# Respect Outcomes Framework

RESPECT

e: info@respect.uk.net

w: www.respect.uk.net

Respect Phoneline: 0808 802 4040

/RespectUK

/UKRespect

# Outcomes Framework - Respect Standard

## Reduction in Perpetrator's Violent and Abusive Behaviour

- Reduction in physical and sexual violence and abuse
- Reduction in coercive control
- Reduction of risk of future harm
- Better conflict resolution
- Improvement in the quality of close relationships

**Measures**
- Impact tool kit
- Mirabal research measures 1, 2 & 5 – respectful communication, safety & freedom from violence and abuse, awareness of self and others

**Proxy indicators**
- Reduction in Police call outs
- Reduction in risk scores

## Increase in Survivor's Safety, Well-being and Freedom

- Increase in safety
- Improvement in well-being
- Increase in freedom

**Measures**
- Impact Tool Kit
- Mirabal research measures 2 & 3 – expanded 'space for action', safety and freedom from violence and abuse
- Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale

**Proxy indicators**
- Reduction in Police call outs
- Reduction in risk scores

## Improvement in Children's Well-being and Safety

- Better mental health
- Better relationships with peers and family members
- Improvement in confidence and self-esteem

**Measures**
- Strength and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQs)
- Mirabal research measures 4 & 6 – shared parenting and safer, healthier, childhoods.

**Proxy Indicators**
- Impact Tool Kit
- Barnardos DVRIM
- De-escalation in social care involvement

## Improvement in Multiagency work

- Improvement in information sharing about perpetrator behaviour and risk
- More options available to agencies for intervention
- Improvement in multiagency decision making and accountability

**Evidence**
- Case file audits
- 360 feedback from partners
- Deep dive analysis of case samples

## Effective targeting of interventions

- Better match of intervention to perpetrator risk, needs and capacity to change
- Safer and more effective interventions
- Reduction in the unintended consequences of matching perpetrators to interventions which are not suitable
- More flexible approach to changes in risk and need

**Evidence**
- Structured assessment tools
- Case file audits

# Outcomes for Respect accredited service providers working with perpetrators of domestic violence and abuse

Survivors need to know that any intervention with an abusive partner or ex-partner has their own and any children's safety at its heart. Commissioners, funders and referring agencies need to know that the service has taken all reasonable steps to work in a way which is safe, effective and accountable. Organisations need to be able to demonstrate that the services they provide have a positive benefit.

Respect encourages outcome focussed commissioning based on 5 key outcomes. These include three service user outcomes for perpetrators, survivors and children and young people and two organisational outcomes for multiagency work and the effective targeting of service provision. In this document, we discuss their importance, the evidence base and suggestions for outcome measurement.

Respect accreditation does not require the use of a specific measurement tool, but it does require that outcomes are measured in a clear, proportionate way.

## Outcome 1
## Reduction in Perpetrator's Violent and Abusive Behaviour

Measuring violent and abusive behaviour is not straightforward. A range of data sources, such as agency data, perpetrators self-reports and, survivor reports of perpetrator change should be used, and the reliability of such data should be considered. The organisation should measure changes to a range of forms of abusive behaviour, including, but not limited to, physical abuse, sexual abuse and coercive control, and ensure data is collected over a meaningful time period to give clear evidence of effectiveness.

The current evidence base for perpetrator outcomes is mainly focused on accredited behaviour change programmes in the criminal justice and community sectors. The key UK studies are the Mirabal research (2015)[i] and the Ministry of Justice outcome evaluation of the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme (IDAP) and Community Domestic Violence Programme (CVDP) (2015)[ii]. International research of note, supporting positive outcomes from similar perpetrator interventions includes Gondolf's multisite evaluation in the USA (2002)[iii] and the Australian Study of the Impact on Men and their Partners of attending Men's Behaviour Change Programmes (2016)[iv].

Those perpetrators with the most entrenched behaviour, greatest level of additional needs and lowest capacity for change require the most intense and sustained intervention to bring about change. In such cases, behaviour change is always possible, but is often unlikely, and the focus should first be on risk management and containing and disrupting the perpetrator's capacity to cause harm. Therefore, the expectation on outcomes should reflect this.

Linked to the reduction of violent and abusive behaviour, an improvement in close relationships is an important measure of success. The sustainability of a cessation of violence and abuse is linked to this across the literature on domestic abuse and general offending. A short-term reduction in violence and abuse can be achieved, where the perpetrator avoids difficult situations or engages in a form of disguised compliance. However, this does not necessarily lead to longer term, sustainable change. Increased problem solving, listening and conflict resolution skills are better markers of significant change, particularly when these are reported by survivors themselves.

