caada
co-ordinated action against domestic abuse

Insights
into domestic abuse

1

Insights National Dataset 2011–12
Appendix to: *A place of greater safety*

Contents

Foreword

Thank you for downloading CAADA Insights National Dataset 2011-12. The report contains the detailed data to support A place of greater safety, the first in a series of annual policy reports from the national charity Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA). Using evidence gathered directly from victims, this series aims to save lives and public money by making recommendations for improving the response to domestic abuse across the UK. We believe that it is vital to keep the experience of victims at the heart of service delivery and these reports represent a step forward in achieving this.

This report contains data from more than 2,500 victim cases collected by 14 specialist domestic abuse services which used the CAADA Insights outcome measurement service in the year to March 2012. It is the largest dataset of its kind in the UK today and provides a detailed profile of service users, support provided and outcomes achieved. We hope that all those with strategic responsibility for addressing domestic abuse will use this data to demonstrate the positive impact that domestic abuse services have on outcomes for victims, and to support the financial case for funding these services. Practitioners may also find it useful to use the data as a benchmark against which to measure service performance to inform local service improvement.

This report focuses on data gathered from IDVA services, however Insights is also used by outreach, refuge and children and young people's workers and future reports will include data from these services. Over time, we hope that by continuing to work closely with frontline service providers to produce regular evidence of the impact of their work, we can help stakeholders across the domestic abuse sector work together to deliver even better services and even better outcomes for victims.

If you would like to find out more about how you can use evidence from CAADA Insights to support your work, or to receive a copy of A place of greater safety please visit our website www.caada.org.uk/commissioning or alternatively email commissioning@caada.org.uk today.

Victoria Hill
Director of Strategy and Development, CAADA

Methodology

CAADA Insights data collection process

CAADA Insights is an outcomes measurement service designed specifically for the domestic abuse sector. The service works through a simple system of data collection. Training and support is provided to frontline domestic abuse practitioners by the CAADA Insights team. This enables practitioners to collect data accurately and robustly with easy-to-use data collection tools. There are three forms used to record information about service users and their case:

1. The Intake Form captures information about referral routes, socio-demographic characteristics of service users, the nature and severity of abuse experienced and circumstance at the point of intake. The Intake Form is completed when the service user engages with the service, within the first three meaningful contacts.

2. The Exit Form captures information about interventions and support mobilised for service users, the nature and severity of abuse experienced at the point of case closure, and safety and wellbeing outcomes. The Exit Form is completed when the case is closed, either a planned closure by the practitioner and service user or when the case is deemed as inactive – that is when there has not been meaningful contact with the service user for 3 months or more – or the service user not longer wants to engage.

3. The Criminal and Civil Justice Form captures information about support with civil orders and the criminal justice process, civil orders applied for and granted, criminal charges and convictions and court information. The Criminal and Civil Justice Form is completed at case closure or when the case is deemed to be inactive.

Practitioners can complete the forms for any service users engaging with the service. Only forms which relate to service users who have consented to have their information used for research and monitoring purposes are submitted to CAADA for analysis.

Practitioners use unique client identification numbers and barcodes on all forms which contain case tracking information. These allow forms relating to the same service user and case to be matched. Whilst making sure that the data remains anonymous to CAADA.

Completed forms are collated by a nominated 'Champion' at the service where they are checked for the first time for errors or missing data. Following this check, the forms are submitted to the CAADA Insights team at the end of each month. Forms submitted then go through six stages of data validation:

1. Manual validation on receipt of forms – checking for key case tracking information and consent

2. Validation at scanning – forms are electronically scanned using specialist software which checks for violations of set rules, for example, invalid dates or multiple responses to single answer questions

3. Validation at upload – forms are uploaded onto a bespoke database which re-checks for missing consent and date errors

4. Validation on the database – administration tasks identify forms with missing data on key questions, duplicates and Exit Forms with no matching Intake Form

5. Reporting on data quality – data from the forms that did not pass the validation process are excluded from the report. We report on why these forms are invalid and on overall data accuracy

6. Report validation - the data included in the reports are compared with historical data, our understanding of the local context and data from our other services to check for major anomalies

For service users who access a service more than once, and therefore have more than one set of Insights forms in the database, the latest case is used in the report and all other cases are not reported on.

