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I. FUNDING IN NORTH CAROLINA

In the state of North Carolina, domestic violence and sexual assault programs receive money from state appropriations and federal block grants. State funding for domestic violence includes state appropriations to a general fund, dedicated funding from marriage license fees, and new legislation placing fees on out-of-state lawyers practicing in North Carolina. Sexual assault programs, on the other hand, only receive state funding from legislative appropriations, which has not increased since it was first introduced. The North Carolina Council for Women & Domestic Violence Commission administers these appropriations to support domestic violence offices and shelters and sexual assault rape crisis response centers.

The Domestic Violence grant program, funded with state appropriated dollars, endeavors to make domestic violence services available to all victims by funding one program in each participating county. In FY 2003-2004, each participating county received $29,500. The marriage license fee was approved by the General Assembly in 1991 for the creation of the Domestic Violence Center Fund. A portion of the $40 fee on all marriage license certificates in the state of North Carolina is deposited into this fund each quarter and is distributed to all qualified applicants. For FY 2003-2004, each agency received approximately $13,000. The out-of-state lawyer fees were approved as part of House Bill 1354, Strengthen Domestic Violence Laws, which passed on July 14, 2004. The collected fees will be allocated to approved legal assistance programs. Twenty percent will be equally distributed to each qualifying program and 80 percent will be divided according to the rate of civil actions of domestic violence in that county.

However, while there are three relatively stable sources of state funding for domestic violence related programs, sexual assault agencies only receive $842,500 in state appropriations, a level that has not increased since 1994. Rape crisis response centers approved for appropriation funds receive equal funding, which ranges from $11,000 and $17,000 annually. Many of these programs (all but about 12 of the total 65 programs) are housed in the same agency as domestic violence services. Some providers express the sentiment that this creates a secondary commitment to fundraising for sexual assault issues; the reasons are complex and vary, some believing that the issue is less popular and therefore harder to fundraise for, and
others believing that the nature and volume of sexual assaults requires fewer resources to support services.

**Chart 1: State Funding Sources for Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>ADMINISTERING AGENCY</th>
<th>ANNUAL AMOUNT TO PARTICIPATING AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>Council for Women &amp; Domestic Violence Commission</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marriage license fees</td>
<td>CWDVC</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out-of-state lawyer fees</td>
<td>CWDVC</td>
<td>future funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>CWDVC</td>
<td>$11-17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal block grants are distributed through the state by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the NC Council for Women, and the North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission. DHHS administers the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVP) grant. The FVP grant program provides the state with a block grant to assist programs that prevent family violence and provide immediate shelter and assistance to family violence victims and dependents. No less than 70 percent of this $2.2 million grant must contribute to providing immediate shelter. Ten percent of the grant must be reserved for tribes and tribal organizations and another ten percent for state domestic violence coalitions.

DHHS also receives Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) funding for Rape Prevention Education from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In the past, the money passed through DHHS and was distributed by the NC Council for Women; however, beginning July 1, 2004, DHHS began allocating these funds directly. Approximately $99,000 of
Rape Prevention Education money funds the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault (NCCASA). The rest of the money is split evenly among sexual assault programs, providing between $12,000 and $16,000 to each.

The N.C. Governor’s Crime Commission distributes the federal block grants from the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC): the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). VOCA funds may only be used for direct services to crime victims. A portion of these funds are distributed according to the level of services provided by the applicant agency. In FY 2003-2004, agencies with an office and shelter received $49,000, those with just an office received $27,000, and satellite offices qualified for $14,000. VAWA funds, on the other hand, support law enforcement, prosecution and court advocacy initiatives and victim services, and are distributed on a competitive basis.

Another very small source of funding for sexual assault programs is federal Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) funding of approximately $197,000. This money for rape prevention predates VAWA funding and has not increased over time. It amounts to approximately $2,000 for each program in the state and is often added to the state appropriates for distribution. These funds are administered by the Council for Women.

