The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) evaluation team developed a survey to collect systemic, self-reported information from all 52 Community Violence Intervention Collaborative (CVIC) community-based organizations (CBOs). The survey included questions about the organization's budgets, funding, partnerships, collaboration, and staffing on May 1, 2022. This date was selected as the level setting date because it pre-dates the launch of Hyphen's broad scale implementation of formal TTA -- known as the National TTA Program. Organizations completed the survey in June and July 2022. The following snapshot is drawn from the 36 (69%, N=52) surveys that were returned by CVIC CBOs. All information is presented in the aggregate to ensure the confidentiality of the community-based organizations participating in the CVIC cohort.

The 52 CVIC organizations are divided into 5 regions.

### Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami
- **Atlanta, GA (2)**
  - CHRIS 180
  - Offenders Alumni Association
- **Austin, TX (2)**
  - Jail to Jobs
  - Youth Advocate Programs, Inc (YAP)
- **Baton Rouge, LA (4)**
  - 100 Black Men
  - AGILE
  - CHANGE
  - TRUCE

### Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC
- **Baltimore, MD (3)**
  - Baltimore Community Mediation Center (BCMC)
  - Center for Hope (Life Bridge)
  - We Our Us
- **Newark, NJ (3)**
  - Newark Anti-Violence Coalition
  - Newark Community Street Team
  - The HUBB
- **Philadelphia, PA (3)**
  - As I Plant This Seed
  - Culture Changing Christians
  - Unity in the Community
- **Washington, DC (3)**
  - Alliance for Concerned Men
  - J&B Monitoring
  - Yaay Me

### Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis
- **Chicago, IL (4)**
  - Enlace & New Life Centers
  - Ex-Cons for CSC
  - Project Hood
  - Think Outside Da Block
- **Detroit, MI (3)**
  - Ceasefire
  - Detroit Friends and Family
  - Force Detroit
- **Memphis, TN (2)**
  - 901 BLOCC
  - Memphis Artists for Change
- **St. Louis, MO (2)**
  - Project Haki Organization for Black Struggle
  - The BRIC (Bullet Related Injury Clinic)

### King County, Los Angeles
- **King County, WA (3)**
  - Community Passageways
  - Freedom Project
  - Renegades for Life
- **Los Angeles, CA (5)**
  - Advocates for Peace and Urban Unity
  - Chapter Two
  - Community Warriors 4 Peace, NE
  - Healing Urban Barrios
  - Helper Foundation

### Minneapolis, Rapid City, St. Paul
- **Minneapolis, MN (4)**
  - Metro Youth Diversion Center
  - Restoration, Inc
  - Touch Outreach
  - We Push for Peace
- **Rapid City, SD (3)**
  - I am Legacy
  - Journey On
  - WAMBLI SKA Woyotan Church
- **St. Paul, MN (2)**
  - Community Ambassadors
  - Guns Down, Love Up
We heard from 36 of the 52 CVIC organizations.

- All: 69%
- Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami: 58%
- Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC: 67%
- Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis: 64%
- King County, Los Angeles: 100%
- Minneapolis, Rapid City, St. Paul: 67%

N=52 CVIC organizations
n=36 survey respondents

N=12 organizations in the region
n=7 survey respondents

N=12 organizations in the region
n=8 survey respondents

N=11 organizations in the region
n=7 survey respondents

N=8 organizations in the region
n=8 survey respondents

N=9 organizations in the region
n=6 survey respondents

Most of the CVIC organizations do not have a fiscal sponsor.

- All: 67%
- Independent: 22%
- Have a Fiscal Sponsor: 11%

*Four (4) (11.4%, n=35) organizations self-reported that they had an “other” eligibility for applying for funds; one reported that their local government expressed interest in sub-contracting with them, one reported being “close” to being ready to apply, one reported being unsure, and one reported advocating for state funding.

The majority of CVIC organizations reported having an operating budget.

- All: 83%
- Yes: 67%
- No: 33%

Data presented in blue represents the CVIC CBO cohort.
Data presented in green represents regional data, not the whole CVIC cohort.

The CVIC organizations self-reported the sizes of their operating budget.

- All: 27*
- $0-$499,999: 29.7%
- $500K-$999,999: 40.6%
- $1M-$1,999,999: 18.8%
- $2M+: 10.9%

*Nine (9) of the survey respondents did not answer this question.
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CVIC organizations described their violence prevention and intervention programs. The most common service CVIC organizations provide is street outreach.

