

VOCA Stakeholder Recommendations

Stakeholder	Formula		
	Recommendation	Pros	Cons
MOCADSV	<p>Zak email on 11/7/22: Model after Texas. Still researching. Population + Service Formula = New Hampshire</p> <p>Most states are competitive (1-2) lag for carry over dollars</p> <p>Potential ask for an increase in ARPA dollars</p>	<p>Follow DPS grant review process which includes state staff as well as stakeholders</p>	
Kids First	<p>Jessica email on 11/7/22: North Carolina allocates full 10% to CAC's in a non-competitive formula. Each CAC has a base allocation, which is subtracted from the total allotment in the formula. Remaining available funds are allocated based on services provided by agency Ex 25% mental health, 35% medical treatment etc.</p> <p>Developed a "per child served" rate allocation by dividing the advocacy allocation by the total number of children served by all CAC's applying for funding during that cycle. The rate is then multiple by the number of children served by each CAC the prior FY. Total amount of allocation for an agency is a cumulative total of the base amount plus any funding for service components like MH, medical, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divide the full pot of money each agency has a base amount (minimum) plus per child served • Small pot left for competitive grants • Statewide funding plan with stakeholders • Mostly competitive 	

MO-CASA	Looked at other state CASA processes, mostly competitive, still researching	Texas: competitive awards, Texas CASA gets a dollar amount and they divide it up amongst the CASA programs	
MAPA	Kathy Tofall email on 12/8/22: Allocate funding to PAs according to statute 595.212 RSMo through non-VOCA funding.	Request state GR to fund PA based advocates per statutory requirement to free up MAPA allocation for other providers	Currently no funding appropriation for statute
MOPS	Same as MAPA- Looked at South Carolina: appropriates GR to make up the gap in funding. Attorney General office controls VOCA dollars in South Carolina		
FACT Board			
MSHP (School violence hotline) (Anti Human Trafficking Training)	Would prefer a statewide contract category rather than regional based on the services they provide	Provide very special and specific services, may need to request GR in the future	Regional allocation would be difficult to cost allocate because services are not regional
Kansas City Mothers in Charge			
Reynolds/Wayne County Victim Advocate	Special workload: work both with law enforcement and prosecuting attorneys through the court process		Concerns: no GR funding, rural areas could potentially get less money due to smaller populations Concern: Formula population base- is a concern
MADD	Collecting information from other states		

St. Charles County Family Court	<p>Multi- Service agency CASA is court based not a 501(c)(3) can't fundraise Victim Advocacy Program not part of the prosecuting attorney's office, working with juvenile offenders, seeing an increase in cases due to "raise the age"</p>	Reaching out to other states to see how they do it	Staff caseload is maxed out .6 FTE, will need to do some adjusting due to increased docket
Missouri Coalition Against Trafficking & Exploitation (MOCATE) & Healing Action		Smooth transition	Agencies have expressed concerns they don't have enough money to do what they want.
Senate of Representatives			
House of Representatives	Joe Engler: Be involved as much as possible		

Notes:
