

TRC Grant Issues and Strategic Recommendations

Talking Points for CalVCB Board Meeting

Meeting Time: July 17th, 1 pm – 4 pm

Location: 400 R Street, Room 330, Sacramento, CA 95811

The agenda is posted and can be seen here:

[VCB Agenda: July 17, 2025 - CA Victim Compensation Board](#)

Information about attending virtually or in person can be seen here:

[Notice of Meeting 7/17/25 - CA Victim Compensation Board](#)

On behalf of the California Trauma Recovery Centers, the National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers respectfully submits the following summary of TRC grant award issues and recommendations for the California Victim Compensation Board's consideration.

BACKGROUND

The University of California, San Francisco Trauma Recovery Center (UCSF TRC) treatment model was developed in 2001, in partnership with the California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB), to address the complex problems faced by victims of violent crime, particularly those in underserved communities.

Replication of the model began in 2013 (Government Code Section 13963.1) and the CalVCB has managed the TRC grant application and award process since that time. Additional legislation passed in 2017 (AB 1384) established the UCSF TRC model as the basis for TRC replication in California and defined the minimum requirements / core elements of this evidence-based model for serving survivors of violence and those who have lost a loved one to homicide; it also directs the CalVCB to use these standards when funding TRCs. In addition, the statute includes the following:

- The Trauma Recovery Center sites shall be selected by the Board through a well-defined selection process that considers the rate of crime and geographic distribution to serve the greatest number of victims.
- The Board may award a grant providing funding for up to a maximum period of three years. The Board may award consecutive grants to a trauma recovery center to prevent a lapse in funding.

- CalVCB shall use “any other related criteria required by the Board” in funding Trauma Recovery Centers

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SHORT TERM:

1. ISSUE: Defunding well-performing TRCs while funding new TRCs

- a. Six TRCs were defunded in the last grant award cycle (FY 25-26), many of them for missing a single sentence about their capacity to provide services within 30 days of receiving the award despite ongoing service delivery.
- b. New grant applicants sometimes score higher than established TRCs based on proposals rather than actual delivery.
- c. The current competitive funding process wastes funding resources by closing successful TRCs for technicalities.
- d. Closing performing TRCs harms the underserved communities most impacted by violent crime. It abruptly discontinues needed services, disrupts community trust, and creates additional barriers to care.

RECOMMENDED SOLUTION: Prioritize funding for well-performing, existing TRCs

- a. **Use a 10-point bonus system for performing TRCs** similar to the State of New Jersey. For sample NOFA language, please see the following excerpt from the [New Jersey Office of the Attorney General Trauma Recovery Grant Program](#) Application FY 2024:

“Priority consideration will be given to those entities that can show a history of running a successful TRC program within the last 36 months. Applicants may demonstrate success in their current or past TRC programs through, for example, evidence of victims served, services offered, the delivery of customary community violence intervention services, the use of workers with appropriate experience and recognized training, as well as other indicators of success. These entities will receive an additional 10 points added to their final total score.”

- b. **Amend the current NOFA scoring rubric criteria 7-10 point tier and remove the requirement for an applicant to demonstrate TRC service capacity within 30 days in every narrative qualification response.**

From the 2025-2027 Grant Application Scoring rubric: “7-10 – Highly Qualified; in addition to meeting the Qualified standard above, answer provides direct experience and comprehensive examples of qualification **and clearly states the ability to begin providing services within 30 days of receiving award.**”

Because this scoring criteria is only relevant for new grant applicants and has led to closing performing TRCs based on a technicality, it should be removed. **Instead, we recommend that the CalVCB add the following Qualification to the TRC Grant Program Narrative Qualifications:**

“Qualification 7: Please describe your program’s ability to continue offering services or to begin offering services within 30 days of receiving a grant award.”

NOFA scoring can be reconfigured to reflect seven narrative qualifications instead of the current six.

2. ISSUE: Excluding subject matter experts from TRC grant materials development and/or review process.

- a. Best practice for grant award management is to include subject matter experts in the grant management process.
- b. Subject matter experts include representatives from multiple California TRCs, State Pilot UCSF TRC model experts, and survivors of violent crime.

RECOMMENDED SOLUTION: Create an ongoing California TRC grant advisory board facilitated by the CalVCB that informs the grant award process and meets on a quarterly basis at minimum, beginning in September 2025.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LONGER TERM:
--

1. ISSUE: The 2-year TRC grant cycle

- a. The 2-year cycle creates barriers for staffing/hiring in the second year due to funding uncertainty.
- b. Brief grant cycles place an administrative burden on programs that detracts from a focus on service delivery.
- c. Brief grant cycles place an administrative burden on CalVCB staff to develop and manage the grant award process over a shorter period of time.

RECOMMENDED SOLUTION: Increase the TRC grant cycle to 3 years as is permitted by legislation. The CalVCB would need to appropriately allocate 3 years of program funding to match a 3-year grant cycle, and not use the current 2-year funding amounts over a longer grant period as has been suggested.

2. ISSUE: Lack of sustainability for performing TRCs and lack of access to TRC services for survivors of violence in California

- a. The competitive grant process has resulted in uneven TRC network expansion and the closure of many well-performing TRCs.

- b. With closures of well-performing TRCs and diminishing funding for other social safety net resources, survivors of violence will have even less access to much-needed services.
- c. **RECOMMENDED SOLUTION: Align statewide TRC funding renewal standards with those used for Sexual Assault Service Programs (SASPs) under California Penal Code Section 13837**
 - a. Shift from a competitive grant process to a performance-based Request for Application (RFA) model for previously funded TRCs.
 - b. Ensure continued funding for TRCs meeting established standards, with non-renewal only for those failing to demonstrate adequate performance.
 - c. This would ensure consistent funding for previously funded programs that continue to meet established standards.
 - d. This would allow CalVCB to fund new TRCs as new funding becomes available.

Prepared by:

Stacey Wiggall (Stacey.wiggall@ucsf.edu) and Alicia Boccellari (Alicia.boccellari@sfdph.org)