The majority of CVIC organizations report participation in regular meetings, calls, and other methods of communication with the broader community violence intervention (CVI) ecosystem.

Most CVIC organizations self-identified as eligible to apply for federal, state, and local CVI funding.

KEY
- In the row charts, the results in blue are a percentage of the whole, not the percentage of respondents from the region. For example, the graph describing CVIC organizations’ participation in regular communication with the community violence intervention (CVI) ecosystem, all of Atlanta, which is 19% of the total sample, responded "yes" to participating in regular meetings, calls, and other methods of communication.

* Twelve (12) of the 36 survey respondents did not answer this question.

***Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

All
n=24*

Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami

Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis

King County, Los Angeles

Minneapolis, Rapid City, St. Paul

The CVIC organizations shared that they primarily connect with law enforcement, community leaders, and city government officials, including the Office of the Mayor and City Council.

Most CVIC organizations self-identified as eligible to apply for federal, state, and local CVI funding.

*Other
n=4

Four (4) (11.4%, n=35) organizations self-reported that they had an “other” eligibility for applying for federal funds; one reported that their local government expressed interest in sub-contracting with them, one reported being “close” to being ready to apply, one reported being unsure, and one reported advocating for state funding.

***Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.
CVIC organizations self-reported different levels of capacity and knowledge to implement a coordinated CVI strategy. Only one organization shared that they do not have the capacity to implement a coordinated CVI strategy; this one organization also reported having some knowledge of CVI and its strategies.

The self-reported range of knowledge to implement a coordinated CVI strategy among the CVIC organizations varied by region.

CVIC organizations’ capacity to implement a coordinated CVI Strategy also varied by region.
The evaluation team looked at the survey data to see if there were any differences in the size of the organization's budget or region when it came to having employees. It found a relationship between the size of an organization's budget and whether or not they have employees. Two CVIC organizations with the smallest budgets ($0-$499,999) in two different regions (Baltimore et al. and Chicago et al.) did not have employees.
The majority of CVIC organizations provide their paid staff with CVI-related training and/or certification.

### All***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All*** n=34*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, Los Angeles</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minneapolis, Rapid City</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two (2) of the 36 responding organizations from this region skipped this question.
**Among the 2 organizations that responded “other” to the question asking if they provide their staff with CVI-related training, one responded “volunteers.” The second organization stated that “CVI related training typically come from other organizations for staff development.”
***Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Some CVIC organizations engage volunteers and others do not.

### All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All n=36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, Los Angeles</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Rapid City, St. Paul</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most CVIC organizations reported being eligible to apply for CVI funding.

### All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Type</th>
<th>Yes, independently</th>
<th>Yes, with a fiscal sponsor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All n=36</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four (4) (11.4%, n=35) organizations self-reported that they had an “other” eligibility for applying for funds; one reported that their local government expressed interest in sub-contracting with them, one reported being “close” to being ready to apply, one reported being unsure, and one reported advocating for state funding.
Most CVIC organizations applied for and/or received external funding (e.g., local, state, federal, private, and/or other).

Among the 13 (36.1%, n=36) organizations that shared details about their funding applications for federal, state, and/or local government funding during the period July 1, 2021, to May 1, 2022, most (61.5%, n=13) applied to local funding sources. In total, they applied for: 24 local grants, with requests ranging from $17,830 to $943,925; 14 state grants, with requests ranging from $30,000 to $814,000; and one federal grant, with a $35,000 request.

Eight (8) (61.5%, n=13) organizations self-reported applying for local funding during the period July 1, 2021, to May 1, 2022; they cumulatively requested $6,962,821. These organizations submitted 24 requests and 25 of the local grant requests were awarded, or 104%.[1] The total awarded was $5,418,136 or 77.8% of the total requested. Local grant awards ranged from $10,000 to $944,900.

Six (6) (46.2%, n=13) organizations self-reported applying for state funding during the period July 1, 2021, to May 1, 2022; they cumulatively requested $3,042,544. These organizations submitted 14 requests and 6 (42.8%) of the requests were awarded. The total state funding awarded was $1,453,004, 47.7% of the total requested. The grant awards ranged from $86,128 to $393,000.

One (1) (7.7%, n=13) organization applied for and secured federal funding during the period July 1, 2021, to May 1, 2022; they received $35,000.

*Only 13 of the 36 CVIC organization survey responses provided details about their funding applications.