NOTE: Information about other federal grants for DV and SA agencies, coalitions, and related programs, is available through the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Their website, located at http://www.nrcdv.org/funding.html, provides a comprehensive list of Federal and Violence Against Women grants, links to the State Funding Matrix, and other valuable funding links.
II. FUNDING IN OTHER U.S. STATES

Throughout the country, a variety of funding sources are used to support domestic violence programs, shelters, legal services, prevention and intervention, and education and training. State funding source include:

- Birth certificate fees
- Court fines/fees
- Death certificate fees
- Divorce certificate fees
- General funds
- Jury service contributions
- Marriage license fees
- Permanent fund dividends
- Special funds
- Tax contributions and credits
- Tax on sales/transactions
- Trust funds

Appendix 1 outlines the different sources of state funding and the corresponding states in which they are utilized. Half of all states support domestic violence through general funds and over 33 states support DV through general and/or special funds, which are the most commonly used sources of funding. The second most widely used source of funding throughout the country is a marriage license certificate fee. Twenty-eight states, including North Carolina, donate all or a portion of a fee on marriage licenses to domestic violence services. Court fees or fines are also a common source of funding being implemented in twenty-four states. The uses of these funds include supporting DV related centers/programs, legal assistance/services, shelters, training/education, and victim compensation.

The states with the most diversity in statewide funding sources are Florida and Hawaii (five sources each). In addition to the common court fee/fine and marriage license fee, Florida’s system also includes a divorce certificate fee, a jury service contribution option, and an optional county tax on food and beverage sales. The $18 fee from each divorce certificate is applied to the state’s Domestic Violence Trust Fund. The jury service contribution program provides an opportunity for jurors to

---

Highlight

In 1998, the Hawaiian legislature implemented a mandatory compensation fee to support its Crime Victim Compensation Commission (CVCC). By FY 2001, fees of $100 for felonies, $50 for misdemeanors, and $25 for petty misdemeanor convictions, contributed to over $650,000 for the CVCC. The estimated potential of these fees could have reached almost a million dollars if judges had assessed the fees in all appropriate cases and all the money was collected.
voluntarily donate their jury service fee to domestic violence shelters. Finally, counties have the option to implement a sales tax on food and beverages sold in establishments that are licensed to sell alcohol. Money raised goes to the county’s local DV agency.\textsuperscript{ix} Hawaii, on the other hand, has been successful in setting aside money from certification fees. For example, it is the only state using a death certificate fee to support domestic violence and it is one of only two and one of four states to implement a birth certificate fee and a divorce certificate fee, respectively. (See Appendix 1)

Another unique program to raise state funding is implemented by Nebraska, which places a documentary stamp fee on all real estate transactions. This money supports the state’s Homeless Assistance Trust Fund, which benefits homeless shelters. The NC Housing Coalition is also looking into this option and domestic violence advocates may want to work closely with them during this process.

The funding streams above illustrate how some states are thinking more creatively about the need for greater state funding for domestic violence. North Carolina’s recent legislation (discussed previously) indicates that advocates in the state are also thinking creatively about accessing legal assistance funds. Implementing a fee on out-of-state lawyers avoids many of the common objections to increasing state funding. However, it is still surprising that North Carolina has not yet developed court fees/fines as a source of funding, in light of the fact that almost half of all U.S. states are accessing DV funding through this source. During past discussions about the idea, the Administrative Office of the Courts opposed expanding the use of court fees/fines for earmarked programs because of personnel shortages and the high costs associated with collecting such fees. However, as current state dollars are being stretched further in the future, advocates may want to consider lobbying in this direction more strongly. A comparison should be made between the costs of collecting these fees and the estimated revenue from the fees in order to determine whether this is a viable option.
III. FOUNDATION FUNDING

A report for the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation by Third Space Studio analyzed national and state foundation funding for women’s issues and organizations. According to this report, 24 national foundations cite women’s services and centers as funding priorities. In the three years reviewed by Third Space Studio, national funders gave a total of $20 million to North Carolina non-profit organizations, of which, $143,600 went to domestic violence and $355,00 to women services/centers, and none to sexual assault programs.\textsuperscript{x}

The following table lists some of the grants made by national organizations to North Carolina domestic violence agencies in 2002:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUNDATION</th>
<th>GRANT VALUE</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baxter International</td>
<td>$83,600</td>
<td>Family Services of McDowell County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight Foundation</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Turning Point of Jackson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Foundation</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Avery Citizens Against Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Express</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Women’s Resource Center of Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altria Group, Inc.</td>
<td>$6,000-$10,000</td>
<td>Funded eleven different programs throughout North Carolina in 2003. Five programs in 2002.\textsuperscript{xi}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other donors interested in women’s domestic violence issues include:

- Avon Foundation
- Public Welfare Foundation
- Duke Endowment
- Kate B. Reynolds Foundation
- Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation
- Cannon Foundation
- Sisters of Mercy
- Sunshine Lady Foundation
- Target Foundation
- Altria
- Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina Foundation
North Carolina donors interested in women’s sexual assault issues include:

- Duke Endowment
- Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation
- Janirve Foundation

The Third Space Studio report also notes that “of all the local women’s centers and local domestic violence and sexual assault agencies in the state, only one reports that more than 20% of their total revenues is from individual donors: the Women’s Center of Greensboro.” Therefore, it appears that many programs may be relying heavily upon foundation grants and state and federal funds.

The relatively limited foundation funding for domestic violence and sexual assault programs in North Carolina suggests that foundations are not a reliable source of funding for direct services. In addition, foundation grants are generally accessed by the largest DV/SA agencies and those with the most skilled grant-writing staff. On the other hand, there are many agencies in North Carolina that would benefit greatly from foundation funds, but do not have the time, experience, and/or expertise to write successful grant proposals. Additionally, agencies that do receive foundation funding for specific projects or programs are often unable to continue providing those programs after the foundation grant period is ended. Therefore, many of the current funding practices do not contribute to the sustainability of programs or services. Further, while foundation grants provide large and valuable grants to some of the most well-resourced agencies in the state, they remain widely inaccessible to many agencies in critical need of funds.

Outlined below and explained further in later sections, are methods by which foundations could play a valuable role in funding capacity building within domestic violence and sexual assault agencies:

**Sharing Resources**

1. Providing incentive grants to agencies within a geographic area that are willing to collaborate and take advantage of economies of scale through minimizing duplication
of programs, sharing information, and providing complementary services and transportation for victims.

2. Supporting further analysis of a statewide/regional phone line(s) and assisting with implementation of any positive recommendations.

3. Supporting a consultant who could help develop a system for exchanging information and ideas on a statewide basis.

**Billing Secondary Payers**

4. Funding an analysis of the potential to connect domestic violence and sexual assault agencies to the state mental health plan and to reimburse services through Medicaid or private insurers would be extremely valuable. If evaluation results indicate this would be a valuable direction in which to move, foundations could provide assistance at the state or local level to develop the capacity for agencies to bill for services rendered to victims.

5. Acting as advocates, interested foundations and the business community should encourage the state to put more resources into researching ways to explore the potential of billing secondary payers for counseling and other services provided by domestic violence and sexual assault agencies.

**Fundraising and Business Ventures**

6. Funding business venture consultants who could provide analysis and recommendations regarding venture possibilities to individual agencies throughout the state.

7. Support development positions within agencies and provide incentives to agencies focused on expanding their community fundraising efforts.
IV. POTENTIAL STRATEGIES FOR SHARING RESOURCES

The following ideas suggest strategies that statewide DV and SA stakeholders should consider to share resources and, thus decrease costs. This is not an argument to decrease overall funding. Rather, it proposes methods for decreasing costs in an effort to free up resources to support existing demands for services. Sharing resources could help alleviate some of the constraints faced by local DV and SA programs because of insufficient funding levels.

Example 1: Statewide/Regional 24-hour Response Phone Line(s)

In the summer of 2003, the NC Council on Women and Domestic Violence Commission conducted a survey of domestic violence and sexual assault programs to assess hotline coverage and to determine support for centralized/regional state phone line(s). Twenty-four hour crisis phone lines are expensive and difficult to staff. In addition, as a part of accessing funds, the NC Council for Women requires local DV/SA agencies to adhere to the following hotline guidelines: a trained advocate answers the hotline during normal business hours, and at all times, if possible; answering machines are never to be used; and an answering service should be used outside of business hours, if necessary. It was suggested that a statewide/regional phone line(s) could minimize some of the challenges local organizations face in meeting these requirements with limited staff and resources.

The 2003 survey found that only 58 percent of calls to DV/SA hotlines between 7pm and 8am were received by a trained advocate. A statewide/regional hotline(s) could potentially provide much more widespread services for victims. For example, victims in every area of the state could speak directly with a DV/SA volunteer/professional at any time. For victims in need of local assistance, the statewide responder could redirect the calls to local organizations. Further, the statewide phone line could provide bilingual services, in Spanish and English, to all callers. Organizations that struggle to serve Spanish-speaking victims could also refer them to the statewide phone line to facilitate better assistance. A statewide phone line service could also require that all advocates be trained to respond to the needs of both domestic violence and sexual assault victims.
A statewide/regional phone line could also benefit local agencies. It could eliminate the challenges organizations face in staffing and paying for a 24-hour phone line. Instead, volunteer/professional time and program money could be redirected to other services and programs.

