations enabled better communication and understanding between those charged with supporting and protecting battered women and their families and holding perpetrators accountable. Often these agencies stand in different positions to the violence and have sometimes coexisted in a state of tension. The collaborations catalyzed through the FACTS project have broken down many barriers, enhanced communication, and improved the handling of cases, including safety planning and risk management. We select just a couple of illustrations.

Break the Chain Against Domestic Violence, Gun Barrel City, Texas, reported a liaison between a local medical office and the Family Peace Project (MR, October 2007). The partnership resulted from a referral by the Chamber of Commerce. The medical office provided free vision/spine screening in the community along with information regarding health and safety, something victims could benefit from. The medical practice eventually donated $1,000 to the Family Peace Project so that staff could work with victims. Break the Chain also reported a partnership with their community McDonald’s to host birthday parties free of charge for children living in the program’s transitional housing program (MR, October 2007).
During the FACTS project a number of programs overcame turf problems with community agencies. The Zoe Institute is a case in point. In the early days of the FACTS grant, the Zoe Institute existed in a state of tension with the local shelter. A number of FACTS programs reported similar initial tensions. Now the Zoe Institute director reports an active collaboration with this same shelter, something unheard of before FACTS.

Other liaisons and networks of partnerships involve more than dyads. The Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence (JCCDV), Vernon, Indiana, works collaboratively with an impressive array of agencies. FACTS funds augmented this collaboration. JCCDV collaborates with the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Ladies Ecumenical Group, Goodwill, St. Vincent De Paul, the Township Trustees, the Good Samaritan Food Pantry, a local daycare center, and Child Protective Services, as well as enjoying a productive relationship with local criminal justice agencies.

In sum, the FACTS program and the 39 sub-awardees enhanced coordinated community responses to domestic violence, developing new partnerships and networks, all of which served victims with a vigor and passion often hitherto unseen.

**STAFF AND VOLUNTEER LABOR**

The infusion of FACTS funds allowed programs to hire new staff that in turn recruited significant numbers of volunteers to work with them. The reporting forms captured these details under the combined heading of “staff and volunteer labor.” The prestige of winning a federal grant brought kudos to the program, often elevating its standing in the community, thereby making it more attractive as a place for volunteers to commit their time and energy. The work of staff and volunteers is one of the highlights of the FACTS project. We include some excerpts below to illustrate the impact of their work.

In its last two monthly reports, the Park County Crisis Center, located in the remote mountainous region of Bailey, Colorado, informed us of the following developments regarding its volunteer base.

* Thanks to the FACTS volunteer coordinator, one of our shelter residents was able to furnish her new housing with donations. Our volunteer coordinator also recruited two very handy volunteers who have made major contributions to the repairs and maintenance of our shelter. Our volunteer coordinator recently recruited ten new direct service volunteers to work with domestic violence victims. She is also participating with an innovative “share the care” model to create a community of volunteers to help our families (MR, September 07)

* Our volunteer coordinator, who is funded through our FACTS grant, has organized a women’s church group to provide a monthly night out of the shelter for the residents. Some of the activities will be cooking and nutrition, making Christmas gifts, an Internet class and a field trip to the zoo. When necessary, childcare will be provided (MR, October 2007).
We conducted a focus group at the Bailey location, interviewing staff, volunteers and clients alike. Without exception, all people at the table talked of how the program, energized with FACTS funds, made a crucial contribution to overcoming isolation. The networks and links established through the FACTS infusion will have lasting effects in this community, providing hope for victims where none existed before.

At the CASA Women’s Shelter, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, volunteer labor helped raise donations to support victims in their pursuit of education. Our focus group interviews at this location revealed growing volunteer support for many of the young African-American women in shelter. The FACTS infusion contributed greatly to the expansion of the volunteer base. Young, African-American women reported feeling comfortable with the faith-friendly climate at the shelter, telling us they had felt rejected at other shelters where they had perceived a need to subdue or repress their religious sensibilities. The majority of young African-American women in the focus reported moving beyond a life of drugs and violence, instead marshalling their resources to expand their educational opportunities.

*The F.A.C.T.S. grant has provided us with contacts and new donation resources to help us with back-to-school needs. We had donations of school supplies, backpacks, uniforms, and cash to assist in getting our clients and several former clients back into school. We also have a client (age 18) in our shelter that is a high school senior (MR, August 2007).*

All these examples reflect the reality that the FACTS infusion swelled the staff and volunteer base at the 39 sites. As we have already noted, it is inappropriate in some ways to make comparisons of the raw numbers for deliverables pre- and post the-FACTS infusion. Notwithstanding these reservations, graph 5 conveys a sense of numerical increase in the volunteer base across the programs.

---

**Graph 5: The Number of Staff and Volunteers at the 39 FACTS Sub-Awardee Programs Before (2/2006-9/2006) and During (10/2006-10/2007) the FACTS funding cycle.**
FACTS programs’ interactions with faith communities have been extensive and rewarding. The faith communities linked to the FACTS sites provided enormous amounts of volunteer labor, essential resources, and often provided spiritual support as women moved forward. As Safeline Incorporated, Chelsea, Vermont reported, “The faith community outreach continues to be incredibly successful. Many new volunteers have emerged from these partnerships, as well as relief funds and resources” (MR, May 2007).

Many FACTS programs have reached out to work with clergy by offering them workshops on domestic violence. For example, Safe Passage Incorporated expanded services into Fulton County, Arkansas, by establishing the Fulton County Family Abuse Inter-Faith Coalition. Before the Coalition was formed, no services or shelters existed in that county. The initial meeting included constructive communication between law enforcement, churches and other key stakeholders. Since the Coalition’s establishment, they have seen a marked increase in referrals.

Ozer Ministries, East Palestine, Ohio, reported running a booth at an interagency collaboration meeting for service providers in Columbiana County. The regional mental health department and the juvenile court sponsored the event. Indeed, during the second five months of FACTS, a number of liaisons emerged involving collaboration between secular authorities such as criminal justice agencies and religious/spiritual authorities.

The North Kingston United Methodist Church in Rhode Island, reported a most impressive Interfaith Conference titled, “Addressing Domestic Violence: A Faith Based Approach.” According to feedback received, the conference was a resounding success. The pastor administrating the grant writes:

* Over 50 representatives from the Muslim, Jewish, Protestant, Catholic, and Christian community came together in agreement that nothing in their faith traditions condoned domestic violence. It was a beautiful and harmonious day, as keynote speaker Kristen Leslie spoke about the issues of forgiveness, covenant, and pastoral care for victims of domestic violence. Participants also attended workshops on Teen Dating Violence, Legal Matters for Clergy, Sexual Violence, Incorporating Domestic Violence Awareness into Daily Worship, and Intimate Violence in the Gay and Lesbian Community (MR, May 2007).

The Archuleta County Victim Assistance Program convened a Religious Response to Domestic Violence training. Twenty people participated including six local faith leaders from large and small congregations alike. (See MR, May 2007).

The FACTS sites have worked extremely hard to create a climate that accommodates the diversity of women’s religious beliefs. Roughly one-third of the programs were faith-based. Among the remaining two-thirds, the community programs were amenable to working with issues of faith and religiosity. Given that nearly all the women we interviewed in focus groups indicated a belief in God, such openness is clearly important. The religious and spiritual sensitivities of the FACTS initiative blends well with the extensive, and in many
settings, entirely novel offering of a complex array of material supports.

We have learned a lot from FACTS clients about their religious and spiritual sensibilities and the way these sensibilities inform decision making about surviving violent and controlling relationships. It is essential that advocates and faith communities grasp the significance of battered women's religious sensibilities. Our position is that if these sensibilities are meaningful to women, then an awareness and sensitivity to them should be essential components of preventive intervention strategies.

Through our focus group conversations with FACTS clients, it emerged that many women distinguish between the church/formal religion and their own spirituality. This distinction often helps them frame the conflict between official religious doctrine concerning divorce and their personal decisions to divorce abusive and violent men. Most women agreed, “Their God did not want them to be abused.”

We have, however, observed a distinct difference between Catholic women in the Southwest and other Christian denominations in the Southeast and Midwest. The Catholic women were quite clear that, despite the formal rejection of divorce by the Church, their decision to divorce did not conflict with their relationship to God. Rather, their beliefs and feelings of closeness to God gave them the strength and courage to carry on under extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

In contrast, some of the Southern Baptist, Pentecostal, Church of Christ, and Jehovah’s Witnesses women living in the Southeast and Midwest believed that divorce because of physical abuse was not acceptable. While they could leave their marriages temporarily without jeopardizing their spiritual standing, they could not divorce. Additionally, many women viewed their histories of abuse by parents, strangers, and multiple partners as both a reflection of their own bad choices and an aspect of God’s plan for them. As they progressed through their lives, they began to understand their prior abuse as a mechanism for spiritual development that led them closer to their true nature and to God.

Women also discussed the ways that sharing religious beliefs with other women helped form a community of support within shelters and within their churches. Apart from scripture or specific preachers or ministers, women found the religious sensibilities of other women to be a source of support. They felt the isolation they had experienced within abusive homes was broken by their friendships with other women. At the same time, other shelters or programs in the region that had prohibited discussion of religion, Bible study, or prayer groups were described as mimicking the abusive control exercised by intimate partners.

Differences of opinion emerged regarding the issue of “forgiveness.” Due in part to their upbringing and the unsupportive reactions of their husbands, parents, and clergy, women struggled with guilt over ending their marriages and bringing pain to their children. Many relied on beliefs about God’s forgiveness to nurture self-forgiveness. All women believed that forgiveness was a positive goal encouraged by their religious beliefs, but some women felt they could not extend forgiveness to the man who had forced them and their children to live in fear, poverty, and uncertainty.
BUILDING CAPACITY/SUSTAINABILITY

FACTS was designed to kick-start a number of supportive interventions for battered women in rural regions that have hitherto received no federal funding. By definition, these operations had small budgets and a limited infrastructure. In what follows, we convey a sense of the energy programs have expended in raising funds, increasing donations, and writing and receiving grant money. In total, programs have raised a minimum of $1,292,797 in grant funds as a result of their FACTS funding. Put simply, FACTS funding enabled these programs to write grants. In addition, having a FACTS grant increased the prestige and credibility of FACTS programs, putting them in a stronger position to apply for further grant funding.

Graph 6 reports a steady increase in the number of FACTS programs both applying for and receiving public and private funds prior to and during the grant cycle. Again, comparisons of funding sought and received before and during FACTS are not really appropriate to make. However, it is clear that sub-awardees applied for more public and private funding during the FACTS cycle than prior to it. Receipt of private funds increased slightly during the FACTS cycle compared with the period prior to it.

The programs report their own growth in more nuanced ways. The following excerpts illustrate the catalytic effects of the FACTS infusion.

*In the last six months, we have been able to triple our funding. We have also been able to provide more services, more service hours and more case management, education and prevention activities in the community. We feel that having the support of OVW has been*
remarkable because it increased our standing in the eyes of funding agencies (Comité Cívico Del Valle, Inc., Brawley, CA; MR, June 2007).

In its next monthly report, the Comité Cívico Del Valle reported partnering with the cities of Coachella and Calexico to offer services to victims. The director observed:

* We feel that we have become a leader locally in our efforts, and there are a lot of people that know the work that we do. We are experiencing the biggest growth and recognition in the community since the organization started back in 1987 (MR, July 2007).

Increasing the budget and community profile of these FACTS programs reaps rich rewards in other areas. As reputations develop, community awareness increases, and the programs help more women and families, potential donors are much more willing to give. Mary’s House in Pickens, South Carolina told us:

* The FACTS grant increased community awareness about domestic violence. It also encouraged the community to fund our program. We will use the recent funding to purchase top-of-the-line appliances for the house, a playground for the children, computers for the women, and to help furnish a handicap-accessible room (MR, May 2007).

But the benefits did not stop here. In their weekly teleconference call (August 2, 2007), Mary’s House staff reported receiving a $30,000 donation from a local car dealer. According to the director, the car dealer donated because of the improved status and reputation of the program. The staff member attributed this windfall to the FACTS infusion. As she recalled, “it was because the government was willing to fund us. This gave us more credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of that car dealer.”

The CASA Women’s Shelter of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, was one of many more sites that reported the synergistic effects of the FACTS infusion. They noted:

* We have received at least 9 donations this month from people who learned about our program from the FACTS project (MR, May 2007).

The San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center, Alamosa, Colorado, was awarded double the VALE (Victim Assistance and Law Enforcement) funds it received the previous fiscal year, increasing revenue from $5,250 to $10,500. The director noted:

* We attribute this to our FACTS grant and the fact that we were able to go from a quarter time position to a half-time position. This has helped tremendously in having more time with our clients and doing more outreach in the community (MR, June 2007).