Validation of approach

CAADA Insights data collection was set up in response to the need highlighted by the 2009 multi-evaluation of IDVA services 'Safety in Numbers' for ongoing, good quality and easy-to-use data collection and analysis for specialist domestic abuse services. CAADA Insights was piloted in 5 services and following a consultation period was launched on 1st July 2010.

Since then, CAADA Insights has been used in a total of 22 specialist domestic violence services and has been commissioned in five local authority areas. During this time, the CAADA Insights time has presented the data on a regular basis to commissioners, service managers and domestic abuse practitioners. The data has been used to evaluate services, highlight best practice, bring to light gaps in service provision and make requests for funding. Insights data has also been used in consultancy projects for the Crown Prosecution Service and local authority partnerships.

Sample description

Table 1 Service user cases used in the analysis	
Intake Forms	2653
Exit Forms	2067
Criminal and Civil Justice Forms	1724

The data presented in this report relates to victims of domestic abuse who engaged with one of 14 Independent Domestic Violence Advisor services in the 12 months from 1st April 2011 to 31st March 2012.

Table 1 above outlines the number of each form type used in the analysis.

A total of 2,938 Intake Forms were submitted, which represents the number of cases opened during this period. Following form validation

(as outlined on above) and de-duplication, Intake Forms relating to 2,653 service users were valid for interpretation.

A total of 2,397 Exit Forms were submitted, which represents the number of cases closed in the 12 months to April 2012. These include both cases which were opened before and during the 12 month period. Following data validation and de-duplication, Exit Forms relating to 2,067 service users were valid for interpretation.

A total of 2,007 Criminal and Civil Justice Forms were submitted, relating to cases closed in the 12 months to April 2012. Following data validation and de-duplication, Criminal and Civil Justice Forms relating to 1,724 service users were valid for interpretation.

Data analysis

We carried out a brief statistical analysis on some of the measures in this report to explore potentially useful points of difference. Where we have discussed the 'length of abuse' experienced by the Insights service users, we have considered both the mean and the median. The mean length of abuse is 5 years. This is calculated by averaging across the length of abuse reported by every service user. This calculation not only has an intuitive appeal, but also accounts for the experience of every service user.

We have also reported the median length of abuse (3 years). This is calculated by finding the 'middle value' in the length of abuse data. The median is not affected by the highest and the lowest values in the data. This is a statistically robust approach when data are not 'normally distributed'; a histogram and the Kologrov-Smirnov test showed that the length of abuse data significantly deviated from normality ($p < .05$). When considering what factors affect the length of the abusive relationship, we have therefore used the median calculation.

Considering the value of the approaches described, we have included both calculations in this report and have clearly indicated which figure is a mean and which is a median in the text and footnotes.

The remaining measures discussed in this report, were categorical. Therefore, potential differences were explored using statistical-tests appropriate for data of this kind (Chi-square, Mann-Whitney, or Kruskal-Wallis tests of significance). Differences were deemed significant if their probability value was below the widely accepted alpha-value of .05.

Data collected at point of engagement

The data in this section is that collected within the first three contacts between the IDVA and the service user and is recorded on the Intake Form.

Referrals

Table 2 Breakdown of new and repeat referrals		
	n	%
New referrals	2309	87
Repeats	334	13
Missing	10	0
Total	2653	

Cases are deemed repeats if the service users return after their case was previously closed (or made inactive) since Insights data collection began. 13% of cases submitted at intake were repeat referrals.

Table 3 Primary referral route into IDVA service		
	n	%
Police	1232	46
MARAC	154	6
Self referral	432	16
Health	182	7
Domestic sexual and sexual violence services	137	5
Housing	108	4
Children's and young people's services	152	6
Specialist services	6	0
Other	134	5
Missing	116	4
Total	2653	

There is a difference in the length of abuse experienced by service users accessing IDVA services through different referral routes. Service users who were self referrals had experienced a longer length of abuse (median length of abuse was 4.3 years) than those referred by another service or agency (2 to 3 years).[1] Service users who were referred by health agencies tended to experience the abuse for a shorter length of time than service users accessing though other routes, and had a significantly shorter length of abuse (median length of abuse of 2 years) than self referrals (4.3 years).[2] Health referrals also tended to be in a younger age group. Self referrals were more likely to be ages between 31 and 50 years old, and less likely to be aged under 30 years old.[3]

1   Kruskal-Wallis, $H(4) = 69.57$, $p < .001$
2   Mann-Whitney, $U = 6324.50$, $z = -4.7$, $p < .001$
3   Chi-square, $X^2(24) = 105.93$, $p < .001$

Service user profile

Social demographic description of the service users

Table 4 Demographic information of service users at intake (T1)		
Age of service user	*n*	*%*
Under 18 years old	73	3
18 to 20 years old	197	7
21 to 30 years old	935	35
31 to 40 years old	720	27
41 to 50 years old	488	18
51 to 60 years old	153	6
61 years or older	63	2
Missing	24	1
Total	2653	

At the point of intake into an IDVA service, more than a third of service users (35%) were aged between 21 and 30 years old, and over a quarter (27%) were aged between 31 and 40. 3% of service users were under 18 years old and 2% were over 60. There was a significant association between the length of abuse and the age of the service user.[4] Younger service users were more likely to experience abuse for a shorter length of time and older service users were more likely to suffer a longer length of abuse.[5]

Gender and gender identity	*n*	*%*
Female	2433	92
Male	92	3
Missing	128	5
Total	2653	

Transgender service users	0	0
Sexual orientation	*n*	*%*
Heterosexual	2,548	96
Lesbian, gay or bisexual	35	1
Gay female	12	<1
Gay male	12	<1
Bisexual	11	<1
Missing	70	3
Total	2653	

4 Kruskal-Wallis, $H(6) = 261.46$, $p < .001$
5 Chi-square, $X^2(24) = 375.89$, $p < .001$

The majority (92%) of service users were female and 96% were heterosexual. 1% of service users identified themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual. There were no transgender service users in the dataset.

Ethnicity	*n*	%
White British or Irish	2253	85
British	2243	85
Irish	10	<1
Other white background	80	3
Asian	162	6
Indian	24	1
Pakistani	46	2
Bangladeshi	14	1
Any other Asian background	34	1
Asian British	44	2
Black	72	3
Caribbean	9	<1
African	37	1
Any other black background	8	<1
Black British	18	1
Dual Heritage	31	1
White and black Caribbean	15	1
White and black African	5	<1
White and Asian	7	<1
Any other dual heritage	4	<1
Other	25	1
Total black or minority ethnic	370	14
Chinese	31	1
Missing	30	1
Total	2653	

The majority of service users (85%) were white British or Irish. Black and other minority ethnic service users made up a further 14% of the sample, of which 6% were Asian.

Asian service users were more likely to be experiencing abuse perpetrated by a current intimate partner or an adult family member[6] and were more likely to be living with the perpetrator.[7] Black service users were also more likely to be experiencing abuse perpetrated by an adult family member,[8] more likely to be self referrals or referred through health and less likely to be referred by the police or through MARAC.[9] Dual heritage or other ethnic service users were also more likely to be referred through health.

6   Chi-square, X^2 (8) = 53.93, *p*< .001
7   Chi-square, X^2 (4) = 34.41, *p*< .001
8   Chi-square, X^2 (8) = 53.93, *p*< .001
9   Chi-square, X^2 (16) = 74.34, *p*< .001

Immigration status and related needs	n	%
British, EU or permanent residents with indefinite leave to remain	2524	95
Temporary residents (including EEA nationals)	61	2
Asylum Seeker	2	0
Other	4	0
Missing	62	2
Total	2653	

	n	%
Service users needing an interpreter	55	2
Service users with no recourse to public funds	54	2
Service users needing to apply for indefinite leave to remain	40	2

95% of service users were British, from the EU or permanent residents with indefinite leave to remain (ILR). 2% of service users were temporary residents, and asylum seekers made up <1% of the dataset.

Table 5 Children		
Service users with children and pregnancy	n	%
Service users with children	1747	66
Service users with no children	906	34
Missing	0	0
Total	2653	

	n	%
Service users who are pregnant	173	7

Total number of children	3491	
Average number of children per household with children	2.0	

Ages of children (years)	n	%
<2	845	24
3–4	596	17
5–7	653	19
8–11	676	21
12–17	721	21
Missing	9	0
Total	3491	

Two-thirds (66%) of IDVA service users have children, and there are a total of 3,491 children living in households where abuse is taking place. Service users with children had an average of 2 children each. The median length of abuse for service users who had children was 3 years, a year longer than those who did not have children.[10]

10 Mann-Whitney, $U = 628499$, $z = -6.11$, $p < .001$

7% of service users were pregnant at the point of intake into the service. The median length of abuse experienced by service users who were pregnant was 1.5 years, half the time of those who were not pregnant.[11] Pregnant service users were more likely to be referred through health than other agencies.[12]

In general, service users with children experienced abuse for longer than those without children, regardless of whether they were pregnant.[13]

Statutory children's social services involvement in family	*n*	%	
Service users with children's social services involvement	616	35	
Service users with no children's social services involvement	1011	58	
Missing	123	7	
Total		1747	
Where there is children's social services involvement:	S31[14]	40	2
	S47[15]	267	15
	S17[16]	247	14
	CAF [17]	62	4

More than a third (35%) of service users with children had current statutory children and young person's service (CYPS) involvement in the family. Families where there was no statutory children and young people's service involvement were more likely to be classified as non-high risk.[18]

Table 6 Complex needs identified at intake (T1)							
	Yes		No		Missing		Total
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*
Drugs misuse	172	6	2398	90	83	3	2653
Alcohol misuse	309	12	2265	85	79	3	2653
Mental health issues	832	31	1733	65	88	3	2653
Threatened or attempted suicide	500	19	1966	74	187	7	2653
Self harm	422	16	1986	75	245	9	2653
Financial problems	719	27	1792	68	142	5	2653
Requiring benefits advice	491	19	207	8	21	1	719

---

11   Mann-Whitney, $U = 135597.5$, $z = 6.19$, $p < .001$
12   Chi-square, $X^2 (4) = 21.29$, $p < .001$
13   Chi-square, $X^2(4) = 24.49$, $p < .001$
14   Care and Supervision Order
15   Applied to children suffering/likely to suffer significant harm and indicated in Child Protection Plan
16   Children in Need plan drawn up and implemented for children not in immediate risk, but in need of additional support
17   Common assessment framework
18   Chi-square, $X^2 (2) = 23.17$, $p < .001$

Table 6 Complex needs identified at intake (T1)							
Community care payments	176	7	2324	88	153	6	2653

Nature of vulnerability:	n	%
Physical	102	4
Learning	26	1
Vision	1	0
Hearing	4	0
Other	49	2

Service users accessing IDVA services had a number of additional, complex needs, and many had multiple complex needs.

6% of service users misused drugs and 12% misused alcohol. Service users with substance abuse issues were more likely to be referred through health.[19] Just under a third (31%) had mental health issues, 19% had previously threatened or attempted suicide and 16% had self harmed.

More than a quarter (27%) had financial problems and 19% required benefits advice. 7% of service users were receiving community care payments for additional vulnerabilities, mainly physical in nature.

Service users with multiple complex needs were more likely to be referred through health, and less likely to be self referrals.[20]

19 Chi-square, X^2 (16) = 60.91, $p < .001$
20 Chi-square, X^2 (16) = 60.91, $p < .001$

Profile and history of abuse at intake (T1)

Table 7 Service user circumstances at intake (T1)		
Relationship to perpetrator	*n*	**%**
Intimate partner	870	33%
Ex intimate partner	1509	57%
Intermittent intimate partner	81	3
Family member minor	16	1
Family member adult	160	6
Other	12	<1
Missing data	5	<1
Total	2653	

Living arrangements	*n*	**%**
Living together	630	24%
Not living together	1,902	72%
Living together intermittently	116	4
Missing data	5	<1
Total	2653	

Multiple perpetrators	223	8
Risk of forced marriage	20	1
Risk of honour based violence	66	2
Total	2653	

Nearly three-quarters of service users (72%) were not living with the perpetrator at the point of intake into the IDVA service, and more than half (57%) were experiencing abuse perpetrated by an ex-intimate partner. A third of service users (33%) were in a current relationship with the perpetrator.

Nearly a quarter of service users (24%) were living with the perpetrator and these service users had a median length of abuse of 4 years, compared to 3 years for those not living with the perpetrator,[21] and were more likely to have been in the relationship for more than 10 years.[22]

21 Kruskal-Wallis Test H (2) = 21.87, p< .001
22 Chi-square, X^2(8,)= 34.94, p< .001

Service users who were living with[23] or in a current relationship with the perpetrator[24] were more likely to access an IDVA via a health referral than any other route.

6% of service users were experiencing abuse perpetrated by an adult family member. Nearly one in ten service users (8%) were being abused by multiple perpetrators; 2% were at risk of honour-based violence and 1% were at risk of forced marriage.

Table 8 Risk profile at intake (T1)		
	n	%
High risk	1915	72
Medium risk	568	21
Standard risk	170	6
Missing	0	0
Total	2653	
Service users reaching the MARAC threshold	1576	59

At the point of intake into the service, nearly three-quarters (72%) were classified as high risk, based on the completion of the CAADA Risk Identification Checklist. More than half (59%) reached the threshold for their case to be heard at MARAC.

Table 9 History of abuse at intake (T1)		
Length of abusive relationship		
Average (mean) number of years of abuse		5 years
Median number of years of abuse		3 years
	n	%
Missing	98	4%

The average (mean) length of the abusive relationship is 5 years. This is calculated by averaging the length of abuse reported by every service user. We use this calculation because it accounts for the impact of domestic abuse on every service user.

The median length of abuse is 3 years. This is calculated by finding the 'middle value' of the length of abuse data. We use this calculation for analysis purposes as it provides a more statistically robust means of identifying which factors affect the length of the abusive relationship. This is explained further in the data analysis section.

23 Chi-square, X^2 (8) = 31.76, $p < .001$
24 Chi-square, X^2 (8) = 47.79, $p < .001$

| Service users behaviours in the last 12 months | | | | | | | | |
| Attempts to leave perpetrator | | | Reports to police | | A&E attendances | | GP attendances | |
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Service users reporting	1,731	65	1,955	74	554	21	1,181	45
Reporting never/none	575	22	528	20	1,696	64	630	24
Not available/ applicable/ missing	373	14	171	6	407	15	843	32
Total	2653		2653		2653		2653	
Average number of times[25]	3.4		2.7		1.4		5.3	

Nearly two-thirds of service users (65%) had attempted to leave
the perpetrator in the 12 months prior to accessing the IDVA service.
Almost three-quarters (74%) had reported the abuse to the police
and one in five (21%) had attended A&E as a result of the abuse.
Just under half of service users (45%) reported having attended their
GP, for any reason.

25 The average figures excludes data not available, applicable, missing and never/none.

Table 10 Abuse profile at intake (T1)						
Type of abuse			Yes		No	
			n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Physical abuse			1,852	70	772	29
Sexual abuse			579	22	1,961	74
Harassment/stalking			1,501	57	1,094	41
Jealous and controlling behaviours			2,098	79	501	19
Level of abuse	High		Moderate		Standard	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Physical abuse	1229	46	460	17	99	4
Sexual abuse	249	9	218	8	94	4
Harassment/stalking	927	35	444	17	80	3
Jealous and controlling behaviours	1275	48	621	23	122	5
Escalation in severity	Worse		Unchanged		Reduced	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Physical abuse	1230	46	371	14	156	6
Sexual abuse	240	9	235	9	70	3
Harassment/stalking	1000	38	363	14	62	2
Jealous and controlling behaviours	1273	48	622	23	91	3
Escalation in frequency	Worse		Unchanged		Reduced	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Physical abuse	1153	43	418	16	166	6
Sexual abuse	235	9	225	8	76	3
Harassment/stalking	968	36	366	14	73	3
Jealous and controlling behaviours	1232	46	623	23	110	4
Multiple types of abuse and escalation					*n*	*%*
Multiple types of abuse reported					2039	77
Multiple types of abuse that are high					1198	45
At least one form of abuse that is high					1856	70
At least one form that is high and escalating in frequency or severity					1537	58
Any escalation in severity of abuse					1859	70
Any escalation in frequency of abuse					1915	72
Escalation in frequency and severity of abuse					1767	67

Nearly three-quarters of service users (70%) were experiencing physical abuse, one in five (22%) were experiencing sexual abuse, more than half (57%) were experiencing harassment and stalking and 79% were experiencing jealous and controlling behaviours.[26]

More than three-quarters of service users (77%) were experiencing multiple abuse types. Service users experiencing multiple abuse types were less likely to be experiencing abuse for less than one year and were more likely to be referred by health.

26   Due to the high prevalence of jealous and controlling behaviours, further analysis of the abuse profile has used the following categories of abuse: physical abuse with/without jealous and controlling behaviours (n=693), sexual abuse with/without jealous and controlling behaviours (n=23), harassment and stalking with/without jealous and controlling behaviours (n=434), jealous and controlling behaviours only (n=137), other multiple types of abuse (n=1181).

Data collected at case closure

The data presented in this section of the report is recorded by the IDVA at the point of case closure or when the case is deemed to be inactive. The information is recorded on the Exit Form.

Service user outcomes

Outcomes and profile of abuse at exit (T2)

The following is an analysis of cases where an Exit Form was completed during the reporting period. Cases have been matched with their corresponding Intake Forms, and T1 data here relates only to the cases with exit data.

Table 11 Circumstances at exit (T2)		
Living arrangements at exit	*n*	%
Living together	233	11
Not living together	1683	81
Living together intermittently	39	2
Missing	112	5
Total	2067	

Where not living together; do any of the following apply?	*n*	%
Service user in refuge	123	7
Perpetrator in jail	148	9
Serious illness or death of perpetrator	11	1
Other (perpetrator abroad, military duty, etc)	481	29
Total	1683	

Ongoing contact, if not living together	*n*	%
Service users reporting ongoing contact	586	35
Service users reporting no ongoing contact	957	57
Missing	140	8
Total	1683	

Reasons for ongoing contact	*n*	%
Children	374	64
Family and social network	93	16
Legal proceedings	75	13
Financial arrangements	27	5
Ongoing abuse by the perpetrator	72	12
Other	80	14
Total	586	

At the point of exit from the IDVA service, 11% of service users were living with the perpetrator and 81% of service users were not living with the perpetrator. Of the service users not living with the perpetrator, 57% reported no ongoing contact and 35% reported some ongoing contact. Where there was ongoing contact, the most common reason for this contact was children (64%).

Table 12 Profile of abuse at exit (T2) compared to intake (T1)		
	n	%
Service users reporting a complete cessation of all types of abuse	1300	63
Total	2067	

At the point of exit from the IDVA service, 63% of service users had experienced a complete cessation of all abuse types.

Type of abuse at exit compared to intake (cases with T2 data)				
	Any level (T1)		Any level (T2)	
	n	%	*n*	%
Physical abuse	1458	71	290	14
Sexual abuse	436	21	69	3
Harassment/stalking	1129	55	416	20
Jealous and controlling behaviours	1626	79	519	25

Level of abuse at exit compared to intake (cases with T2 data)						
	High		Moderate		Standard	
	T1 %	T1 %	T1 %	T2 %	T1 %	T2 %
Physical abuse	48	7	17	5	4	1
Sexual abuse	10	1	8	1	2	0
Harassment/stalking	33	5	17	9	3	5
Jealous and controlling behaviours	48	8	23	12	5	4

Multiple types of abuse and escalation at exit compared to intake		
	T1 %	T2 %
Multiple types of abuse reported	77	18
Multiple types of abuse that are high	45	7
At least one form of abuse that is high	70	12
At least one form of abuse that is high and escalating in frequency or severity	58	6
Any escalation in severity of abuse	71	9
Any escalation in frequency of abuse	73	10
Escalation in frequency and severity of abuse	67	8

At the point of exit from the IDVA service, 63% of service users were not experiencing any abuse. 80% of service users reported a reduction in physical abuse, 84% a reduction in sexual abuse, 63% a reduction

in harassment and stalking, and 68% a reduction in jealous and controlling behaviours.