Many agencies responded to the 2003 NC Council on Women survey with concerns about a statewide/regional phone line. Most felt that speaking with an advocate that understands local information and issues is invaluable. However, many agency directors also suggested that a statewide/regional hotline(s) could be useful as a complementary service to existing phone lines. As a complementary service, it could fill in during volunteer shortages and after hours. During an interview, one agency director suggested it could be a very valuable method for reaching many victims who would not call back if they received a busy line or answering system.

The information provided by the survey respondents is very valuable. Despite their objection to replacing local hotlines, further analysis should continue regarding this issue and the responses should guide the discussion. Connecting victims with advocates is very important, and if a statewide/regional phone line(s) has the potential to expand access for victims, this idea should be pursued. An analysis of statewide/regional phone line costs, including implementation, advocate training, and annual service costs, could provide more information about the relationship between costs and benefits of the phone line. Research could also reflect the potential of providing additional services to many more Spanish-speaking victims.

Lastly, a statewide/regional phone line(s) may garner support from foundations, which are increasingly interested in programs that endeavor to lower program costs and minimize duplication of services. In addition, Verizon Foundation has become nationally active in soliciting grant requests for domestic violence prevention and education projects and supported NCCADV in 2004. As a phone service provider, it may be particularly interested in partnering on this project.
Example 2: Information Exchange

Another source of resource sharing that could be extremely beneficial and relatively low cost is a coordinated information exchange through which agencies could share ideas, express concerns, and gain assistance from other DV/SA community stakeholders. The NC Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NC CADV) has discussed developing this type of information sharing program, but has not yet determined the best method to move forward. This is an area where foundation support could be very useful. A grant could support the costs of an outside consultant to develop this information exchange process.

Through the exchange of information, agencies that are considering introducing new programs or services in their community could communicate directly with stakeholders who have already successfully developed a similar program. The shared experience could help the new program development avoid pitfalls and learn about successful approaches to achieving the end goal. In the long run, this could save money if obstacles are avoided or if more efficient approaches are developed.

Example 3: Regional/Satellite Program Coordination

Albemarle Hopeline is a good example of an agency in North Carolina that successfully implemented satellite programs to reach victims in rural parts of North Carolina that cannot support their own DV/SA agencies. Albemarle Hopeline provides a regional service which benefits from economies of scale. It saves money by minimizing the number of personnel needed for each service provided and using one shelter to serve a large area. Other parts of the state utilize this strategy for service delivery and it warrants investigation for further possible expansion, particularly in historically underserved areas.

For example, in other areas of the state, there may be agencies that provide similar services in a relatively close area. By working together to minimize duplication of services, agencies can offer unique services that serve multiple provider areas. One process for implementing this could include identifying areas where there is one large agency and several smaller surrounding agencies. If grant administrators and foundations worked together to
provide financial incentives to agencies willing to work towards this type of collaboration, they
may be able to overcome short term obstacles and benefit from longer-term savings.

V. STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING ACCESS TO RESOURCES

Billing for services: Medicaid and other secondary payers

Some adults and children who receive services from DV and SA agencies have private
insurance. Many do not, either due to reasons associated with being victimized, and, for reasons
similar to many North Carolinians who do not have private insurance. Many women who
receive services from these agencies are eligible for Medicaid services. Younger victims may
also qualify for CHIP (Children’s Health Insurance Program). If mental health parity laws are
passed, and there is growing support for this, the number of victims who could be covered with
private insurance will increase dramatically. If properly structured, the services provided by
these DV and SA organizations could qualify for reimbursement by secondary payers.
Therefore, agencies providing such services have the potential to recover/underwrite some of the
costs. Currently, only a very limited number of programs in North Carolina are benefiting from
this source of funding. Most of them are very large organizations that provide services extending
beyond domestic violence and sexual assault assistance. Mental health reform presents
opportunities for more agencies to bill for the services they provide. While it may not make sense
for individual agencies to pursue these funds, the new regional structure of the mental health
system is designed to make this more and more likely. The domestic violence and sexual assault
community would be wise to work closely with area programs in order to see that this happens.
A good use of foundation funding would be for the design of such a system.

Many of the challenges to billing for services are related to bad experiences with the
existing mental health system and confusion about the new state mental health plan. The
perception by some providers is that under the new plan, only the most serious mental health
corns can be reimbursed and that the majority of victims will be diagnosed with adjustment
disorders, or other disorders which are not included in the mental health plan.
However, the mental illnesses targeted for coverage under the plan include Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), major depressive disorder, and other disorders common among victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. The target population under the new plan includes those whose functional status is assessed using the Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) and who have a qualifying score. There is good reason to believe that if screened, many victims would have qualifying scores.