[1] This excess of 100% is due to an organization reporting they received funding without first submitting a request.
Most CVIC organizations collaborated on a funding application.

**All***

- **Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami**: 9% Yes, 9% No
- **Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC**: 12% Yes, 9% No
- **Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis**: 15% Yes, 6% No
- **King County, Los Angeles**: 15% Yes, 9% No
- **St. Paul, Minneapolis, Rapid City**: 6% Yes, 12% No

*Two (2) of the 36 CVIC organizations that responded to the survey skipped this question.

***Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Among the CVIC organizations that did not collaborate with others on a funding application, the majority (21%) were organizations with a budget of $500,000-$999,999.

**All**

- **$0-$499,999**: 15% Yes, 9% No
- **$500K-$999,999**: 12% Yes, 21% No
- **$1M-$1,999,999**: 9% Yes, 6% No
- **$2M+**: 6% Yes, 3% No
- **Skipped Question******: 15% Yes, 6% No

*Two (2) of the 36 CVIC organizations that responded to the survey skipped this question.

****We use “Skipped Question” to note missing information. In this case, seven (7) organizations did not provide information for their budget range but did respond to the Yes/No question asking if they had collaborated with others on a funding application.

Most CVIC organizations do not have the operating reserve or funds to cover a cost reimbursement grant or contract.

**All***

- **Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami**: 8% Yes, 8% No, 3% Other**
- **Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC**: 8% Yes, 14% No
- **Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis**: 8% Yes, 11% No
- **King County, Los Angeles**: 8% Yes, 8% No, 6% Other**
- **St. Paul, Minneapolis, Rapid City**: 11% Yes, 6% No

**Three (3) organizations stated they had an “other” experience. Among these, one (1) organization said they would follow up with information but did not, one (1) said “Did not have a contract yet, have a foundation budget to cover expenses,” and one (1) said “There is not a specific reserve account -- contracts are cost reimbursement.”

***Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Estimated Reserve

**n=10***

Ten (10) organizations (27.8%, n=36) shared an estimate of their reserve balance. The smallest estimated reserve was $4,000; it belonged to an organization with a budget of $62,155. The largest estimated reserve was $1,834,078; it belonged to an organization with a budget of $376,000.

*Only 10 of the 13 CVIC organization that shared they did have a reserve provided an estimate of their reserve balance.
The evaluation team looked at the survey data to see if the size of CVIC organizations' budgets and their region had any connection to whether or not an organization had operating reserve or funds to cover a cost reimbursement grant or contract. It found that organizations whose budgets fall between $500K and $1,999,999 in two regions (Atlanta et al. and Baltimore et al.) did not have an operating reserve.

### Atlanta, Austin, Baton Rouge, Miami***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$499,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$999,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$1,999,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skipped Question**** 14%

*** Percentage does not add up to 100% due to rounding.
**** To protect the anonymity of organizations, data on "other" is not provided here.

### Baltimore, Newark, Philadelphia, Washington DC***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$499,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$999,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$1,999,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M+</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skipped Question**** 38%

*** Percentage does not add up to 100% due to rounding.
**** We use "Skipped Question" to note missing information. In this case, two (2) organizations did not provide information for their budget range but did respond to the question asking about their operating reserve.

### Chicago, Detroit, Memphis, St. Louis***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$499,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$999,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$1,999,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skipped Question**** 14%

*** Percentage does not add up to 100% due to rounding.
**** We use "Skipped Question" to note missing information. In this case, one (1) organization did not provide information for their budget range but did respond to the question asking about their operating reserve.

### King County, Los Angeles***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$499,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$999,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$1,999,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M+</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skipped Question**** 13%

*** Percentage does not add up to 100% due to rounding.
**** We use "Skipped Question" to note missing information. In this case, three (3) organizations did not provide information for their budget range but did respond to the question asking about their operating reserve.

### Minneapolis, Rapid City, St. Paul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$499,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$999,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$1,999,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skipped Question**** 17%

*** Percentage does not add up to 100% due to rounding.
**** We use "Skipped Question" to note missing information. In this case, one (1) organization did not provide information for their budget range but did respond to the question asking about their operating reserve.

The regional data presented in green and grey is broken down by the budget size of the organizations: $0-$499,999, $500K-$999,999, $1M-$1,999,999, $2M+.

---

This data snapshot was created for CVIC and Hyphen by UCLA.
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