Recommendations from NYPWA workshop
DV Regulatory Workgroup Roundtable
7/21/09

Is the length of stay sufficient?

- Access to permanent housing is more problematic now and therefore more time in shelter may be needed before alternate housing can be located. Extending the 45 day extension period would give local districts the discretion to extend the length of stay when necessary.
- There may be concerns about bottlenecks in the longer term, but so many systems are bottlenecked, it can be managed
- Extending stays should not be viewed as additional time to start working on housing and follow-up plans. Start working on discharge plan from day one; maintain sense of urgency – think exit upon entry
- Are providers making the best use of the initial length of stay to find housing, etc.? This can be a significant concern from counties paying for residents in cross county shelters with whom they do not contract.

Should the part 408 – length of contract – be extended beyond one year?

- The fewer contracts the better
- Longer contract periods mean less work
- Typically there is a 3 year maximum on the length of a contract with annual reviews.
- Often depends on local procurement laws
- Maximum flexibility is preferred approach

Should shelter staff be mandated to report child abuse?

- Yes, similar to new mandates on school personnel
- If there is a child safety issue, the local district wants to know
- This may be a training issue; need to train staff to identify and report; training is more accessible now
- The local district contract could include a mandate to training
- There is an issue around the lack of collaboration between dv providers and cps at the community level

Should shelter regulations include a provision for informed consent?

- Yes, residents should be clear that they have a choice particularly because so many choices have been taken from them
- Its good practice

Should telephone interviews be allowed rather than requiring face-to-face interviews prior to admission to shelter?

- The reality is; this is typical practice now and is acceptable
- Telephone interviews should not be an issue for shelters/programs since they have 24- hour staff and will see resident face-to-face anyways

Should trafficking victims be eligible for dv shelter and services?

- This requires much more thought and discussion
- Many trafficking victims don't fit the definition of dv victim
- Trafficking tends to encompass a much broader population and could open Pandora's box and significantly increase costs
- There are concerns that providers would not be equipped to meet the needs of trafficking victims.

Who should be responsible for cost and provision of transportation?

- There is no reimbursement stream for districts to provide transportation
- In some cases, transportation costs are covered; i.e. Medicaid, school, etc.
- Transportation costs should be covered by the per diem rate (except in the case, for example, of victims who are deemed ineligible for one shelter and need transportation to another and would not be included in a rate)
- A separate state reimbursement stream is needed for transportation costs

Should residential programs be required to offer education and outreach?

- It may not be necessary to mandate as awareness has increased and programs would provide regardless as funding relies on residents in shelter
- There is concern that if not mandated it might fall away and the new generation still needs to be educated

Are there other services that providers should offer?

- Need to look at bigger picture and think outside the box
- There is a need for more radical rather than cosmetic changes to the regulations
- If for example, there are multiple providers in one county, is it necessary to have multiple hotlines; could certain providers be experts in specific areas?

Summary of reactions and next steps:

- Counties are looking for flexibility and alternatives to meeting victim needs
- Counties are dealing with a multitude of issues; finding time to focus on dv can be a challenge
- Webcasts/telephone conference calls are not conducive to discussion; counties would prefer face-to-face time
- The recommendation is to tag on to an existing meeting; Commissioners meet the third Thursday of each month – some Commissioners may be able to stay after their morning meeting for an afternoon discussion, brining in providers at some point as well