Likewise there is broader eligibility for those with substance abuse disorders and those with developmental disabilities. A recent study indicated that 99 percent of all domestic violence programs served at least one woman with a developmental disability in the previous year. Disability status can also qualify many people for services and these victims could potentially benefit if DV programs could recover money spent to improve services for this population. Pregnant women, homeless women, women of child bearing age, and women involved in the criminal justice system are also a special priority under the plan. Although accessing the mental health system for victims of domestic violence and/or sexual assault can be frustrating because of paper work, licensing and eligibility requirements, the system is going through tremendous change, which can also create opportunities.

Under reform, local management entities (LME’s) are replacing Area Programs, which used to both provide direct services, and pay for services. The LME will no longer offer direct services; instead they are responsible for establishing a network of local providers who will deliver services for which they will be reimbursed.

The provider network can include private providers, non-profits and even other public agencies, all of which can now bill public as well as private sources. Each LME has a local plan, which includes plans for both prevention and outreach. Under this system programs can seek to become either direct service providers or develop relationships with new service providers who can bill through the LME or to private insurers. It is imperative that DV and SA agencies play an active role in the local LME planning process, which is supposed to include plans for serving high-risk populations.
However, most DV and SA agencies do not have the staff resources necessary to take part in this planning process. In addition, negotiating this kind of arrangement may require a skill set that does not exist in all domestic violence and sexual assault agencies. This is an area where a strategic planning process that includes outside funders, coalitions and advocates would be helpful.

Another problem stakeholders could face in the effort to bill for services is that under the new state mental health plan, local management entities (LME) won’t contract out to organizations that don’t have the internal capacity to bill for services. The majority of DV/SA agencies in the state lack available staff time and resources to develop the capacity to bill. Developing this capacity is not an effective use of resources for small and medium sized agencies, which would not reimburse enough services to justify this cost. However developing statewide or regional capabilities might be cost effective.

There are models in other states where public and private foundations developed capacity to allow small agencies to bill for service through larger entities. This is a potential leadership role that foundations and/or government agencies can play. An advantage of such a system is that this kind of centralization allows government entities to make better use of both public and private funds to meet federal match requirements.

Foundations could also help programs build capacity to provide reimbursable services by helping them meet the service provider qualifications. Only services rendered by trained professionals, such as those with a Master of Social Work, are reimbursable. However, many organizations cannot afford to pay these licensed providers. Therefore, in addition to capacity building, programs may need to support cover the up-front costs of hiring a trained professional. This process would have the added benefits of both improving services to victims and assuring funders that dollars are going to effective programs.

The state mental health plan is an evolving document. Through advocacy at the state level, both the target population and the service definitions can be adjusted to increase the number of services for DV and SA victims that are reimbursable. Likewise at the local level
advocates can work with LMEs to provide funding for these services. This process would be very time intensive and may meet a lot of resistance from those who see the mental health system as pathologizing victims and a belief that mental health, developmental disabilities and substance abuse problems will dissipate or disappear once the victim is physically safe and empowered to live free from violence. Nonetheless, this is an area where investments by coalitions, foundations and other funders could pay real dividends.

VI. FUNDRAISING AND VENTURE STRATEGIES FOR LOCAL AGENCIES

Agencies throughout the state are conducting and developing new strategies to raise money for local programs and services. Unfortunately, these strategies can be time and labor intensive and could limit an agency’s capacity to provide services to clients. The ideas below are introduced to begin the discussion about new and innovative projects that, if implemented, should be evaluated for agency capacity and project demands.

Entrepreneurial Ventures

Over time, government support of non-profit community programs has decreased and this trend is likely to continue. On the other hand, foundations have become a valuable source of project-specific revenue. Within this environment, non-profits are forced to think more creatively about funding operational expenses and direct services. Many non-profit, non-governmental organizations are beginning to use lessons from the private, for-profit sector regarding self-sufficiency and profitable ventures.

Directors of domestic violence and sexual assault programs indicate that funding issues are a large part of their responsibilities as program directors. The former advocacy role, which is still a central part of the director’s mission, is becoming secondary to that of fundraising in many organizations. In addition, the value of staff with development/fundraising skills is increasing. This mindset is not changing because directors and staff are less committed to their mission, but out of necessity, because the mission is becoming more difficult to achieve in light of existing financial constraints.
Traditional funding streams cannot meet the needs of successful non-profit organizations whose clients are appealing to them for new services, in addition to greater capacity to provide existing services. Therefore, many non-profits are considering social entrepreneurial ventures, which can provide them with a greater source of more consistent, non-earmarked revenue. In addition, many programs have found that a for-profit venture can contribute to the organization’s overall mission. For example, Outer Banks Hotline Crisis Intervention and Prevention Center of Dare County, North Carolina, has developed a hand craft store, Endless Possibilities, which serves as both a source of revenue for the organization and as a healing place where victims can volunteer and learn to weave. The Outer Banks Hotline developed both Endless Possibilities and a thrift store to support the program’s overall services.

Another example of a creative program is REACH of Jackson County. REACH developed a thrift store in 1995 from a $5,000 grant and its current sales exceed $100,000. REACH recognizes that government funds are decreasing and it views new for-profit ventures as essential to program viability. Thus, REACH established a development committee to brainstorm more profitable ideas, which include starting a craft store or an E-Bay business. (See Appendix 2 for more examples) The most important aspect of REACH’s endeavor is their recognition that planning, analysis, and consideration of venture feasibility are essential to future project success. Unfortunately, many organizations lack the capacity to do this type of strategic planning and few have the capital to begin new ventures.

Foundations could play a vital role in this developmental capacity. First and foremost, state domestic violence and sexual assault programs could benefit greatly from consultants who could review the agency’s overall strategic plan, suggest ways it could use resources more efficiently and effectively and identify approaches to accessing potential new sources of funding within the community. The consultants could work with the organization to determine which ventures would have the greatest potential for success.
by examining local community demands and considering the organization’s capacity and available resources. Further, consultants could work with the organization to develop a business plan that would incorporate the nonprofit’s mission and provide guidance for running a for-profit business.

Foundations could support consultants in a number of ways including: paying for permanent consulting positions within NCCADV and NCCASA for a designated number of years; developing a non-profit consulting firm (see “Highlight,” p. 20); or hiring an independent consulting firm/individual. If foundations are not interested in supporting consultants, another alternative includes providing mini-grants to organizations in need of start-up capital for initial costs. In the case of mini-grants, grant managers could provide guidelines for new ventures and long-term strategic plans.

Despite the fact that entrepreneurial ventures can be innovative, profitable, and effective long-term sources of funding, it is also important to understand that entrepreneurial ventures, particularly those developed by organizations with small staff, should not be expected to cover 100% of an organization’s expenses. The previous example of REACH of Jackson County illustrates this point. Although the agency successfully developed a thrift store that generates more than $100,000 annually, this income covers less than one quarter of the organization’s total expenditures. Therefore, entrepreneurial ventures should not be viewed as a replacement for other sources of funding, such as state allocations or foundation grants. Instead, it should be recognized as a potential source of additional revenue to supplement existing streams and ventures should endeavor to contribute to the mission of the organization.

**Fundraising Events/Programs**

Local fundraisers and community solicitations are common in domestic violence and sexual assault programs. However, for many organizations, these efforts are challenging and have limited returns. Programs often spend many days preparing mailings or organizing events, which can be taxing on a small staff. Additionally, fundraisers often only earn a couple thousand dollars. However, in many cases, well-organized annual fundraisers and individual donor solicitations can provide some of the most consistent sources of long-term funding. In addition,
these efforts are important because they raise community awareness about the issues and they draw attention to the programs they provide. Evidence of community interest can also be used to leverage more local community funding and support.

Sexual assault programs face unique fundraising challenges because some communities are not willing to support sexual assault in the same way that they will support domestic violence programs. Additionally, sexual assault programs generally have fewer staff members and less funding. Therefore, sexual assault agencies may need more direct assistance and funding to develop marketing strategies for their organizations and services.
### Appendix 1: State Sources of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>STATE (funding use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth certificate fee</td>
<td>Hawaii (DV centers/programs, prevention/intervention); Minnesota (DV centers/programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court fee/fine</td>
<td>Arizona (shelters); California (DV centers/programs, legal assistance/services, training/education); Colorado (DV centers/programs); Connecticut (DV centers/programs); Florida (DV centers/programs, training/education); Iowa (victim compensation); Idaho (DV centers/programs); Illinois (shelters); Indiana (DV centers/programs, victim services/assistance); Kansas (DV centers/programs, victim services/assistance); Louisiana (shelters); Michigan (victim compensation); Minnesota (DV centers/programs); Missouri (shelters); Montana (DV centers/programs, legal assistance/services); North Dakota (DV centers/programs); New Jersey (DV centers/programs, legal assistance/services, training/education, victim compensation); New Mexico (prevention/intervention); Nevada (DV centers/programs, legal assistance/services); Pennsylvania (DV centers/programs); Rhode Island (DV centers/programs); Tennessee (DV centers/programs, training/education); Utah (DV centers/programs, training/education); Wisconsin (DV centers/programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death certificate fee</td>
<td>Hawaii (DV centers/programs, prevention/intervention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce certificate fee</td>
<td>Florida (DV centers/programs, legal assistance/services); Hawaii (DV centers/programs, prevention/intervention); Iowa (DV centers/programs); Idaho (DV centers/programs); North Carolina (Displaced homemaker program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General funds</td>
<td>Delaware (prevention/intervention, shelters); Georgia (shelters); Illinois (DV centers/programs); Kentucky (DV centers/programs); Louisiana (DV centers/programs); Massachusetts (DV centers/programs); Maryland (DV centers/programs); Maine (DV centers/programs); Michigan (prevention/intervention, shelters, training/education); Minnesota (training/education); Missouri (DV centers/programs); Mississippi (DV centers/programs); Montana (DV centers/programs); North Carolina (DV centers/programs); North Dakota (DV centers/programs); Nebraska (DV centers/programs); New Mexico (DV centers/programs); New York (DV centers/programs, training/education); Oklahoma (DV centers/programs); Oregon (DV centers/programs); Texas (DV centers/programs); Utah (DV centers/programs); Virginia (DV centers/programs); Washington (DV centers/programs); Wisconsin (DV centers/programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury service contribution</td>
<td>Florida (shelters); Texas (DV centers/programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage license certificate fee</td>
<td>Alabama (shelters); Arkansas (DV centers/programs, shelters); Arizona (shelters); California (DV centers/programs, prevention/intervention); Florida (DV centers/programs); Hawaii (DV centers/programs, prevention/intervention); Idaho (DV centers/programs); Kansas (DV centers/programs, victims of crime); Kentucky (shelters); Louisiana (DV centers/programs); Maryland (DV centers/programs); Michigan (counseling/treatment) Missouri (shelters); Mississippi (shelters);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent fund dividends</td>
<td>Alaska (DV centers/programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special funds</td>
<td>Colorado (legal assistance/services); Connecticut (shelters); Delaware (DV centers/programs); Georgia (shelters); Hawaii (prevention/intervention); Kansas (shelters, training/education); Nevada (victims of crime); Oregon (DV programs/services); South Dakota (DV programs/services, training/education); Texas (victims of crime, legal); Washington (training/education); West Virginia (legal); Wyoming (DV programs/services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax contribution/credit</td>
<td>Arizona (shelters); Missouri (shelters); Virginia (DV programs/services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax, sales/transactions</td>
<td>Florida (DV centers/programs); Nebraska (DV centers/programs, shelters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund</td>
<td>New York (DV centers/programs); Virginia (DV centers/programs, shelters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 2: Successful Social Enterprise Ventures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Services Description</th>
<th>Venture Program</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associated Youth Services</td>
<td>Associated Youth Services provides specialized residential programming and support services for behavior disordered youth.</td>
<td>The Power Plant Greenhouse is designed for community youth who may benefit from project-based learning activities, school-to-career and entrepreneurial training as tools for personal and civic growth. The revenue from the sale of plants helps support the programs offered at the greenhouse.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.children.org/projects/ays.html">http://www.children.org/projects/ays.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas City, KS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Community, Inc.</td>
<td>GGCI endeavors to transform the lives of homeless and at-risk youth and young adults by providing them with employment, housing and support services.</td>
<td>GGCI operates three social purpose enterprises in San Francisco that provide employment and job training opportunities including: Ashbury Images- custom silk-screened and embroidered apparel; Einstein’s full-service café and catering service; Pedal Revolution, a new and used bike store.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ggcici.org/website/main.html">http://www.ggcici.org/website/main.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco, CA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greystone Foundation</td>
<td>Greystone Foundation is an integrated system of nonprofit and for-profit organizations that offer a wide array of programs and services to more than 1,200 men, women and children annually. Beginning in 1982 as a small bakery to employ Zen Buddhist students, Greystone now has 180 employees and provides jobs, housing, social services and health care to low-income residents.</td>
