Institute for
Public Safety
Crime and Justice

Institute of
Health and Wellbeing

Providing shelter and housing for victims of domestic violence

Jane Callaghan
Joanne Alexander

2014

Institute for Public Safety, Crime and Justice
Institute for Health and Wellbeing
University of Northampton
Park Campus, NN2 7AL
(01604) 892514

THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTHAMPTON
Transforming lives, inspiring change

Executive summary

Aim

The Northamptonshire Health and Wellbeing Board requested a review of current shelter and housing provision, nationally and internationally. Specifically, the research team were asked to address three questions:

1. How do other parts of the world deal with this issue, particularly where there is more emphasis on support for the victim to stay in their own home and removing the perpetrator?

2. What if any, is the impact on funding IPV services following structural changes to partner agencies namely CCG's being formed, and the current changes to the Probation service?

3. How have other areas dealt with the impact of these changes so that victims and perpetrators continue to receive support?

Methods

A synthetic literature review was conducted to address research question 1.

A qualitative interview based study was conducted to address questions 2 and 3. Individuals from local authorities and service providers from Northamptonshire and five other counties were interviewed, to identify how local authorities have responded to the changing funding and commissioning landscape, and to explore how services have reconfigured in response to this changing landscape. 14 individuals were interviewed and interviews were transcribed. A descriptive analysis was completed to summarise funding and service provision models county by county. A thematic analysis was also completed to identify and summarise dominant concerns and issues across the counties.

Key findings

Literature Based Study

Examples of models that enabled survivor victims of domestic violence to remain in their homes were identified in the UK, the US and Australia. The strongest academic evidence base for these was in Australia, but these models emerged from the UK 'Sanctuary Scheme' model. Findings from these can be summarised under the following headings: Housing and safety concerns; Legislative / policing concerns; Victim concerns; Perpetrator Concerns; Model Concerns

Housing and Safety Concerns

- When survivor victims remain at home, they need to be supported by responsive social landlords, whose role is not just the provision of safe accommodation, but also of responsive services. To enable this, social landlords need a good understanding of domestic violence and its consequences

- In addition to practical material elements of target hardening, technological advances like GPS tracking can support survivor-victims to feel safe at home

- Risk assessments need to take into account the complexity of each abusive relationship. In addition to considering how safe the home can be made, these assessments must take into account the likelihood that perpetrators will respect DVPOs and other orders.

Legislative and policing concerns

- Models that enable survivor-victims to remain at home are most effective when there is a strong legislative framework supporting them, and when there is strong enforcement of orders, and of breaches of orders by perpetrators

- Models are more likely to be effective when perpetrators are assessed as likely to respect and comply with orders like DVPOs

- There is some concern that DVPOs are too short to allow them to be effective in supporting a model of safe housing at home for survivor victims

- A careful system of monitoring of compliance to orders is needed to keep survivor victims 'safe at home'. This can be supported by use of technology

Survivor-Victim concerns

- Keeping survivor victims at home can help them to experience stability and security post-abuse
- To benefit, they need to ***feel safe***, and a coordinated wrap around support system is needed to enable this.
- Specialist support is necessary for these models to succeed.

Perpetrator concerns

- The safety of survivor-victims who are kept at home is strengthened by ensuring appropriate housing support for the perpetrator
- Mandated engagement with perpetrator programmes also increases effectiveness and reduces risk of revictimisation and re-offending.

Model concerns

- Keeping victims safe at home, or keeping victims safe in other social or independent housing requires an integrated model of service provision, with joined up working across policing, housing, welfare, health, legal and domestic violence support services
- It is important to see models that maintain survivor victims at home or in other social housing as one possible model of provision alongside others. Evidence from the UK and abroad makes it clear that shelters, other transitional housing, etc remain necessary elements of support for survivor victims. There is no one-size-fits all model.

Interview based studies

A summary of the regional case studies is provided in figure 2 overleaf.

- Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire offer examples of housing funded via housing benefit

- Lincolnshire currently have funding from Public Health and it is expected that this will also continue in the future

- Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire have described clear models of integrated service provision within which domestic violence support is provided

- Interviewees from Nottinghamshire reported the effective use of target hardening as one of a range of service responses

- All regions have been affected by funding changes and most reported anxiety about future provision. For the majority of interviewees these affects were considered to be negative. However, a small minority considered that funding cuts could act as catalyst for innovation and positive change within the IPV service landscape. A small minority of participants suggested that due to shifts in contributing funders, the sources of funding for IPV had changed within their regions, but the overall level of funding for IPV had remained the same.

- Anxieties were expressed in relation to the development of integrated funding models, reflecting concerns about complex funding structures, contradictory delivery agendas amongst commissioning bodies, and late release of tenders. Participants reflect on a need to build simplified and integrated funding structures, and pooled IPV budgets

- Interviewees advocated a blended and integrative approach to domestic violence provisions, enabling victims the option of choosing from a range of possible resources. In some instances, implementing a blended approach was considered to mitigate risks associated with the isolated use of alternative housing models.

- Interviewees highlighted the potential for innovative practice to deal with the new landscape of commissioning and funding changes. Some participants gave specific examples of services re-modelling provisions in order to broaden their target client group, meet needs more effectively or to produce a more cost-effective streamlined service in line with reductions to their budgets

Conclusions and Recommendations

- The funding and service landscape for domestic violence is in considerable flux, and models of good practice are not well established or well evidenced

- All participants across all regions indicated that responses to this changing landscape are varied and developing
- Models that enable survivor-victims to stay at home offer one potential response to this changing landscape, but this must be part of a range of services available that can be tailored to the specific needs of the survivor-victim (and where relevant their family)
- Models using housing benefit and accessing public health funding represent further potential elements of an integrated response
- Altering models of housing provision will require a strong enforcement response, with clear monitoring of orders and rapid and effective responses to breaches

Contents

1 Introduction

The Northamptonshire Health and Wellbeing Board requested a review of current shelter and housing provision, nationally and internationally. Specifically, the research team were asked to address three questions:

1. How do other parts of the world deal with this issue, particularly where there is more emphasis on support for the victim to stay in their own home and removing the perpetrator?

2. What if any, is the impact on funding IPV services following structural changes to partner agencies namely CCG's being formed, and the current changes to the Probation service?

3. How have other areas dealt with the impact of these changes so that victims and perpetrators continue to receive support?

2 Approach and Method

To address the three questions identified by the Health and Wellbeing Board, the research team initially completed a search of available scholarly and grey literature. However, it was clear that questions 2 and 3 could not readily be answered by literature that was available in the public domain. Consequently, interviews were carried out with local authorities and with service providers in Northamptonshire, and in five other counties, to explore the impact of funding changes for domestic violence services, and to establish how other counties have responded to these funding changes.

2.1 Literature review

To address the question of national and international models where the victim is' enabled to remain in the home, a review of literature was completed. The research team conducted a systematic search of peer reviewed and grey literature, using the following search terms:

- Interpersonal violence, domestic violence, domestic abuse

- Housing, housing models, shelter, refuge
- Target hardening
- DVPOs / domestic violence protection orders
- "perpetrator leaves" or "models where the perpetrator leaves the home" (various phrases were used to capture this
- "victim remains at home" or "victim is enabled to remain at home" (various search phrases were used to capture this)

Given the nature of both the question and the literature available, it was decided that a systematic literature review was not appropriate. Instead, a narrative synthetic review was produced, summarising the key literature thematically, according to housing model used.

2.2 Interview based study with local organisations and organisations outside the county

One-to-one interviews and small focus groups were conducted with Service Providers and Professionals working within Local Authorities. Interviews were conducted via telephone or face-to-face. This project used a semi structured approach, to enable participants to respond flexibly to the questions posed, to guide the interview and share related perceptions and experiences. This method enabled us to explore a very varied and shifting landscape, and to capture information that was local and contextual. As a consequence each interview was not identical – there were different emphases in each interview, largely guided by the responses of participants. Interviews were aimed at developing an understanding of the ways that Domestic and Interpersonal Violence services operate in the wake of significant changes to funding models. Interviews explored housing models, the impact of funding changes, and participants' experiences and thoughts surrounding the implementation of alternative models such as Domestic Violence Protection Orders (DVPOs), Target Hardening and 'Independent Refuges'*.

Blank copies of the Local Authority and Service Provider Participant forms can be found in the Appendices section of the report (Appendix 1 and 2 respectively). The Interview Schedules

for Local Authority professionals and Service Providers varied slightly. Questions within the Local Authority Interview Schedules were designed to provide participants with an opportunity to explore the management of funding changes and the responsibilities of different structures to fund Interpersonal Violence Services, areas of greater relevance to Local Authority Professionals.

* The term 'independent refuge' is one that emerged from participants' responses to a question about benefits funded housing. Refuges that lost Council funding but continued to run with the income from housing benefit as the only statutory income were described in interviews as 'independent refuges' by several participants. This term has therefore emerged from the usage of participants.

Figure 1. Participant Table

Geographical Area	Service Provider/ LA/Police	Pseudonym
Northampton/shire	Police	David
	Service Providers	Helen & Claire
		Gwen & Kim
	Local Authority	Kerry
		Naomi
Leicestershire	Service Provider	Linda
		Kate
	Local Authority	Ben
Suffolk & Norfolk	Service Provider	Hayley
Nottinghamshire	Local Authority	Paula
Derbyshire	Local Authority	Alice
Lincolnshire	Local Authority	Angela

2.2.1 Data Analysis

The 12 individual interviews and focus groups were digitally recorded and selections transcribed. The qualitative data from all interviews has been thematically analysed (Braun

and Clarke, 2006) and representative selections of participants' quotes have been included within the report to illustrate themes. All data are anonymised and, where necessary, identifying information has been removed. Figure 1 above introduces participants using pseudonyms, and shows the general geographical area discussed in interview.

2.2.2 Ethics

Ethical approval for this project was provided by the Social Sciences Ethics Committee, at The University of Northampton. Consent was sought from all participants. All data has been anonymised before use in the study. Pseudonyms have been given to all the participants to protect their identity. To further protect identity, given the small size of the sample and the population it was drawn from, the organisations and authorities that participants work within have not been named. Because of the nature of the study Researchers felt it important to ensure that general locations, for example regions, towns and cities could still be identified and named within the report.

Researchers allowed participants the opportunity to alter their responses given in interview to ensure that they had some control over how they were represented within this report. Extracts from interviews with participants, as well as a draft report were sent out to participants to enable them to make alterations as they wished. Researchers indicated a willingness that written submissions participants wanted to make would be taken on board in addition to the interview to enable participants to rectify any issues with their representation in the report.

3 Literature based study

Domestic violence and abuse is a key contributor to homelessness (Clarke & Wydall, 2013), and in particular homelessness for women (Scottish Government, 2010). Domestic violence is associated with housing instability, frequent house moves and the risk of repeat homelessness (Netto, Pawson, & Sharp, 2009; Pavao, Alvarez, Baumrind, Induni, & Kimerling, 2007). Traditionally, survivor-victims fleeing domestic violence had just one major option to avoid homelessness – moving into transitional accommodation, such as shelters.

Alternative housing models for survivor-victims began to be used in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and in the UK, the Sanctuary Scheme became fairly widespread in the early 2000s. The Sanctuary Scheme involved the use of integrated and holistic support for survivor-victims, to enable them to remain in their home, through a combination of good policing, monitoring, and target hardening. In this review, we consider national and international examples of the use of this scheme, and the limited evidence base around its effectiveness. It should be noted that there is a lack of high quality evidence around the use of this approach to housing in domestic violence, and that caution should therefore be used in evaluating and applying the insights of this review.

3.1 Australia

A critical review of the literature revealed that the strongest evidence base for the provision of alternative housing models for those leaving domestic violence did seem to come from Australia. Australia adapted the UK 'Sanctuary Scheme', which was tailored by several regional authorities to meet local needs. Several regional authorities use the 'Home and Safe' model. This model arose in Domestic Violence work from a recognition that victims had few real choices in escaping domestic abuse, and is an attempt to enable victims to exercise a right to remain in their homes.

Spinney found that homelessness prevention was more likely to be effective when supported by a strong legislative framework. In particular it was important that protection orders were well enforced, and that responses to any breaches of police orders were strong. Homelessness services were also more effective when domestic violence courts were available to victims, and there was an integrated set of working practices between police, courts, welfare and housing. In addition, newer housing models were likely to be more effective when victims were offered a coordinated package of specialist domestic violence support, that included both practical and emotional support: housing and security, emergency support, and personal support (including confidence building and post abuse work). A crucial feature of effective models was the provision of appropriate accommodation for perpetrators. Additional features included the non-restrictive eligibility criteria, easily available affordable housing, and housing agencies with 24 hour response services.

In her interviews with service users and professionals working with the Home and Safe Model, Spinney found evidence of considerable variation in the way that Domestic Violence Orders

were being used, with inconsistencies in how and when perpetrators were removed from the home. Access to good quality legal aid and court support was seen as essential for the effective working of this system. This is particularly the case because women in refuge have more day to day contact with support workers than those living at home, who can be quite isolated. This may present specific challenges in the UK because of recent changes to the legal aid system.

Spinney found that schemes were more effective when DV victims were given priority in re-housing, enabling a second line of protection for victims. She also noted that schemes that included a full domestic violence service that included housing, full support for the victim and mandated counselling for the perpetrator were more successful. Outreach services that enabled professionals to go out to people's homes were also highly valued and increased the effectiveness of the approach. Spinney's evaluation underscores the importance of wrap around services of support and partnership to enable the Home and Safe Model to be successful.

Edwards (2004)found that models that enabled women to stay in their home following domestic violence were more acceptable to survivor-victims when they were attached to their home, they felt they had the right to remain in their home, and the perpetrator was removed (using orders like the UK DVPO) and placed in alternative housing.

Edwards found that these models were more acceptable to survivor victims when appropriate measures were taken to make them feel safe. She also found that the use of practical measures to increase safety like target hardening, and support via technology (like mobile phones and GPS trackers) improved acceptance of this model.

Survivor victims were more likely to feel safe if they knew how to report breaches, and if police were available and known to them both for advice, and for reporting of breaches of orders. It was important for the effectiveness of the model that any contact between perpetrators and survivor-victims take place outside the home. An important factor when assessing risk and establishing the safe home model for a specific case would be to assess the likelihood that the perpetrator would accept and obey relevant police and court orders – this was key to the effectiveness of this housing model.

Important symbolic factors to improve the acceptance of safe housing models were changes in the house itself to help survivor-victims symbolically cleanse the home of unpleasant memories, enabling them to feel safer and more at home in the house.

McFerran (2007) similarly found that Australian models that enabled survivor-victims to remain at home were more effective when courts granted exclusion orders, police removed perpetrators, wrap around and integrated support was provided for survivor victims, and there were clear and individualized risk assessments and safety plans, with the possibility to 'upgrade' such plans if risk monitoring suggested that the threat level had changed. McFerran also emphasized the importance of appropriate provision for perpetrators and the importance of perpetrator engagement with support programmes.

Evaluating Shelters in Queensland, S&S Consultants (2012) noted that if affordable housing was not available for those escaping domestic violence, they were significantly at risk of returning to violent relationships (particularly if they had dependent children and were concerned about risk of homelessness). Based on interviews with women fleeing domestic violence, S&S consultants found that shelter provision was highly valued by survivor-victims, but that other models were seen as important too. Survivor victims highlighted the need for safe housing after leaving shelters, to enable them to restore stability, to engage with other social and health services to secure appropriate support for themselves and their families, and to enable them to re-engage with the work force. To be effective, S&S argue that there is a need to recognise the criminality of domestic violence, provide appropriate perpetrator programmes and appropriate accommodation for perpetrators.

A further Australian housing model was the New South Wales Family and Community Services (2013) "Start Safely Private Rental Subsidy Scheme". This model recognized the limited availability of affordable housing in New South Wales, and subsidized the difference between market rent and existing social housing subsidy, for up to 24 months, for survivor-victims fleeing DV. Clients were required to evidence their history of domestic violence, evidence that they met financial thresholds for the scheme, and the non-availability of housing that was affordable within their existing subsidy, to be eligible for the scheme. NSW suggest that early indicators are that this is an effective strategy in reducing risk of homelessness following domestic violence, but the formal evaluation of the scheme is still in progress.

Edwards (2004) suggests there are significant advantages to the 'staying home' model: it increases stability for parents and children, enabling the provision of a stable and secure home; it reduces placement moves and disruption; and it fosters a sense of justice in survivor victims, enabling some redress of power imbalances, and a sense of greater empowerment for those who have left domestic violence.

3.2 North American Models

Several US states and cities have shifted away from focusing just on the provision of housing through shelters to a more permanent housing model. However, there is very limited evaluative literature on the effectiveness of these models.

US housing models have made use of GPS technology to support survivor-victims to stay safe at home. The use of bilateral electronic monitoring can be used to detect perpetrator / defendant entry into victim-survivors' homes (Erez & Ibarra, 2006). This enables more effective policing and monitoring, but also increases a subjective sense of safety and of being protected. This technology also offers the possibility of evidence of any harassment or intimidation that can be used by victims and courts in the event of breaches. It is also suggested that this kind of technology provides a safety net that supports "victim re-entry into civil society" (Erez & Ibarra, 2006, p.100). Rhodes (2012) has similarly noted that GPS monitoring is "a necessary and effective tool in protecting victims from 'separation assaults.'" (p130)

Botein & Hetling (2010) evaluated the Connecticut based permanent model for survivors of domestic violence, which provided a supportive housing model akin to a sheltered accommodation scheme. Residents had independent housing units with private kitchens but could make use of flexible on-site support services. Residents were involved in service design and planning, and the housing model provided a bridge between transitional housing and more permanent housing solutions. The housing was paid for via 'Housing Choice Vouchers', or where appropriate, residents could pay 30% of their income to finance their housing. This was found to be an effective housing model, that enabled residents to establish themselves in longer term accommodation with high levels of support, without some of the disadvantages of shelter based accommodation.

In contrast, in Canada, the Canadian Network of Women's Shelters and Transition Houses, 2011 noted that US based cross-sectional and survey base studies had established that shelter offered the most effective and supportive option for survivor-victims. Shelters are able to provide wrap around support, and to enable empowerment of women who have experienced DV. However, Baker, Billhardt, Warren, Rollins, & Glass (2010) found in contrast that

individuals fleeing DV find it difficult to find and maintain permanent / long term housing, and that there was a clear need for ongoing housing support beyond shelter stay, while The Wilder Research Centre (2004) noted that an inability to find affordable safe housing made it less likely that victims leave abusive relationships.

3.3 UK

As described above, Sanctuary Schemes were launched in the UK, and emulated in Australia. Findings from UK studies are not dissimilar from the Australian research. A key point reiterated across the UK literature on Sanctuary Schemes is the importance of the adequate enforcement of exclusion orders to enable women to stay at home (Scottish Government Communities Analytical Services, 2010)

One legislative framework that can be used in supporting a 'Perpetrator Leaves' model of domestic violence housing provision is the use of Domestic Violence Protection Orders (DVPOs). The evaluation of the DVPO pilot scheme was released in 2013 (Horvath, Lovett, Coulson, Kernohan, & Gray, 2013), reporting on its implementation in three pilot sites. The Domestic Violence Protection Order is a 14-28 day sanction imposed at the magistrate's court that limits the perpetrator's interaction with the domestic violence victim. The pilot was found to be effective in reducing reported rates of re-victimisation, especially in chronic domestic violence. Victim survivors who participated in the evaluation also saw the DVPO as a positive thing, that increased their sense of safety, and gave them time to reflect on their future options. However, the pilot evaluation found they were an expensive order, that was not cost effective. There have also been concerns that sanctions for breach are not sufficient, because the DVPO is a civil rather than a criminal order.

Effective use of DVPOs is essential for any kind of 'Sanctuary' or 'Safe at Home' scheme to be effective. To ensure this, the Horvarth et al report suggests there is a need for

- Training to broaden police perspectives on when DVPOs can be used.
- Training for legal advisors and magistrates
- Statement of reasons when no charge or DVPN is issued

- Proactive monitoring of the DVPO
- Referral to support services for victims (with consent)
- Availability of perpetrator programmes, that where appropriate can be court mandated

Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004 strengthened protections for victims of domestic violence, making breaches of non-molestation orders a criminal offence. This facilitated a different kind of response to housing issues for those fleeing DV (Clarke & Wydall, 2013). However, The Department for Communities and Local Government (2010) found that survivor-victims using the Sanctuary Scheme were unwilling to make use of orders like DVPOs, because they were afraid it would escalate difficulties with the perpetrator, and because they felt the perpetrator would disregard the order. Several UK authors (e.g. The Scottish Government, 2010; Price-Kelly, 2010) have noted the importance of ensuring that exclusion orders and DVPOs have adequate force, to enable survivor-victims to stay at home. This requires a strong advocacy framework, and good quality legal support for survivor-victims. The changing landscape of legal support in the UK might make this challenging.

In Scotland, Sanctuary Scheme models highlighted the need for strong integration of services - social landlords who are aware of the needs of victims of DV, and considering how rent, arrears and repairs procedure might unfairly penalize victims of abuse; liaison between social landlords and local authorities with specialist support to secure appropriate support and legal advice; involvement of victims in development of services for them; and the availability of joint multi agency training (Scottish Government Communities Analytical Services, 2010).

Women's Safety Unit supports safe housing in wales through the provision of a central point of access for survivor-victims of domestic violence (Edward & Avenue, 2003). Provides a place of safety, housing support, legal advice, counselling and support, advocacy, target hardening. Integrated service that works very effectively in the provision of a full range of services for domestic violence. Good housing services are enabled through this integrated service, that is also integrated with court processes.

Models like the Aberystwyth 'Making Safe' programme (Clarke & Wydall, 2013) established housing models that facilitated the victim remaining at home, while the perpetrator leaves. As with other evidence reviewed in this report, this model requires the safe re-housing of the perpetrator to facilitate its effectiveness. In Aberystwyth, it has been stressed that "A comprehensive policy to tackle domestic violence must also address the abusive behaviours

of perpetrators." (Clarke & Wydall, 2013, p. 1) While the Making Safe programme has been an effective housing model in Aberystwyth, it is one of several needed strategies for dealing with the housing needs of people fleeing domestic violence – alongside shelter and temporary local authority housing (Clarke & Wydall, 2013). The evaluation of this programme involved qualitative interviews with survivor-victims, perpetrators and professionals, and found that there were clear advantages for survivor victims in staying in the family home: it facilitated a stable home life, offering time and space for recovery and reflection. Key workers and perpetrators emphasized the importance of engagement with a perpetrator programme while safely accommodated, reporting that advantages included a re-evaluation of their attitudes towards intimate partners, and an experience of relative independence that enabled them to challenge dependency issues that might underpin controlling and abusive behaviours. The authors noted that the effectiveness of these programmes depended on having sufficient time and space to recover – the Home and Safe model provides for two years of support following separation. They suggest that DVPOs do not offer a long enough time frame for this.

3.4 Critical concerns

The Importance of Complex Specialist Services for Complex Needs: People fleeing domestic violence tended to report multiple needs – mental health needs, living skills, alcohol or drug dependency, housing management, other support needs. It is important to remember that domestic violence is not 'just' housing issue, and to ensure that there is an appropriate range of wrap around services for vulnerable survivor-victims.

Domestic violence prevention is multifaceted: As DV is not just a housing issue, long term effective support and prevention requires monitoring, high quality policing, outreach and advocacy work and educational interventions (particularly in schools) (Hague & Bridge, 2008). These kinds of interventions have historically been supported in Northamptonshire by the shelter movement and it is crucial to ensure such interventions are not lost in changing housing models.

DV survivor-victims are a heterogeneous group: Any 'one size fits all' approach to meeting housing and other needs will not be effective. There is a need for varied responses to meet varied needs (Clarke & Wydall, 2013), and this should include the provision of a range of housing responses, including shelters and other transitional housing, as well as longer term housing solutions.

Ensuring sanctuary schemes do not constrain victims: Given that victims are most at risk of violence during the period of separation and immediate post-separation, it is important to ensure that victims do not feel they are effectively 'locked up' inside homes that have been target hardened (Squire, 2007). Policing and social / emotional support needs to be in place to enable survivor-victims to enjoy a full life, and to feel safe beyond the home.

Domestic violence housing provision is a national, not a local issue: While refuges might be conceptualised as a 'local resource' research has suggested that they more typically function through patterns of reciprocation between local authorities. The Department for Communities and local Government (2011) reported that 70% of refuge referrals came from out of area, and the 50% of those who left refuge moved to a different local authority. The AYA project (Bowstead, 2012) explored how women move between services, and patterns of internal migration, when fleeing domestic abuse. This project tracked these movements, within and between local authorities. There was a roughly equivalent number of women leaving and entering various local authorities to flee violence, which meant that individual local authorities did not note a net increase or decrease in numbers affected by DV. It is important to consider the enduring use of this reciprocal set of arrangements when developing systems that are rooted in constructs like 'localism'. As national coordination (provided through 'Supporting People') draws to a close, it is important to consider the potential impact for victims fleeing abuse.

Survivor victims with disabilities: Support for survivor-victims with disabilities has been patchy historically. Individuals with disabilities experience significant challenges in social housing, and in accessing support services, and there is a need of specific support (including educational support re rights and protecting self) for people with disabilities in situations of Domestic violence (Price-Kelly, 2010).

Housing support is a long term issue: Support for survivor victims is a long term commitment and cannot be usefully conceptualized as a short term intervention. This is one concern about the potential effectiveness of DVPOs. Neither the risk of further victimization, nor the healing process post-abuse are likely to end quickly after survivor-victims leave domestic violence, and wrap around support needs to be long term. (Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, 2014; Netto et al., 2009)

Transitional housing will still be needed: Not all victim survivors can easily move straight into independent housing, and some will need transitional housing to provide a supportive environment for recovery form abuse. A more supportive housing model can facilitate a sense

of safety, while on site services can provide a stronger sense of containment and support for individuals with complex needs. (Fotheringham, Walsh, & Burrowes, 2013)

Impact of new commissioning models: Increasing localization has had a specific impact on women only services, as it has become difficult for women-only services to compete with larger bidders in new commissioning models. Hirst and Rinne (2012) suggest that: "Providers felt the shift from grant aid towards commissioning procedures had affected the nature of the service provided. Almost all who had been through the commissioning process felt that rather than having the freedom to define the service themselves, they were now required to respond to the commissioner's view of what an appropriate service should be." (vi) It is concerning that economic models and commissioning processes might be eclipsing providers with specialist knowledge and expertise.

4 Interview based studies

SUMMARY TABLES

Two tables have been provided. Figure 2 summarises models of service provision, innovative practice, and funding issues in each geographic area involved in the study. Figure 3 provides an overview of the key themes identified across the interviews conducted.

Figure 2 provides an overarching summary of the domestic abuse context of each area, drawn from and representing data from interviews. The Context Table is intended to provide a brief summary of the situation within each county, using information derived from all participants from that area.

Figure 2. Context Summary

Geographical Area	Housing Model	Funding		Innovative Practice
		Current	Future	
Northampton/shire	Refuge Support previously funded through 'Supporting People'. Loss of Northamptonshire County Council funding for Refuge. Uncertain future in terms of refuge – Providers anticipating closure. Housing Benefit covers building managements.	NCC has previously been the primary funder for the Support element of refuges within Northampton. Grants were also awarded from the Borough Councils, Community Safety Team. Funding for refuge support was due to end in March 2014 but extensions have been granted until the end of Sept 2014.	Future funding for Refuge Support is uncertain.	One Northamptonshire Provider is moving towards extending the holistic nature of their work specifically looking at working with those with complex needs, long-term and intergenerational patterns of familial violence. Adapting existing housing with an aim of building familial relationships. Planning to recruit Student Researchers to evaluate pilot housing project.
Leicestershire (Information provided reflects	County Council funded refuge support is commissioned through the Adults & Communities Department. This just funds	County Council funding has been reduced by around 25% in the last year in negotiation with the	Decisions about funding and commissioning for refuges is part of a wider ongoing service review across	Main hubs have been created within several District Council Offices where Council Services, Police Officers, Probation staff and Domestic Abuse Support Workers

the situation in the County)	support costs for 18 refuge places. One Service is funding refuge support using finances gained from paid for Social Work student placements.	provider, further reductions are expected from 2015. Previously funded refuge (not through County) has for the last two years been running on Housing Benefit and restricted charity funding. Within this 'independent refuge' staffing numbers have reduced from seven to one within five years.	accommodation support in the County. Anticipating cuts to budgets that go into domestic abuse support services at a Local Authority level as of 2015. A sense of uncertainty and change in relation to future structures underpinning DV services.	are based. This enables faster and more effective inter-agency communication.
Suffolk & Norfolk	Refuge Support is funded jointly by Suffolk & Norfolk County Councils. Housing Benefit funds accommodation, clients pay a contribution.	Interviewee reported that refuge support funding had to date remained consistent.	Anticipating reduction as of Jan 2015 – uncertain as to the extent. Currently exploring alternative funding streams.	
Nottinghamshire	County Council are currently commissioning two refuges, with a total of 15 spaces. Nottinghamshire County Council previously commissioned 4 refuges, but the two Providers unsuccessful in winning the tender continue to keep their 'Independent Refuges' open. Closure of Nottingham City funded Asian Women's refuge. Supported Housing provided by Housing Association, 12 units in total. Currently unable to meet the	The County Council primarily commission domestic violence provisions within Nottinghamshire with some District funds allocated separately The two 'Independent Refuges' have a total of 15 spaces and run on Housing Benefit and external fundraising.	Anticipating a reduction in funding for DV at re-procurement in 2015, but uncertain as to the extent. Interviewee suggested that there is unlikely to be a large reduction due to the strong political support for domestic violence provisions within Nottinghamshire.	Supported Housing Model. 12 units provided by Housing Association. 6 months Support from a specialist domestic violence worker. Once a family has settled, they keep the flat or house and the Housing Association makes another one available for Supported Housing. Target Hardening 'Sanctuary Programme' links a Support Worker to client with a view to mitigating potential risks. Programme funded and coordinated through Outreach Service.

	national demand for refuge in Nottinghamshire. Those fleeing violence increasingly have to go further afield to access refuge.			
Derbyshire	In conversation with providers across the county, keen to keep refuges running, although anticipating possible cuts to additional refuge support following consultation. Future cuts may be aimed at refuges support funding and on resettlement. There are also refuge provisions aimed specifically at male victims and young women.	Current resources tied into contracts which can be extended, so not susceptible to cuts. Interviewee suggests funding has actually increased due to new contract addressing perpetrators.	No funding cuts planned so far, County Council still committed to current funding until March 2015. Possible cuts to refuge funding after April 2015 following consultation, due to begin in September 2014.	Refuge provisions solely for male victims. Also have a refuge specifically for young women aged 16-24.
Lincolnshire	Purpose built refuge in Lincolnshire as well as other types of refuge accommodation. Currently space for approximately 19 families. One (small) refuge that failed to gain funding has stayed open.	Interviewee suggests that refuges are running on external fund-raising and Housing Benefit.	Refuges are running on funding from the County Council (including Public Health), external fund raising and housing benefit.	Planning to extend provisions to male victims and those with mobility difficulties. Run own charter of 10 standards for statutory services to meet, hope for all to meet these standards by March 2016. LCC have just hired a data analyst to find out from charter how much each agency spends on DV-related issues/cases in order to develop a profile on victims/perpetrators and impact on agencies. Provides ongoing training to raise awareness in schools, and have recently started a similar project to educate GPs on recognising signs of DV.

The above table is intended to provide a snapshot of the domestic abuse funding and provision landscape within each area as perceived by interviewees. Interview data suggests that this landscape is complex and variable within and between counties. We explore these complexities in greater depth in the following qualitative analysis.

Interview data was thematically analysed (Braun and Clarke, 2006) to draw together insights and concerns from across the interviews. Three key themes were identified; (i) *Integrated Funding Model*, (ii) *Blended Use of Resources*, (iii) *Positive Change & Innovation* (See Figure 3 below for themes and descriptions).

Theme	Description	Example Quotes from Interviews
Integrated Funding Model	Frequently occurring within the data set was the suggestion of building or further developing more simplified or unified funding structures or pooling IPV budgets. Participants reflected upon concerns in relation to complex funding structures, contrasting delivery agendas of commissioning bodies, late release of tenders	*"...there is no joined up thinking. All the timeframes for each of the strategies is very disjointed. So rather than each directory looking at where services could save them money, and each divvying it up so that Health could provide a certain amount, Police and Housing and County Council ((erm)), there's been no joined up thinking."* *"We have a model which is a partnership model where there's a complicated, I don't think there's an algorithm, but there's a complicated funding structure [...]"*
Blended use of Resources	Interviewees predominantly considered that a blended approach to domestic violence provisions would be most favourable – drawing together 'traditional' refuge provision, with other community based approaches to housing. Where appropriate, this would enable victims to choose from a range of resources. In some instances, implementing a blended approach was considered to mitigate risks associated with the isolated use of alternative housing models **Subtheme: Alternative Provisions – Integrating Support:**	

	Participants described the complexity of issues in using target hardening, DVPOs and other alternatives to 'traditional' refuge based provision the majority of participants raised concerns and questions about the safety and effectiveness of DVPOs and Target Hardening. They did regard them as one viable option, but as part of a range of possible interventions. Participants emphasised that there was a need to ensure adequate support resourcing from specialists to ensure safety and effectiveness when using these measures.	*" [...] the advantage of the 'Sanctuary Programme' is they get a Support Worker with it, [...] they'll put extra doors and maybe a CCTV camera up, things like that. They have to have a Support Worker linked to them through the Outreach Service because otherwise, you find they've got a really 'hard target' and then you find that the perpetrator is perhaps living back with them and they could be even more at risk with a very safe house, locked inside"*
	Subtheme: Accommodation and Housing Most participants highlighted the importance of ensuring a range of housing and accommodation provision, with tailoring of level of support and security to the level of risk of each case.	*"[...] it's about having the whole toolbox. So it isn't just about saying "Okay we don't need safe accommodation because we're going to target the perpetrators and move them on". It needs to be the right intervention for the right person at the right time so we need the full range of options."*
Positive Change & Innovation	This theme focuses on change and innovation within the domestic abuse service landscape. Throughout the data set there were examples of participants calling for innovative practice, or examples where services were attempting to re-model provisions in order to broaden their target client group, meet needs more effectively or to produce a more cost-effective streamlined service in line with reductions to their budgets	*"[...] we just don't think outside the box enough. Actually, if you were to start with a blank sheet of paper, there could be any number of innovative ideas there, but I think people get too caught up in how we've always done things, and I think a lot of the adverse press stuff at the moment is very much caught up in how we've always done stuff without thinking, actually, this is an opportunity to rethink"*

5 Thematic Analysis

Drawing together the insights from the all the interviews conducted, three themes were identified.

5.1 Integrated funding model

Frequently occurring within the data set were discussions around the complexity (and sometimes confusion) of existing funding structures and of building or further developing more simplified or unified funding models or pooling IPV budgets. Many expressed a sense of hope that more integrated and streamlined structures would be developed within their area, whilst others talked about aims to further develop existing integrated models to ensure greater efficiency. Naomi reflects on the ineffective use of funding within her area:

> *Naomi: We're not actually clear sometimes about where it is that there is a gap, we've often duplicated funding.....*

Naomi's comment implies a need for a more integrated approach around commissioning services, suggesting that gaining a fuller, more detailed insight into the duplications and gaps in service provision would prevent inefficient and ineffective commissioning. Ben also highlights the work he and his team are currently doing which involves joining up commissioning:

> *Ben: [...] so we'd do a bit of work around, well at the moment, trying to join up budgets around Domestic Abuse from different partners and have a joined up approach.*

Here we see Ben planning to engage a range of different partners with a view to working together collaboratively to pool budgets and build an integrated funding model. David reflects on the funding model in his area and highlights a sense of uncertainty around future funding resulting from short-term commitments to commissioning. He also implies that the current funding model does not adequately allow for or enable organisations to forecast or make future plans in relation to service delivery:

> *David: In terms of IPV, the big risk around funding is we've talked about re-commissioning these services for about two, no, maybe for about three, four years. So every year our funders [...] have been thinking, "Right, we'll give for another 12 months then we'll see, we'll give it for another 12 months and then we'll see", and*

now it's, "We'll give it for another 6 months and we'll see". So I don't think we have a clear, we have a current funding model, but I don't think we have a clear one of what the future holds really.

David goes on to consider the Partnership model within his area and suggests that streamlining the pooled budget structure is required:

David: [...] We have a model which is a partnership model where there's a complicated, I don't think there's an algorithm, but there's a complicated funding structure where Police, County Council, District Councils, Private Hospitals [name omitted], and a variety of others, Probation – as was, pay in to provide what were agreed quite a few years ago a series of different sort of tools [...]

Helen's comment below reflects the thoughts of the majority of participants, considering funding models often to be 'disjointed' and lacking continuity. Helen calls for a more cost efficient and effective funding model and discusses some of the problems that she considers to filter down to Service Providers as a result of an inefficient or non-integrated funding model:

Helen: [...] there is no joined up thinking. All the timeframes for each of the strategies is very disjointed. So rather than each directory looking at where services could save them money, and each divvying it up so that Health could provide a certain amount, Police and Housing and County Council, there's been no joined up thinking. And that's where we've been really campaigning and fighting to say "look at the scope and the breadth of these issues and look at the social return on investment you get from refuge provision. It's relatively very cheap if you do a cost analysis of the impact on A&E beds, Police, Local Authorities having to pay for temporary accommodation, GPs prescribing antidepressants for anxiety and depression, which is a major contributory factor around domestic abuse"...

Similarly, Kim discusses the late release of tenders and subsequently what she felt were unrealistic deadlines for delivering and assessing an intervention programme aimed at building relationships between perpetrators and their children:

Kim: We just went back and said "This is so unsafe, we feel pressured to do something that can't be properly risk assessed, we'll end up putting children at risk by doing it, and we're not prepared to do that" so we refused it. This was accepted but the finance was not held available for us to have time to put together a safe and high quality intervention, which with time we could have done. So often demand is driven by pots of money being made available suddenly and the work needing to be completed and evaluated within impossibly short timescales in order to apply.

Timescales which don't even take into consideration of the number of weeks an intervention will run

Here Kim expresses a sense of feeling "pressured" to plan, deliver and evaluate an intervention programme. She suggests that the assessment and delivery of such a sensitive intervention aimed at rebuilding or developing relationships between perpetrators and their children would not be the sort of programme conducive to any kind of time pressures because of the potential risks that it could present to the children, carers and perpetrators. Kim conveys a sense that Service provisions are at the mercy of the specifications attached to funding, and that the late release of tenders puts pressure on the service. Kim suggests that "pots of money" are made available "suddenly", this could potentially imply that there is a lack of foresight in relation to the availability of funds, and a potential lack of forecasting, cohesion and planning surrounding the current commissioning model. Whilst most interviewees considered a more integrated approach to commissioning IPV to be a positive progression, many either foresaw, or had experienced barriers and obstacles which presented a challenge to more simplified funding structures being developed. Below, Linda reflects on the plans of her authority to draw funding together to create a pooled budget for IPV:

Linda: ...So the strategic review is I think quite complex to get everything together, so some contracts have just been rolling over year by year, but now with a strategic review everything will be brought supposedly all under one budget pot. Because we get paid from different pots of money, the idea is that all of the money will be grouped together in one pot, but that's quite difficult I think for different budget holders who may not want to release their budget... they've got the power to do with their budget as they think fit, but then they'll lose it and bring it all under one pot of funding.

Linda foresees complexities involving differing objectives of partners, and suggests that there might be some tensions around getting potential partners to agree to pool their budgets, releasing them and potentially relinquishing control over decision-making in the process of integration. She expresses a sense that budget holders participate in any integrative practice at their will, and do not have any authorisation to do so, statutory or otherwise. In a similar vein, Ben talks about having to negotiate differing delivery objectives and agendas of funding bodies in the process of building a unified model:

Int: Okay. Are you able to talk about the barriers and enablers to implementing a more unified approach?

Ben: ((erm)) ((...)) I think it's various funding levels is often one of the big barriers in terms of finding a model that allows for various funding in different geographic areas. Something we've looked at doing as well is joining up our funding with, or joining up an approach around not just domestic abuse, but other areas as well, but the differential in funding has made it difficult for us to find a model where we can commission something together that's then, I guess the funding is broken down appropriately. So it's that element there really, particularly where money from Local Authority is allocated to a specific geographical area that they are, I guess, to some extent quite rightly saying, "well we need to see the benefit of all this money in this area and not be subsidising other services in other areas, you know, because we're putting money in and others aren't"

Ben goes on to discuss the complexities and tensions involved in trying to encourage budget holders to agree to pay into an integrated model and suggests that difficulties might be resolved through a 'strategic agreement':

Ben: [...] I think something I've been realising a bit lately we need to do a bit more work on is actually is also having that, a strategic agreement that this is what we are going to do is join up funding. I think at my level there's quite a bit of will and an idea that we need to do this, but then actually having that, I guess endorsed and directed at a higher, at the kind of tops of organisations, is something we haven't got yet and need to get ((erm)) and I think the biggest barrier to that is that domestic abuse doesn't, the responsibility around developing and funding domestic abuse services doesn't sit in one particular service or one particular area, it sits across many services, and I think that can, yeah, it makes things more difficult because there's not one service that kind of says "right we've got to do this, and we're going to lead on this and pull this together". To some extent it's a partnership that everybody has an interest in doing something around domestic abuse, but no-one particularly has a responsibility for that [...]

Whilst Ben proposes plans to encourage agreement within a partnership model, Kerry suggests that this kind of approach was previously managed and coordinated by specifically assigned Domestic Violence Coordinators:

Kerry: We used to have a very strong Partnership approach to domestic abuse, but I do feel that the move, and it's kind of national really, there was a drive around having Domestic Violence Coordinators in post, and generally they would coordinate

Partnership-working, look at how the funding draws together. In some ways, they were the jack of all trades. They would be the commissioner, they would be the strategy writer, they would be the coordinator for the Partnership Boards. They would do all those things and certainly over the last few years there has been a move nationally to kind of, those posts have ceased to exist in many cases [...] I do think since that point coordination has become harder and harder. So in terms of funding changes specifically, I think all statutory partners are now struggling to, with diminished public resources and having much less money, are struggling to cope well with the changes. I also think though, it isn't just us, in terms of the changes to funding, there are other partners that I'm not convinced are prepared for the work that they need to do in response to changes

Kerry paints a picture of the work that Domestic Violence Coordinators would previously have undertaken. Responsibilities overwhelmingly focused on the drawing together of finances and Partnership-working. Kerry elaborates further on the challenges that face Partnership-working in the wake of funding changes:

Kerry: [...] the difficulty around who had what budget for what, and where it was transferred to certainly wasn't plain sailing and wasn't simple when the Health structures changed. So I think at one point, we were seeking for NHS England to confirm whether they had the funding for the 'Sexual Assault Referral Centre' because at our end, we couldn't find the budget, the budget wasn't still there. It turned out that they did have the budget [...] I guess that they're now at a point where they're having to commission something but they're still working through what the implications of that are and what they've got to do

Here Kerry reflects on the complexities of pooling budgets at a time when the commissioning climate is so uncertain and where their partners are also undergoing significant structural changes. Below, Linda suggests that political uncertainty within the UK reflects on commissioning:

Linda: We've got lots of tenders coming up, but there's lots of uncertainty about the future, not only because of strategic reviews that are taking place but also because of the general election and nobody's quite sure what is going to happen, so that makes it very difficult for us to plan services. So in the last couple of years, services have been rolling on a year by year basis without people being sure of what's happening, so it means our lives really stop in March, but we're not able to say what's going to happen beyond that.

Several participants talked about the forthcoming election and related it to uncertainty around funding. Linda connects this uncertainty with an inability to effectively plan services, and implies that this uncertainty is cascaded down from a commissioning level to service provision.

5.2 BLENDED USE OF RESOURCES

This was the most frequently occurring theme within the data set, with two subthemes identified as '*Alternative Provisions'* and '*Housing & Accommodation'*. '*Alternative Provisions'* represents participants' thoughts in relation to provisions such as 'Target Hardening' and 'Domestic Violence Protection Orders' (DVPOs). The '*Housing and Accommodation'* subtheme represents participants' considerations into refuge, safe-and crisis-accommodation, and re-settlement housing. Interviewees predominantly considered that a blended approach to domestic violence provisions would be safer, and more efficient and cost effective than using tools singly. Participants perceived that a blended approach would enable practitioners to better meet clients' diverse and complex needs, and it was considered to be more inclusive, enabling men and those with mobility issues to draw on interpersonal violence resources that may have previously only been aimed at women and children. In theory a blended use of resources would enable a more person-centred approach, allowing clients greater flexibility to design their own pathway to surviving domestic abuse, thereby engendering a sense of empowerment.

> *Ben: ...I think ideally what we'd have is a mixed economy of provision for people and what's appropriate for that person's needs, really, that actually fits. And then there is actually something that makes them more secure, and feels more secure, available. But actually if they do need to get away and get out of there, then they can.*
> *Kerry: ... it's about having the whole toolbox. So it isn't just about saying "Okay we don't need safe accommodation because we're going to target the perpetrators and move them on". It needs to be the right intervention for the right person at the right time so we need the full range of options.*

5.2.1 Alternative Provisions

There were tensions and contradictions in the ways that participants spoke about alternative IPV provisions. One interviewee considered DVPOs and Target Hardening to be a cheaper but ineffective and potentially risk-laden way of managing IPV. The majority of the cohort raised concerns and questions about the safety and effectiveness of DVPOs and Target Hardening, but nonetheless considered them to be a viable option when used as part of a range of interventions - a blended use of resources. Ben shares his thoughts on the isolated use of DVPOs:

> *Ben: We've just started work around DVPOs and I think we've identified there's a big risk, that there isn't anything at the moment around support for the person who, well I guess that's similar to the 'Perpetrator Leaves' type model in that there isn't that support there.*

Like Ben, Naomi and Paula also identify potential risks associated with the isolated use of Target Hardening and DVPOs and suggest that drawing on Outreach Support Workers might help to mitigate these risks:

> *Naomi: ...Do I think it will be effective? I think the only way it will be effective is if it's enforced and supported. And what we're proposing is that if they use a DVPO anywhere, then [name of DV organisation omitted] will support that victim because in theory, if you need a DVPO, you're basically saying that there is some kind of professional judgement that suggests that they are high risk and that perpetrator shouldn't return [...] as we know perpetrators are very, very clever at finding out where somebody is, and where there's a DVPO, they basically know that the person they've been abusing is where they are at that time, so if it's not properly enforced, they'll just go back there*.
>
> *Int: And in your area do you have things like Target Hardening and DVPOs*
> *Paula: Yeah, mainly that goes through the Districts...some of them have just general Crime Prevention Target Hardening Programmes, but the advantage of the 'Sanctuary Programme' is they get a Support Worker with it, so that comes out of our Outreach Service. [...] So Sanctuary, they'll put extra doors and maybe a CCTV camera up, things like that. They have to have a Support Worker linked to them through the Outreach Service because otherwise, you find they've got a really 'hard target' and then you find that the perpetrator is perhaps living back with them and they could be even more at risk with a very safe house, locked inside.*

Paula highlights a major concern in relation to the safety of victims post-Target Hardening, suggesting that potentially they could actually be at greater risk having had their

accommodation Target Hardened, if perpetrators returned to the properties either by force, or through the resumption of the intimate partner relationship. Naomi and Paula build a case for linking Support Workers to victims where Target Hardening has been undertaken and where DVPOs have been issued. Kate added a stipulation to the issuing of DVPOs suggesting that they should not be used in cases deemed to be high risk:

> *Int: You said you're not 100% for them [DVPOs], do you think they are useful in any aspect or?*
>
> *Kate: [...] the very hardcore domestic violence, I don't believe that should be used in those instances <u>at all</u>.*

Many interviewees felt that there were a lot of unanswered questions in relation to the criteria, delivery and enforcement of alternative models. We explore a selection of these below, starting with Hayley's thoughts on DVPOs:

> *Hayley: Well if the perpetrator's going to leave the home, that's fabulous. How long's he going to leave it for? And is there going to be any contact while he's left the home? Is there going to be any harassment by telephone, text, whatever? It's not the same as coming into refuge and rebuilding your life. It's a different solution for a different case I would think. It's another string to the bow*

Here Hayley suggests that DVPOs might offer an alternative option to going into refuge. She perceives the 'moving away' element of refuge to be an important opportunity for victims to start afresh and "rebuild*" their lives. She clearly feels strongly about the benefits of refuge, and implies that refuge would be the better option; she does however view DVPOs as a positive addition to a range of tools which can be selected and implemented where appropriate. David also raises concerns about DVPOs and the implications to perpetrators, perceiving there to be gaps in the legislation:

> *David: I think it makes assumptions that they will move in with other family, friends or out of their own pocket, they'll go into a B&B, or those sort of things. I think it notes their human rights, but it doesn't explicitly say that the Local Authorities have to provide 'X' that are displaced from their home. It's quite draconian, the legislation in that way, which does worry me, does worry our partners because some of these perpetrators are vulnerable in their own way and...their own vulnerabilities can be further exploited by further displacing them, but there's a balance between protecting the life of a child and a victim*

Paula raises similar concerns in relation to the displacement of perpetrators issued with Domestic Violence Protection Orders:

Paula: ...we're keen on DVPOs. We haven't started it yet, it's coming in July here [...] we're quite keen on it, sort of watch and wait really. The only concern about it expressed has been that we're going to have frustrated perpetrators hanging around, y'know, are they going to be homeless? What are we going to do with them? But the review from the pilots of DVPOs didn't raise that as a major issue

Int: ...Is there any strategy in place for those perpetrators or ...?

Paula: We haven't managed to do anything. We're wondering whether there'll be a pressure on our homelessness services

Although Paula raises concerns about the potential increase in homelessness owing to the eviction of perpetrators from their accommodation, there are no strategies in place to work with or accommodate perpetrators in her area. Potentially if additional pressure on homelessness services becomes apparent following the introduction of DVPOs, a strategy to deal with the impact will need to be implemented. This suggests a reactive and siloed approach to intervening in domestic abuse, rather than a preventative and multi-agency approach which might attempt to plan and remediate the possible impacts of one service on another. Paula's comments might imply a need for the implementation of an additional resource where DVPOs are issued, specifically aimed at temporarily accommodating the perpetrator, and possibly also around working with the perpetrator in relation to their behaviour. Below, Paula identifies that DVPOs may provide victims with a period of respite and enable support services to work with them; however she also raises another concern in relation to the person accused of DV perpetration:

Paula: [...] it gives us time to put support in if they want it for the family. I think it may be seen as harsh on whoever's accused of the violence 'cause there's no evidence required. But given how many women refuse to give evidence because they're so intimidated, y'know, that's what we're dealing with.

Kate echoes the sentiments of participants quoted above and raises safety concerns and questions in relation to both victim and perpetrator:

Kate: The DVPOs? Myself personally, I think they can work at some level, but I'm not 100% for them myself, I'm not 100% for them. You can say that the perpetrator goes, that's fine, but what happens to the perpetrator? Where does the perpetrator go? They'll put the orders in, when women are found, they can be found in refuges if they know where they are anyway. The fact that they're living in the same home, they definitely know where they are. And then they give them the Target Hardening where they say "We'll put shut-downs in the home", and again the woman becomes

another victim as far as I'm concerned, they're in their own homes and are having to lock themselves in.

Kate infers that no one tool can completely protect victims. If perpetrators can locate victims in refuges then, as Kate implies, they may be at greater risk where the perpetrator already knows the victim's address, general location and routines. Kate perceives that Target Hardening could potentially create secondary victimisation by imprisoning and further isolating them. Kate does not entirely dismiss DVPOs but, whilst she personally is not a supporter, she does consider that they can be effective on some level. Similarly, whilst she considers that the heightened security aspect of Target Hardening can potentially have a negative impact on victims, she does not present a critique of its efficacy. In analysing her comment, we can infer that Kate considers there to be pros and cons to these models, suggesting that refinement and the implementation of appropriate additional support could maximise their efficacy and reduce weaknesses.

5.2.2 Accommodation & Housing

All participants considered that some form of safe housing was a necessary provision for those fleeing domestic abuse, but suggestions as to the form this accommodation takes varied amongst participants. Several suggested that safe accommodation should be short-term and made available only in cases deemed to be high risk. Kerry considers the possibility of admitting to safe accommodation according to levels of risk to victims:

Kerry: [...] There's something for me that says "we need to examine the levels of risk sufficient to require safe accommodation, or the choices around safe accommodation made".

Several interviewees suggested that crisis accommodation should be available nationwide as an absolute minimum. However, the majority were concerned about the closure of refuges, and the potential impact it could have on individual families and the wider society as Helen and Claire highlight:

Helen: It will see an increase I believe in child protection issues, because there will be families where violence is occurring, and children will be suffering. So I think they'll have an impact on health and well being of the general population. Hopefully we don't see an increase in domestic homicides, but I should imagine we will, because nationally the statistics are showing that it's happening more and more. And the thing is refuge offers an immediate solution to a problem, so if that's not there,

it's going to have an impact on the social purse because Police will have to find accommodation overnight for families. Accident and Emergency...

Claire: Local Authorities are going to have more people presenting with domestic abuse at their homeless sections, which, I don't think they are fully taking on board at the moment, and therefore, you know, again, bed and breakfast accommodation and the costs of that for them are going to increase.

Claire echoes concerns raised earlier within this report in relation to the possible homelessness and displacement of the victims and perpetrators of domestic abuse. She suggests that whilst financial savings will be made by decommissioning refuges, costs to accommodate those made homeless will increase. Several participants suggested that 'traditional refuge' provisions are not inclusive or open to accommodating a broader demographic, including male victims of domestic abuse, or those with mobility difficulties:

Kerry: Regarding refuges, over the last ten years particularly there have been a lot of developments in terms of their delivery model and how they work, what they do, how they respond. However, there is for me a very fundamental part of refuge delivery "as is" which is based on shared accommodation for women and their children, where applicable, that delivers not only safe accommodation but an overall support element as well [...] there's a number of things in that the "traditional" model doesn't respond to, so that being different types of accommodation. Not everyone wants to go into a shared house, and particularly if there are children in the house as well. If you're a single woman [...] It's about understanding that the model we've got doesn't always give a differentiated approach according to what somebody may want. And I understand that we have to prioritise safety sometimes over a whole heap of other choices, but ultimately I think we're at a position where if we're going to remodel, we could try and take that into account. I also think, in picking my words carefully, it responds to women so there isn't really an accommodation-based solution for male victims of domestic abuse for example, or consistently any way. So there's a number of things that I think traditional refuge doesn't really respond to. [...]

Similarly, in order to meet the needs and choices of those fleeing domestic abuse, Naomi suggests that a range of options be made available:

Naomi: What about those people that don't want to stay in a refuge, they want to stay in their own accommodation, or they want to get housed in a different part of the County. There was some funding given to the refuges to do that sort of support, but actually for some of those people, they would want to access other services.

In terms of housing and accommodation, Naomi and Kerry collectively call for a more open, inclusive provision which enables victims to choose from a range of options. Kim talks about some of the families her organisation works with, and suggests that resources that support and encourage positive familial relationships and cohesion are limited:

> *Kim: We have some families who do want to be together, they don't actually want to split up, but our options have been quite limited really to*
> *make sure kids are kept safe*

Kim's comment would suggest that if resources were available to support families to build their relationships, in cases where it would be deemed safe to do so, it may present as a long-term, more favourable alternative to refuge and subsequent separation, for some families. This addition could widen the range of IPV provisions, and give low-risk families greater choice.

David goes on to discuss the consequences of refuge closure on the Police Service:

> *David: ...Well we got to the brink of losing, a matter of weeks away from losing the whole refuge provision. And refuge is complicated because from what I understand, the majority of people, or a high proportion of the people in the refuges funded by us aren't local people, because of the nature, you want to get them away from the abusive area, so those ripples go across the country don't they really. So it's hard to say because I think at the point, I know I was at a series of meetings where they were talking about right, "we're going to lose the provision, we've got an exit strategy, we're not taking any further referrals". And clearly for us, it reduced some tactical options, in terms of how do you then protect those victims? [...]*

David's comment infers that the Police Service have historically been able to use refuge as a 'tactical option'. In the event of refuge decommissioning, because there is a lack of alternative strategies in place, it potentially could have a huge impact on the way that the Police approach and deal with incidents of domestic abuse. Ben also raises concerns in relation to the decommissioning of refuge:

> *Ben: [...] I guess my own overall thing around [...] changing refuge provision is that issue that actually refuge is part of a national network rather than a resource for people locally specifically. So I think certainly a lot of commissioning decisions are based on the fact that actually maybe we're not seeing loads of people go through this refuge from our area, and actually benefitting people in this area and so they're changing the model based on that but I think the difficulty there is there are some people who need that support and if everybody commissioned on that basis then you would be really breaking up that national network of refuges. I think, I guess the*

view is I think there's concern around different models that it takes away from that it changes what's available and maybe leaves some gaps essentially in what's available, unless you can get a mixed kind of economy across different areas around accommodation support. But it's having the resources to do that, and the available approach, that's the difficulty.

Ben identifies that potentially the national network of refuges could be broken down because commissioners are making decisions not to fund refuges within their locality as those refuges do not serve a significant number of the local population. The reduction in refuge accommodation could potentially make it more difficult to flee domestic abuse, and limit choices as opposed to broaden them. David also raises concern about the challenges of accommodating people:

David: [...] the mitigation was always, actually, refuge filled the gap that was the statutory responsibility for housing providers [...] that's a real challenge for the Districts to deliver around really, you know, very few of them hold stock, so therefore their ability to displace one family and put them in another home is quite difficult.

David considers the lack of social housing stock to be the key reason for the limited availability of accommodation. There is a sense from David's comment that refuge fills a gap that should actually be filled by housing providers and managed and governed at a District level. It can be inferred from his comment that he perceives that an increase in social housing stock would result in an alternative to refuge, with the flexibility to move and accommodate people quickly in emergencies.

Paula talks about her concerns that cuts to refuge provisions are driving privatisation and profiteering and leaving those fleeing without necessary specialist domestic violence support:

Paula: I am worried, I do worry about, we also have a commercial enterprise in the County that calls itself a 'Refuge'. It's a homeless hostel claiming Housing Benefit and they do worry me because they set up expectations claiming that they're like a women's refuge when actually all they are is a Private Landlord claiming Housing Benefit - We've had to pick up quite distressed people who thought they were getting support and then they didn't

Int: So in what ways do they claim to be like a refuge?

Paula: Well they got into the 'Gold Book', the Women's Aid 'Gold Book' a few years ago. But it's completely private, there's no trustees or not-for-profit kind of set-up

Kerry proposes an alternative model to refuge currently being considered within her locality:

Kerry: [...] What we have been trying to propose is, let's take a medium risk domestic abuse family and let's say the mother requires safe accommodation with her children. The difficulty we're having at the moment is, if that family's working with Targeted Prevention [...] would we want to fund the wrap around support? We would want safe accommodation, but bear in mind that our [Targeted Prevention Practitioner] is trained to do that and provide the wrap around support. That's a debate that we're having now locally as to how we do that because we can't duplicate, we can't pay for two lots of Support.

In order to reduce the duplication of funding, the housing model that Kerry discusses here would entail the division of the accommodation and support elements of refuge. Refuge support has historically been provided by the voluntary sector that has also overseen and managed the accommodation. Within the model Kerry describes, the Targeted Prevention Team would provide the support. Gwen and Kim consider the type of alternative model that Kerry describes (above), where refuge accommodation would be funded by Housing Benefit, and refuge Support would be provided by an outside agency. They hint at similar concerns raised by Paula (above) in relation to the potential for unmonitored, non-specialist providers acting as landlords to those fleeing domestic abuse:

Gwen [...] I think that in a sense you become a landlord, well that landlord could be somebody over the
road...If you're not actually able to use your expertise, then there is no point in you existing to deliver that [...] There's no real value in doing that.

Kim: Being a landlord isn't our skill!

5.3 POSITIVE CHANGE & INNOVATION

This theme focuses on change and innovation within the domestic abuse service landscape. Throughout the data set there were examples of participants calling for innovative practice, or examples where services were attempting to re-model provisions in order to broaden their target client group, meet needs more effectively or to produce a more cost-effective streamlined service in line with reductions to their budgets. Kerry gives us an example of the former, and calls for innovation within the IPV landscape:

Kerry: [...] I do wonder, one of the barriers, is that we don't, it's all of us, it's not just voluntary sector, it's public service as well, we just don't think outside the box enough. Actually, if you were to start with a blank sheet of paper, there could be any

number of innovative ideas there, but I think people get too caught up in how we've always done things, and I think a lot of the adverse press stuff at the moment is very much caught up in how we've always done stuff without thinking, actually, this is an opportunity to rethink

Kerry gives a sense that in effect the slate should be 'wiped clean' in relation to the IPV landscape in order to start afresh and overhaul it. However, others gave examples of their attempts to bring about positive change in smaller ways within their own services and areas:

Kim: We are moving towards extending and improving the holistic nature of the work specifically looking at working with those who find it especially difficult to break free so those with more complex needs, and those with life-long abuse that makes it very difficult to change patterns in short-term interventions, those with other additional needs to domestic abuse that make it difficult, especially where there's child protection issues. So we're looking at improving and extending the holistic nature to provide a programme.

At a time when commissioning is funding time-limited and short-term interventions, Kim's organisation has made a choice to support a client group who are likely to require medium- to long-term support. However, in providing an intervention to those with complex needs and who have experienced life-long abuse, it may potentially provide a key to reducing the repetition of intergenerational patterns of violence. In a similar way Paula goes on to talk about an alternative housing model she perceives to be innovative which has been implemented within her locality:

Paula: So imagine the woman and children moved into Supported Housing, it's provided by Housing Association, then they get 6 months support funded by a specialist worker. It's a Supported Housing model, like you'd have for Learning Disability. But once the family's settled instead of having to move into permanent accommodation, they keep the flat or the house and the ((Housing Association)) makes another one available for the Supported Housing. Isn't that clever! ((said with enthusiasm)). When I heard of it, I thought why don't we do more of that?...It's a good model for a partnership between a specialist provider and a housing and social landlord. There's no reason why that couldn't happen more generally [...] Definitely if you can't afford refuges, I think a Supported Housing project is a good second best, and for some people it's better!

Paula's enthusiasm for this alternative model was clear. She implies that it could present an answer to some of the problems associated with refuge, such as the challenges of sharing

with others, of not being inclusive to all demographics, and of waiting for and relocating to resettlement accommodation.

Many participants spoke about the barriers to service planning and delivery and the key issue underscoring this was a sense of uncertainty relating to commissioning:

> *Paula: There will be some savings but we haven't been given a percentage yet. What we did was, because we commissioned and all the grants as were agreed in 2012, and it's very high profile politically in Nottinghamshire so we managed to hold on to most of the money we'd had with little reduction, and then they were protected from last year's massive savings that the County Council did. But when we re-procure in 2015 we know there will be a reduction, but we don't know how much it is.*
>
> *Int: So things are more likely to change in 2015?*
>
> *Paula: Yeah, but I don't think it's going to be massive because we've still got really good political support compared to some areas of the Council*

Paula continues:

> *Int: So do you mean you don't know the extent of the saving that you need to make?*
>
> *Paula: Yeah, we don't know any of it. That's the difficulty at the moment, is we're trying to plan ahead with limited knowledge, and I understand why people can't give you that, I mean there's going to be an election in May. I don't know how much the outgoing Government will tie everything up, before they the election. And all Local Government finance is under such, such strain*

Ben echoes Paula's thoughts, suggesting that he is anticipating financial reductions and changes to structures underpinning domestic abuse support services, but he is uncertain as to the form these changes will take:

> *Ben: [...] And I think generally the difficulties we are looking at for beyond this year really, so for 2015/16 onwards is where we're seeing potential cuts to some of the budgets that go into domestic abuse support services at a Local Authority level and a lot of uncertainty and change around some of the other structures there*

Several participants reflected upon stipulations attached to funding, and perceived these delivery specifications to be overly strict. The different objectives and agendas between individual funding bodies were also considered to have a detrimental impact, frequently shifting, shaping and re-shaping their services. This was perceived to create fragmented and inconsistent provisions. Helen and Claire, Service Providers, discuss the delivery specifications attached to the funding of their group work interventions. They perceive

restrictions and exclusions in relation to the demographics of clients that they are permitted to offer support to:

> *Claire: Self-referrals, wouldn't qualify for the interventions under the new contracts.*
>
> *Helen: No, and they've got to have children over five.*
>
> *Claire: They've also got to be referred in by a professional social worker. .....So self-referrals wouldn't ...*
>
> *Int: So people can't self refer into the interventions?*
>
> *Helen: No. Single women will not be covered*

They go on to say:

> *Helen: [...] Well I believe that it's very short sighted.*
>
> *Claire: If you wanted to sum it up, it's only meeting part of a need.*

Helen and Claire build a picture of a difficult to access service, non-inclusive in terms of demographics and rigid in its criteria in relation to who it can assist. It is apparent that the changes to the funding landscape of IPV have been a challenge to both Service Providers and commissioners alike. Reflecting on Helen and Claire's comments above, for IPV Service Providers in general who have historically campaigned for women and children to flee abuse, it is perhaps not an understatement to view the economic changes they have had to negotiate and adapt to as a culture shock. To potentially be in a position of having to turn those trying to access help away is the antithesis of how they have historically worked.

6 Conclusions and recommendations

- The funding and service landscape for domestic violence is in considerable flux, and models of good practice are not well established or well evidenced
- All participants across all regions indicated that responses to this changing landscape are varied and developing
- Models that enable survivor-victims to stay at home offer one potential response to this changing landscape, but this must be part of a range of services available that can be tailored to the specific needs of the survivor-victim (and where relevant their family
- Models using housing benefit and accessing public health funding represent further potential elements of an integrated response

- Altering models of housing provision will require a strong enforcement response, with clear monitoring of orders and rapid and effective responses to breaches

- UK and international approaches to domestic violence provision all highlight the importance of having a range of available models for clients in different circumstances with different needs. Literature and interview evidence suggests a need to maintain shelter, emergency and transitional housing – this cannot be 'replaced' with other models, but needs to be sustained alongside other models of housing and support.

7 References

Baker, C. K., Billhardt, K. a., Warren, J., Rollins, C., & Glass, N. E. (2010). Domestic violence, housing instability, and homelessness: A review of housing policies and program practices for meeting the needs of survivors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *15*(6), 430–439. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2010.07.005

Botein, H., & Hetling, A. (2010). Permanent supportive housing for domestic violence victims: program theory and client perspectives. *Housing Policy Debate*, *20*(2), 185–208. doi:10.1080/10511481003738575

Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit. (2014). *Finding the Costs of Freedom How women and children rebuild their lives after domestic violence* (pp. 1–6). London.

Clarke, A., & Wydall, S. (2013). "Making Safe": A Coordinated Community Response to Empowering Victims and Tackling Perpetrators of Domestic Violence. *Social Policy and Society*, *12*(03), 393–406. doi:10.1017/S147474641200070X

Department for Communities and Local Government. (2010). *The Effectiveness of Schemes to Enable Households at Risk of Domestic Violence to Remain in their Own Homes Background to the Research : Domestic Violence*. London.

Edward, K., & Avenue, V. I. I. (2003). The Cardiff Women ' s Safety Unit : A Multi-Agency Approach to Domestic Violence Final Evaluation Report Dr Amanda L Robinson School of Social Sciences Glamorgan Building, (02920).

Edwards, R. (2004). *Staying Home*.

Erez, E., & Ibarra, P. R. (2006). Making Your Home a Shelter: Electronic Monitoring and Victim Re-entry in Domestic Violence Cases. *British Journal of Criminology*, *47*(1), 100–120. doi:10.1093/bjc/azl026

Fotheringham, S., Walsh, C. a., & Burrowes, A. (2013). "A place to rest": the role of transitional housing in ending homelessness for women in Calgary, Canada. *Gender, Place & Culture*, (May 2014), 1–20. doi:10.1080/0966369X.2013.810605

Government, T. S. (2010). DOMESTIC ABUSE , HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS IN SCOTLAND : AN EVIDENCE REVIEW, (September), 1–33.

Hague, G., & Bridge, S. (2008). Inching forward on domestic violence: the "co-ordinated community response" and putting it in practice in Cheshire. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *17*(3), 185–199. doi:10.1080/09589230802204134

Hirst, A., Rinne, S., & Consultants, C. P. (n.d.). *The impact of changes in commissioning and funding on women-only services*.

Horvath, M. A. H., Lovett, J., Coulson, M., Kernohan, D., & Gray, M. (2013). Evaluation of the Pilot of Domestic Violence Protection Orders, (November).

Netto, G., Pawson, H., & Sharp, C. (2009). Preventing Homelessness due to Domestic Violence: Providing a Safe Space or Closing the Door to New Possibilities? *Social Policy & Administration*, *43*(7), 719–735. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2009.00691.x

Nsw, H. (2013). Start Safely Program Guidelines Key Features, (June 2009), 1–5.

Pavao, J., Alvarez, J., Baumrind, N., Induni, M., & Kimerling, R. (2007). Intimate partner violence and housing instability. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *32*(2), 143–6. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2006.10.008

Price-kelly, S. (2010). Accommodating Violence, (September).

Rhodes, A. (n.d.). S TRENGTHENING THE G UARD : T HE U SE OF GPS S URVEILLANCE TO E NFORCE D OMESTIC V IOLENCE, 129–144.

Spinney, A. (n.d.). Reducing the Need for Women and Children to Make Repeated Use of Refuge and Other Crisis Accommodation, Evidence Note 26. Queensland: Australian Government.

Squire, G. (2007). Locking up the victim — domestic violence policy looks in the wrong direction. *Criminal Justice Matters*, *69*(1), 34–35. doi:10.1080/09627250708553265

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1: Participant Forms – Local Authority Professionals

Information Sheet – Local Authorities

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

The Purpose of the Research

We are interested in understanding how domestic violence services have continued to provide services (especially accommodation), in the wake of significant changes to funding models in local authorities. We would like to understand how services are being provided, how funding is being managed, and what alternative models of funding and service provision are being considered. We would also like to understand the impact of funding changes on the day to day provisions of services, and on long term service planning. The project is being conducted at the request of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Northamptonshire County Council, to inform service planning.

There is very little information in the public domain in relation to the changing landscape of interpersonal violence provisions and in order to develop knowledge in this area we are inviting service providers and professionals working in different local authorities to share their thoughts and experiences in one-off, informal telephone or Skype interviews.

The primary use of the data generated from the telephone interviews will be to inform a report for Northampton County Council on the way that domestic violence shelter provision has been secured in the context of changes to commissioning practices. Primarily, this report will provide a synthetic description of the data. Case studies of the way that funding has been secured will be provided on a Local Authority by Local Authority basis. In addition, specific themes across the various regional contexts will be identified, to consider the barriers, obstacles and enablers for domestic violence provision across the country. Anonymised quotes from interviews with participants will be used to illustrate these themes. If appropriate data is secured, the study may also be reported in appropriate peer reviewed publications, or presented at academic conferences.

What Participation Involves

After reading this information sheet if you decide that you would like to participate, you can contact me using the details below to arrange a mutually convenient day and time for a telephone or Skype interview. Before the interview, you will be asked to complete & email me a consent form to ensure that you understand the nature of the project and of participation. If you prefer, you can provide verbal consent at the start of the interview.

We will be grateful of any contribution you can offer, and so there is no minimum time allocated for interview, although it should last a maximum of 1 hour.

A copy of the interview questions is attached at the end of this information sheet to give you an idea of the kinds of questions I will cover. If you don't want to answer a particular question, or you want to stop the interview at any point, just let me know. After the interview, if you decide that you no longer want the information you share to be included in the research, you can let me know using the email below.

I will audio-record the interview so that I have a have an accurate record for transcription purposes. This recording will then be transcribed word for word, but all identifying information (such as names, place names etc) will be changed to pseudonyms, to protect your anonymity. Whilst we will take all reasonable steps to safeguard anonymity (by removing identifying information including names and specific organisational information) the nature of this research requires that regional contexts be identified.
All interviews will be analysed to develop a picture of the ways that interpersonal violence service provisions have changed and are managing changes in the wake of changes to funding models. We will develop themes from the focus groups and when we write these up for official reports and for scholarly publication, we will use quotes from the interviews to illustrate the themes. Names and other identifying information will not be reported or included with these quotes.
Care will be taken to store all the information from the interviews securely. Digital audio recordings will be stored on a password protected device. Consent forms will be kept in a locked cabinet, and stored separately from the recordings.

Researcher Contact Information:
If you would like to participate in the study, if you have any questions, or if you want to withdraw after the project, I can be contacted using the following information:
Email: joanne.alexander@northampton.ac.uk
Phone: 07738 738002

If you have any concerns about the research process or if any problems should arise, you can contact the Project Supervisor:
Dr Jane Callaghan
The University of Northampton
Boughton Green Road
Northampton
NN2 7AL
Jane.callaghan@northampton.ac.uk

If you are happy to continue in this process, please contact me to arrange a mutually convenient day/time for interview. Thank you for your involvement.

Interview Schedule – Local Authorities

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

What kinds of changes have there been to the funding of interpersonal violence services in your area?

- What changes have there been to provisions for victims and perpetrators of domestic violence?

How have you managed funding changes to interpersonal violence services?

- In what ways have you tried to ensure that victims & perpetrators continue to receive support despite changes to funding?

- Have alternative housing models been considered? Have these been implemented? What have been some of the barriers and enablers for implementing new models?

- How do you view the introduction of some alternative models for the provision of shelter for people fleeing domestic violence? E.G. how do you see the 'perpetrator leaves' model/ DVPOs/'Target Hardening'/Refuge on housing benefit?

- Is refuge still needed in your area and how specifically are services like refuge being funded?

Who in your area (Council/District/Borough) takes responsibility for Interpersonal Violence accommodation provisions?

- What role does health and other statutory services have on funding?
- Is there an accommodation strategy in your area?

Are there any examples of embedded practice &/or Multi-disciplinary working in your area relating to Interpersonal Violence? (e.g. IDVA's being based in A&E departments)

- Do you have any suggestions as to where IPV provisions might effectively sit within existing services

Consent form

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

Please tick to show your consent in participating in this study.

I have read and understood the information sheet for the project 'Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape'. I acknowledge that:

The purpose of the study has been fully explained to me	
I have the right to withdraw at any point during the interview, and up to one week after by contacting the researcher	
I have the right to not answer any question if I so wish	
I understand that the interview will be digitally recorded	
All interviews will be transcribed word for word, but that my name and other identifying information will be removed from the transcripts and not reported to protect my anonymity.	
Anonymised quotes from my interview will be used within the report and any subsequent scholarly publication	
I am able to contact the researcher if I have any queries	

Signed : .....
Print name : .....
Date : .....

8.2 Appendix 2: Participant Forms – Service Providers

Information Sheet – Service Providers

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

The Purpose of the Research

We are interested in understanding how domestic violence services have continued to provide services (especially accommodation), in the wake of significant changes to funding models in local authorities. We would like to understand how services are being provided, how funding is being managed, and what alternative models of funding and service provision are being considered. We would also like to understand the impact of funding changes on the day to day provisions of services, and on long term service planning. The project is being conducted at the request of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Northamptonshire County Council, to inform service planning.

There is very little information in the public domain in relation to the changing landscape of interpersonal violence provisions and in order to develop knowledge in this area we are inviting service providers and professionals working in different local authorities to share their thoughts and experiences in one-off, informal telephone or Skype interviews.

The primary use of the data generated from the telephone interviews will be to inform a report for Northampton County Council on the way that domestic violence shelter provision has been secured in the context of changes to commissioning practices. Primarily, this report will provide a synthetic description of the data. Case studies of the way that funding has been secured will be provided on a Local Authority by Local Authority basis. In addition, specific themes across the various regional contexts will be identified, to consider the barriers, obstacles and enablers for domestic violence provision across the country. Anonymised quotes from interviews with participants will be used to illustrate these themes. If appropriate data is secured, the study may also be reported in appropriate peer reviewed publications, or presented at academic conferences.

What Participation Involves

After reading this information sheet if you decide that you would like to participate, you can contact me using the details below to arrange a mutually convenient day and time for a telephone or Skype interview. Before the interview, you will be asked to complete & email me a consent form to ensure that you understand the nature of the project and of participation. If you prefer, you can provide verbal consent at the start of the interview.

We will be grateful of any contribution you can offer, and so there is no minimum time allocated for interview, although it should last a maximum of 1 hour.

A copy of the interview questions is attached at the end of this information sheet to give you an idea of the kinds of questions I will cover. If you don't want to answer a particular question, or you want to stop the interview at any point, just let me know. After the interview, if you decide that you no longer want the information you share to be included in the research, you can let me know using the email below.

I will audio-record the interview so that I have a have an accurate record for transcription purposes. This recording will then be transcribed word for word, but all identifying information

(such as names, place names etc) will be changed to pseudonyms, to protect your anonymity. Whilst we will take all reasonable steps to safeguard anonymity (by removing identifying information including names and specific organisational information) the nature of this research requires that regional contexts be identified.
All interviews will be analysed to develop a picture of the ways that interpersonal violence service provisions have changed and are managing changes in the wake of changes to funding models. We will develop themes from the focus groups and when we write these up for official reports and for scholarly publication, we will use quotes from the interviews to illustrate the themes. Names and other identifying information will not be reported or included with these quotes.
Care will be taken to store all the information from the interviews securely. Digital audio recordings will be stored on a password protected device. Consent forms will be kept in a locked cabinet, and stored separately from the recordings.

Researcher Contact Information:
If you would like to participate in the study, if you have any questions, or if you want to withdraw after the project, I can be contacted using the following information:
Email: joanne.alexander@northampton.ac.uk
Phone: 07738 738002

If you have any concerns about the research process or if any problems should arise, you can contact the Project Supervisor:
Dr Jane Callaghan
The University of Northampton
Boughton Green Road
Northampton
NN2 7AL
Jane.callaghan@northampton.ac.uk

If you are happy to continue in this process, please contact me to arrange a mutually convenient day/time for interview. Thank you for your involvement.

Interview Schedule – Service Providers

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

What impact have funding changes for interpersonal violence services had on your services?

What changes have you seen over the last two years?

How has the formation of CCG's, changes in probation services, etc, impacted on the way that you have been funded? How has this affected the way you deliver services?

How specifically are services like refuge being funded in your area?

How is your area ensuring that victims and perpetrators of domestic abuse continue to receive services and support?

Have alternative housing models been considered? Have these been implemented? What have been some of the barriers and enablers for implementing new models?

How do you view the introduction of some alternative models for the provision of shelter for people fleeing domestic violence? E.G. how do you see the 'perpetrator leaves' model/DVPOs/'Target Hardening'/Refuge on housing benefit?

Consent form

Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape

Please tick to show your consent in participating in this study.

I have read and understood the information sheet for the project 'Understanding the Shifting Interpersonal Violence Service Landscape'. I acknowledge that:

The purpose of the study has been fully explained to me	
I have the right to withdraw at any point during the interview, and up to one week after by contacting the researcher	
I have the right to not answer any question if I so wish	
I understand that the interview will be digitally recorded	
All interviews will be transcribed word for word, but that my name and other identifying information will be removed from the transcripts and not reported to protect my anonymity.	
Anonymised quotes from my interview will be used within the report and any subsequent scholarly publication	
I am able to contact the researcher if I have any queries	

Signed : .....
Print name : .....
Date : .....