Table 13 IDVA judgement of risk and safety at exit (T2)					
Risk reduction	*n*	%	Sustainability of any reduction in risk	*n*	%
Significant	739	36	Very short term	11	1
Moderate	787	38	Short term	175	11
Moderate/significant	1526	74	Medium term	631	41
Limited	342	17	Long term	455	30
Increased risk	21	1	Risk permanently eliminated	79	5
Missing	178	9	Missing	175	11
Total	2067		Total	1526	

At the point of exit from the service, IDVAs judged that there was moderate or significant reduction in risk for 74% of service users. Of these service users, the IDVAs felt that the risk reduction was sustainable in medium to long[27] term for 71%.

Table 14 Service user reported outcomes at exit (T2)					
Feelings of safety	*n*	%	Feelings of fear	*n*	%
Much safer	825	40	Not at all frightened	641	31
Somewhat safer	648	31	A little frightened	811	39
Somewhat / much safer	1,473	71	Quite frightened	88	4
No change	124	6	Very frightened	22	1
Less safe	2	<1	Missing	505	24
Missing	468	23			
Total	2067		Total	2067	

Quality of life	*n*	%	Confidence in accessing support	*n*	%
Improved a lot	840	41	Very confident	871	42
Improved a little	579	28	Confident	726	35
Much/a little improved	1,419	69	Not confident	14	1
Not changed	166	8	Missing	456	22
Become worse	13	1			
Missing	469	23			
Total	2067		Total	2067	

27   Six months or more

Service outputs

Table 15 Case status at exit (T2)	*n*	%
Case Closed	1887	91
Case Inactive	155	7
Status missing	25	1
Total	2067	

91% of service users' cases were closed by an IDVA, and 7% were recorded as inactive. Inactive cases are those where the service user has chosen to disengage with the service or the IDVA has had no meaningful contact with the service users for three months.

Table 16 Intensity of support during case (T2)		
Number of contacts between service user and IDVA	*n*	%
Less than 5 contacts	762	37
Between 5 and up to 10 contacts	691	33
More than 10 contacts	588	28
Missing data	26	1
Total	2067	
Average case length[28]	2.6 months	

Around a third of service users had fewer than 5 contacts (37%) or between 5 and 10 contacts (33%). More than a quarter of service users (28%) had more than 10 contacts with the IDVA during their case. Service users who received more than 10 contacts were less likely to be experiencing ongoing abuse at the point of exit.[29] These service users were also more likely to report feeling much safer,[30] that their quality of life had improved a lot[31] and that they were confident to access support in the future.[32] IDVAs judged there to be a significant risk reduction for these service users.[33]

Table 17 Number of interventions accessed by service users (T2)	*n*	%
0 – 1 interventions	113	5
2 – 3 interventions	653	32
4 – 5 interventions	740	36
6 + interventions	561	27
Total	2067	
Average number of interventions per service user	4.3	

Service users accessed an average of 4.3 types of intervention with the help of their IDVA, and more than a quarter (27%) had accessed 6 or more.

28 Average case length is the median case length
29 Chi-square, $X^2 (2) = 23.50$, $p < .001$.
30 Chi-square, $X^2(6) = 134.05$, $p < .001$
31 Chi-square, $X^2(6) = 182.16$, $p < .001$
32 Chi-square, $X^2(6) = 110.62$, $p < .001$
33 Chi-square, $X^2(8) = 129.10$, $p < .001$

Table 18 Types of interventions and outcomes (T2)	Service users accessing services		Any outcome (% service accessed)	
	n	%	*n*	%
Safety planning	1941	94	1933	100
Support with MARAC	1208	58	–	–
Liaison and support with police	1049	51	1032	98
Support with criminal court process	800	39	790	99
Liaison and support with probation	136	7	133	98
Support with civil orders	366	18	340	93
Support with housing	927	45	903	97
Financial benefits advice and support	296	14	286	97
Support with immigration	30	1	24	80
Health and well being advice and support	1502	73	1482	99
Support with children	630	30	611	97
Total	2067			

The most accessed intervention was safety planning, with 94% of service users receiving a safety plan. More than half were supported with the MARAC process (58%) or the police (51%). 39% accessed support around the criminal court process, 7% with the probation service and 18% with civil orders. Nearly half of all service users (45%) were supported with housing issues and 14% with financial benefits. 1% accessed support with immigration. Nearly three-quarters accessed support around health and wellbeing, while 30% were supported with their children.