**Outcome 1 measures**
Organisations should employ a suitable tool to measure behaviour change, risk management and improved relationships. An example is The Impact Tool Kit[v], a European Union funded way to measure changes in abusive behaviours, which collects self-report data from both perpetrators and survivors at different points in the intervention process. The Impact Tool Kit seeks to contextualise data into outcomes for similar services. Impact Tool Kit data, is currently analysed by the University of Bristol, with services getting annual reports on outcomes.

The Mirabal research focused on 6 indicators of success, which provide a framework which organisations may find useful:

1. Respectful communication
2. Safety and freedom from violence and abuse
3. Expanded 'space for action'
4. Shared parenting
5. Awareness of self and others
6. Safer, healthier childhoods

In particular, survivor reports can be used to measure reductions in violence and abuse, better conflict resolution and improved relationships through indicators 1, 2 and 5.

**Proxy indicators**
Reductions in police call outs, or in risk assessment scores may have a correlation to behaviour change, but would not be sufficient on their own to demonstrate positive outcomes.

## Outcome 2
## Increase in Survivor's Safety, Well-being and Freedom

Interventions with perpetrators of domestic violence and abuse are required to offer an Integrated Support Service (ISS) to current and relevant former partners and other at risk. Partly this is to offer regular support and safety planning, but also it is to address and offset the possible consequences of intervening with the perpetrator. In particular, it is known that intervening with the perpetrator can raise the hope that they will change, leading to changes in the survivor's decision making around their safety. The ISS has a role in reducing system generated risks, ensuring survivor safety is at the centre of work with perpetrators and enabling survivor's voices to shape the development of services.

Any service achieving accreditation will be able to evidence a good level of engagement with survivors via the ISS, demonstrating positive changes to survivor safety, freedom and well-being.

Although Outcome 2 is closely linked to Outcome 1, it is important to measure outcomes for survivors as well as, and separate to, outcomes for perpetrators, and to note that a reduction in abusive behaviour does not always bring about improved survivor safety, freedom and well-being. Likewise, when a perpetrator fails to change, a survivor can still be safer, if effective risk management of the perpetrator has occurred alongside effective support and safety planning for the survivor.

Interventions that fail to improve the safety, freedom and well-being of survivors are failing interventions and require review.

**Outcome 2 measures**
The Impact Tool Kit has a victim/survivor facing measure that focusses on changes in perpetrator behaviour and perceptions of safety.

The Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale[vi] is a short questionnaire that has been extensively tested and is widely used.

Mirabal Research indicators 2 and 3 (expanded 'space for action' and safety and freedom from violence and abuse) can also be used.

**Proxy indicators**
As for Outcome 1, reductions in police call outs, or in risk assessment scores may have a correlation to survivor freedom and well-being, they are not in themselves evidence of safety or effectiveness and would not be sufficient to demonstrate positive outcomes.

## Outcome 3
## Improvement in Children's Well-being and Safety

The correlation between parental domestic violence and abuse and the direct and indirect harm to children and young people is well evidenced. This is reflected in the prevalence of domestic violence in the case loads of Local Authority Children's Services. Unsurprisingly children's social care and the family courts are high volume referral pathways into perpetrator interventions.

Accredited organisations will be focussed on achieving better outcomes for children, as well as their parents. The organisation's work with the adults should not obscure the need to improve the lives of children affected by domestic abuse[vii]. This can be by work integral to the perpetrator intervention or as additional parenting work such as restorative parenting, post domestic abuse parenting[viii], safe co-parenting post separation and programmes such as Caring Dads[ix].

**Outcome 3 measures**
Strength and Difficulties Questionnaires[x] (SDQ) are a well validated and commonly used measure for the mental well-being of children and young people (over 4 years of age) and can be completed by a parent and/or by the young person. SDQs can be used pre- and post-intervention to give an indication of changes over time.

Mirabal indicators 4 & 6 (shared parenting and safer, healthier, childhoods) are also useful.

**Proxy indicators**
Other tools which may be useful include the Impact Tool Kit, and the Barnardos Domestic Violence Risk Indicator Matrix (DVRIM)[xi], a tool for assessing the risk to children from male to female domestic violence.

Measuring de-escalation in children's social care involvement

## Outcome 4
## Improvement in multiagency working

As Gondolf (2002) stated in his multisite research into Batterer Intervention Programmes in the US, "it's the system that counts". No one agency on its own can reduce harm to victims and change the behaviour of perpetrators. While many agencies across the statutory, voluntary and private sectors have contact with perpetrators of domestic violence and abuse, they are often not working directly with a perpetrator to reduce their abusive behaviour. Perpetrator services' knowledge of perpetrator behaviour, motivation to change and level of risk informs the decision making of partner agencies, particularly when it comes to risk management and safeguarding.

Organisations have a role in ensuring that perpetrators get an appropriate response from professionals both in terms of addressing additional needs and in managing risk and will need to show evidence of multiagency engagement and institutional advocacy proportionate to the organisation's size, service remit and resources available.

**Outcome 4 evidence**
Case files audits are one way to evidence multiagency working and institutional advocacy.

A 360 feedback process with key partners can evidence an organisation's contribution to the case work of other agencies

Deep dive analysis on a sample of cases is another option for both evidencing this outcome and developing learning for multiagency partnerships.

# Outcome 5
# Effective targeting of interventions

Research on perpetrator interventions, and the broader rehabilitation literature, points to a relationship between who gets a service, what they get and the change observed. At its most basic those with the most entrenched behaviour, greatest level of additional needs and lowest capacity for change require the most intense and sustained intervention to bring about change.

The risk, needs, responsivity (RNR)[xii] framework is the dominant model in the rehabilitation of offenders. Its basic principles are that the intensity of an intervention should be correlated to the likelihood of further harm (risk), that the intervention should target those factors (needs) associated with an increased likelihood of further offending and the intervention must take account (responsivity) of the individual's motivation, learning style and circumstances. These principles are as relevant for perpetrators of domestic violence and abuse as they are for other offenders.

Respect is keen to see a variety of interventions for perpetrators but with that comes a responsibility to adhere to the RNR principles and ensure that each individual is given the right intervention which meets their risk, needs and responsivity profile. Placing perpetrators on behaviour change interventions that they are not motivated or able to engage with is risky – giving a false message to both survivors and other agencies that change is possible. It is also a wasteful misuse of resources and such perpetrators can sabotage any groupwork for other perpetrators who are motivated to change. Equally important is ensuring that high intensity case management interventions are used where most needed and that low intensity interventions are not used for people who present a high risk and/or have multiple, complex needs.

Therefore, organisations are expected to carry out an assessment to match the intervention offered to the service user profile and effectively target their resource in ways that can produce the best outcomes.

**Outcome 5 evidence**
Services need to evidence that they are using structured mechanisms to ensure the effective targeting of interventions. Respect has developed a framework to support services in this process, Respect Guidance for Effective Targeting of Interventions.

Other tools which may be useful are the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory[xiii] and the who is doing what to whom section of the Respect Toolkit for Work with Male Victims of Domestic Violence[xiv].

The use of these specific tools is not an accreditation requirement but any service seeking accreditation must be able to evidence that they are matching intervention intensity, nature and delivery with service user risk, needs and capacity for change.

Case files audits may be a useful way of demonstrating this outcome.

**5**

[i]Steps Towards Change, Kelly and Westmarland (2015) https://www.dur.ac.uk/criva/projectmirabal/
[ii]An outcome evaluation of the Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme (IDAP) and Community Domestic Violence Programme (CDVP), Bloomfield and Dixon (2015) https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/outcome-evaluation-of-idap-and-cdvp
[iii]Batterer Intervention System: issues outcomes and recommendations, Gondolf (2002) http://sk.sagepub.com/books/batterer-intervention-systems
[iv]A Study of the Impact on Men and their Partners of attending Men's Behaviour Change Programmes, Brown et al (2016) https://violencefreefamilies.org.au/longitudinal-study-effectiveness-mens-behaviour-change-programs/
[v]http://impact.work-with-perpetrators.eu/
[vi]https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/med/research/platform/wemwbs/
[vii]The Need for Accountability to, and Support for, Children of Men on Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes, Alderson et al (2012) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/car.2223/abstract
[viii]http://www.fsa.me.uk/parenting-following-domestic-violence.html
[ix]http://caringdads.org/
[x]http://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/c0.py
[xi]http://www.barnardos.org.uk/resources/research_and_publications/barnardos-domestic-violence-risk-identification-matrix/publication-view.jsp?pid=PUB-2380
[xii]https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/rsk-nd-rspnsvty/index-en.aspx
[xiii]https://www.mhs.com/MHS-Publicsafety?prodname=lsi-r
[xiv]http://www.mensadviceline.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Toolkit-for-Work-with-male-victims-of-DV-2nd-ed-3.-IDENTIFYING.-Respect%C2%A9-1.pdf

# RESPECT