<td>Greystone Bakery. Profits support the community development work of the Greystone Foundation, which includes housing, child care, health care, and a computer learning center. In addition, the Bakery actively recruits and hires employees that have had difficulties finding employment in the past. Finally, it partners and serves a network of other businesses, such as Ben &amp; Jerry’s and Stonyfield Farms, who share its social concerns.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greystone.org/">http://www.greystone.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yonkers, NY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.greystonebakery.com/">http://www.greystonebakery.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Haley House**  
*Boston, MA* | Haley House serves society’s forgotten people and provides alternatives to the structures that perpetuate suffering and violence. Programs include: the Soup Kitchen; John Leary House, low-income apartments for the working poor; Mac's House and John Sheils House, rental subsidies for homeless women and men; and Noonday Farm, sustainable living and organic vegetables for the poor. | The Bakery at Haley House, is an economic development initiative used to foster economic independence for under-employed individuals. The Bakery at Haley House offers one-on-one job training to struggling teens and adults. The goal is to foster new work habits. | http://www.haleyhouse.org/index.html |
| **Outer Banks Hotline Crisis Intervention and Prevention Center**  
*Manteo, NC* | A local crisis intervention, prevention center & women's shelter | Endless Possibilities. Using the overflow of clothing & cloth goods from 6 fundraising thrift shops, this studio weaves beautiful cloth for purses, rugs, scarves, boas, and table runners from piles of rags. Volunteers are trained for free in exchange for labor. | http://www.ragweavers.com/ |
| **Provident Counseling**  
*St. Louis, MO* | Provides youth-focused community services such as: Family Skills Development, case management services; Families for Safe Environments, action against domestic violence on children; Heritage House, supervised visitation program; the Shreve Avenue Project, youth pregnancy and sexual responsibility programs; Work Futures Mentoring, work force preparedness program with an alcohol and drug abuse prevention. | At Ease Home Care, Inc., provides services to St. Louis City and County that are designed to assist individuals in maintaining their independence at home. Such services include assistance with light housekeeping, meal preparation, bathing, dressing and errand running. These are just a few of the services an At Ease caregiver provides. At Ease is a wholly owned subsidiary of Provident Counseling. | http://www.providentc.org/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosie’s Place</td>
<td>The underlying philosophy of Rosie’s Place is to provide a safe and nurturing environment to help poor and homeless women maintain their dignity, seek opportunity and find security in their lives.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rosies.org/default.htm">http://www.rosies.org/default.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Residential Options for Substance Abusers (TROSA)</td>
<td>TROSA focuses on helping recovering drug and alcohol abusers to change their lives. The more than 250 men living at TROSA for two years receive therapy, housing, food, and clothing for free during their stay. In exchange, they stay substance free and work in one of the businesses that TROSA operates.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trosainc.org/index.html">http://www.trosainc.org/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Housing and Economic Development Corporation (WHEDCO)</td>
<td>The Women’s Housing and Economic Development Corporation (WHEDCO) is dedicated to the economic advancement of low-income women, men and children, through the creation of beautiful environments and a uniquely integrated program of education, social services, job creation, housing, and job training and placement.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.whedco.org/home.php">http://www.whedco.org/home.php</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Fundraising Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Fundraising Project</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kings Beach, CA</td>
<td>The Tahoe Women’s Services (TWS) works with a local ski resort to raise money for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Skiers purchase price- reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all day lift tickets from Tahoe Women’s Services and all proceeds benefit TWS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last year, skiers and snowboarders raised $22,500 for Tahoe Women’s Services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault</td>
<td>eBay’s Giving Works</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mcadv.org/">http://www.mcadv.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCADVSA signed up with eBay and its affiliate, MissionFish, to raise money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCADVSA can both directly raise money through selling products on eBay, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirectly become the beneficiary of other sales if a seller chooses to donate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some or all of her sale(s) to the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault Response Center, Kennewick, WA</td>
<td>&quot;Little People&quot; project. Each spring SARC displays three-dimensional little</td>
<td><a href="http://www.charityadvantage.com/sexualassaultresponsecenter/SupportingSARC.asp">http://www.charityadvantage.com/sexualassaultresponsecenter/SupportingSARC.asp</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people that represent the number of children whose cases were investigated for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child abuse in Benton and Franklin counties for the previous year. The project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>combines awareness and fundraising. Each &quot;Little Person&quot; is available for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sponsorship ($10). Sponsor names are written on a heart that reads, &quot;Helping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Hearts Heal.&quot; Each heart is placed around a little person’s neck and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>included on a sign displayed with the little people that list all of the sponsors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH of Haywood County</td>
<td>Projects include: Annual golf tournament; annual fashion show; silent auction and</td>
<td><a href="http://www.haywoodnc.org/community/reach.html">http://www.haywoodnc.org/community/reach.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENDNOTES


viii Phone interview with Monika Hostler Johnson, Executives Director of NC Coalition Against Sexual Assault. July 13, 2004.