If we combine the money raised through grants and donations during the FACTS funding period to date, the amount approximates half of the total federal funds initially disseminated to the 39 sites. Put simply, this is a remarkable return on the federal dollar at the same time as constituting a major boost for individual programs and their respective rural communities.
DIFFICULTIES AND CHALLENGES

FACTS sub-awardees are small organizations in rural communities and most have faced a number of difficulties and challenges. These include but are not limited to the following:

* **Training Volunteers**: more needs to be done on providing proper training for volunteers at the sites.

* **Mentoring**: The small number of mentoring programs at the FACTS sites are in their infancy and need more support in working with battered women.

* **Cross training between clergy and advocates**: while advocates have trained significant numbers of clergy, we need to increase the awareness of advocates to the compromises clergy face in working with battered women and their families. Put simply, this dialogue, if it is to move forward, needs to be more of a two-way street.

* **Working with battered women with Limited English Proficiency**: this is a major challenge. However, some sites have made great progress in this regard.

* **Transitional Housing**: We have learned just what a huge issue this is in the lives of battered women in remote rural communities.

* **Childcare**: this remains a significant issue in rural communities. It is especially difficult for women to enter the labor market without childcare support.

* **Virtual Visitation**: We need a concerted discussion about the pros and cons of using virtual visitation centers in rural areas particularly with regard to cost saving and safety planning.

* **Human Trafficking**: As FACTS proceeds we are increasingly aware of the plight and unique difficulties trafficked women face. We need much more work on this pressing issue in rural communities.
APPENDICES

FACTS RELATED MEDIA PRODUCTS

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES


INFORMATION/BROCHURES

*Domestic Violence Bookmarks,* Safeline, Chelsea, VT.

*Safeline Ensemble* at the UU Church in Washington Vermont-July 22, 2007, Safeline, Chelsea, VT.

*Domestic Violence Brochure,* Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

*“Walking Together: Churches and communities working to end the cycle of violence”* Western Racine, Burlington, WI.

*Volunteer application,* Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.


*Women’s Health Extravaganza,* May 5, 2007, Let’s Talk, Chesapeake, VA.

*Safety Plan for Victims of Domestic Violence,* Monroe STOPe, Madisonville, TN.
Information brochure, Ozer Ministries, East Palestine, OH.

Public Service Announcement, how to recognize unsafe relationships, Safe Families, Macoupin Community Health, Carlinville, IL.

“The Next Time Could be the last”, Judge Kenneth Deihl, speaker, Tuesday, April 17
Safe Families, Macoupin Community Health, Carlinville, IL.

Domestic Violence: What congregations need to know. North Kingston, North Kingston, RI.

Teen resource guide, Safeline, Chelsea, VT.

What is consent? Safeline, Chelsea, VT.

DV affects the entire community, Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

Effects of DV on children, Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

Responding to DV: A guideline for clergy, Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

Facts on Children and DV, Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

Respect your elders, Newton County DAWN, Jasper, AR.

Important information for victims of DV, Interfaith Hospitality, Johnson City, TN.

Mini Seminar Schedule, Southwest Arkansas, DeQueen, AR.

Screening Tool in card form, Monroe STOPe, Madisonville, TN.

Dating K.I.S.S. –Keep it safe and simple, Monroe STOPe, Madisonville, TN.

Billboard on signs of Domestic Violence, Monroe STOPe, Madisonville, TN.

Addressing Domestic Violence A Faith Based Approach Conference, Thursday April 26, 2007- North Kingston, North Kingston, RI.

FACTS SUB-AWARDEES

Amherst County Against Domestic Violence, Amherst, VA

Archuleta County Victim Assistance Program, Inc., Pagosa Springs, CO

Blount County CASA, Oneonta, AL
Break the Chain Against Domestic Violence, Gun Barrel City, TX and Family Peace Project, Athens, TX

CASA Women's Shelter, Pine Bluff, AR

Comité Cívico Del Valle, Inc., Brawley, CA

Deaf Smith County Crisis Center, Hereford, TX

Desert Rose Foundation, Inc., Martinsville, IN

Elijah Haven Crisis Intervention Center, Inc., LaGrange, IN

Esther's Haven House, Inc., New Orleans, LA

Hawaii Family Law Clinic dba Ala Kuola, Mililani, HI

Hill Country Community Needs Council, Fredericksburg, TX

Holy Family Catholic Church, Booneville, KY

Interfaith Hospitality Network of Greater Johnson City, Johnson City, TN

Iva's Place, Inc., Lenoir City, TN

Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence, Vernon, IN

Let's Talk, Inc., Chesapeake, VA

Macoupin Community Health Centers, Inc., Carlinville, IL

Mary's House, Pickens, SC

Mercy Ministries Shelter for Battered Women and Children, Cheraw, SC

Monroe County Community Health Access Committee, Madisonville, TN

Newton County Domestic Abuse Women's Network (D.A.W.N.), Jasper, AR

North Kingstown United Methodist Church, North Kingstown, RI

Options, Inc., Monticello, AR

Ozer Ministries, East Palestine, OH

Park County Crisis Center, Inc., Bailey, CO
Rural Enrichment and Counseling Headquarters, Inc. (REACH), Hawley, MN
Safe Haven of Person County, Inc., Roxboro, NC
Safe Passage, Inc., Melbourne, AR
Safeline, Inc., Chelsea, VT
San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center, Alamosa, CO
Southwest Arkansas Domestic Violence Center, De Queen, AR
United Way of Colleton County, Walterboro, SC
Western Racine County Family Violence Community Coalition, Burlington, WI
Women's Crisis Center of Northeast Arkansas, Inc., Jonesboro, AR
Women's Mountain Passages, Quincy, CA
Women's Shelter of Hope, Inc., Hialeah, FL
YWCA of Oak Ridge, TN, Oak Ridge, TN
Zoe Institute, Tahlequah, OK


6 See especially, Fortune and Enger, 2005; Gray-Reneberg, 1996.


Matthew Dale, Project Liaison, Office of Victims Services, Montana; Byron Johnson, Project Director, Baylor University; Elizabeth Kelly, Project Coordinator, Baylor University; Leah Gatlin, Administrative Associate, Baylor University; Neil Websdale, Project Consultant, Northern Arizona University; Rhonda Martinson, Project Consultant, Battered Women’s Justice Project; Kathleen Ferraro, Project Consultant, Northern Arizona University; Barbara J. Hart, JD, Legal Consultant.

See for example, Websdale, 1998.

For example, we connected with many religious organizations such as the Jewish Women’s Foundation, and Lutheran Social Services.

For example, we connected with many religious organizations such as the Jewish Women’s Foundation, and Lutheran Social Services.

For example, we connected with many religious organizations such as the Jewish Women’s Foundation, and Lutheran Social Services.

This list includes groups such as: National Sexual Violence Resource Center, Nursing Network on Violence Against Women, Guidestar.org, charitynavigator.org, aardvarc.org, Toolkit to end Violence against Women, Feminist Majority Foundation, and Praxis International.


We divided the programs into four geographical regions. Representatives from programs in each region participated in one teleconference per month with the FACTS team. This meant that the FACTS team listened to and provided technical assistance to sub-awardees on a weekly basis. Our approach also encouraged communication between sub-awardees.

We instituted the four regional meetings as a means of getting to know sub-awardees and to hear their field experiences against the backdrop of the other programs. We contend these interpersonal arrangements encouraged sharing, problem-solving, and mutual support. The regional configuration of the meetings enabled us to minimize the costs of activities not originally foreseen in the budget. These meetings took place in Little Rock, AR, January 18-20; Knoxville, TN, February 22-24; Denver, CO, March 22-23; Cincinnati, OH, April 19-20, 2007.

We attended the following sites: Park County Crisis Center, Bailey, CO; San Luis Valley Immigrant Resource Center, Alamosa, CO; Desert Rose Foundation Inc., Martinsville, IN; Jennings County Council on Domestic Violence, Vernon, IN; Family Peace Project, Athens, TX; Break the Chain of Domestic Violence, Gun Barrel City, TX; Ester's Haven House Inc., New Orleans, LA; Hawai'i Family Law Clinic, Mililani, HI. Pine Bluff, AR; Brawley, CA; Johnson City, TN; Lenoir City, TN; Madisonville, TN; Monticello, AR; Oak Ridge, TN.

We use pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of clients.


The monthly reporting form designed by NIJ in conjunction with specialists at OVW asked FACTS sub-awardees to report only those victims served with FACTS funds, something we assume the programs did.