Table 19 Outcomes and impact ratings (T2)	Service users accessing services	Outcomes (as % service accessed)		Average impact rating
	n	*n*	%	
Safety planning:	1941			
Safety plan in place		1933	100%	3.5
Liaison/support with Police:	1049			
Protective measures in place		770	73%	3.6
Arrest (including for breach of orders)		385	37	3.5
Other		294	28	3.4
Support with criminal court process:	800			
Criminal justice process ongoing or pending		145	18	3.2
Criminal conviction and sentence		508	64	3.6
Effective bail conditions imposed		206	26	3.5
Other		213	27	3.3

Table 19 Outcomes and impact ratings (T2)			
	Service users accessing services	Outcomes (as % service accessed)	Average impact rating
	n	*n* %	
Liaison/support with Probation:	136		
IDAP or other perpetrator program		41 30	3.5
Other		97 71	3.4
Support with civil orders:	366		
Civil orders granted and enforced		132 36	3.7
Other		216 59	3.1
Support with Housing:	927		
Sanctuary scheme		261 28	3.7
Service user re-housed in area		160 17	3.7
Service user moved out of area		111 12	3.8
Perpetrator evicted		31 3	3.9
Refuge		108 12	3.6
Other		357 39	3.2
Financial benefits; advice and support:	296		
Benefits or other monetary support accessed		241 81	3.5
Debt being addressed		109 37	3.4
Support with Immigration:	30		
Leave to remain not dependent on perpetrator		19 63	3.4
Recourse to public funds		11 37	3.5
Other		0 0	0.0
Health/well being; advice and support:	1502		
Improved access to help and support		1144 76	3.5
Improved coping strategies		693 46	
Service users' engagement with mental health		104 7	3.6
Service users' engagement with other health services		84 6	3.5
Service users' engagement with drug services		37 2	3.4
Service users' engagement with alcohol services		58 4	3.4
Referral to specialist DV services (not refuge)		266 18	
Service user in counselling		189 13	3.7
Pattern changing course (or similar)		184 12	3.5

Table 19 Outcomes and impact ratings (T2)	Service users accessing services	Outcomes (as % service accessed)		Average impact rating
	n	*n*	%	
Positive change in Service users' support networks		400	27	3.6
Other		117	8	3.4
Support with children:	630			
Child contact arrangements in place		177	28	3.5
Safeguarding initiated/ issued/ addressed		396	63	3.3
Civil orders in relation to children granted and enforced		63	10	3.7
Special needs of children addressed		52	8	3.5
Other		104	17	3.4

The breakdown of the interventions within each group accessed is in shown in Table 19, as are outcomes.

Service users accessing between 6 and 10 interventions were less likely to be experiencing any ongoing abuse, whereas those accessing 2 to 5 interventions were more likely to be experiencing ongoing abuse at the point of exit.[34] Service users who accessed 6 or more interventions were more likely to report feeling much safer,[35] that their quality of life had improved a lot[36] and that they were very confident to access support in the future.[37] IDVAs were also more likely to judge a significant reduction in risk for these service users.[38]

34 Chi-square, $X^2(3) = 16.23$, $p< .002$
35 Chi-square, $X^2(9) = 99.04$, $p< .001$
36 Chi-square, $X^2(9) = 134.59$, $p< .001$
37 Chi-square, $X^2(9) = 70.46$, $p< .001$.
38 Chi-square, $X^2(12) = 116.87$, $p< .001$

Data relating to the criminal and civil justice systems

The data presented in this section relates to any support given and outcomes achieved for service users with regard to the criminal and civil justice systems. The information is recorded on the Criminal and Civil Justice Form at the point of case closure.

Criminal and civil justice outcomes
Criminal justice system outcomes

Table 20 Criminal justice system outcomes (T2)		
	n	%
Cases where a report to police was made (% of cases reviewed at exit)	1,270	61
Cases where no report to police was made (% of cases reviewed at exit)	435	21
Total	2067	
Cases where a charge was made (as % of cases reviewed at exit)	790	38
Cases where no charge was made (as % of cases reviewed at exit)	434	34
Total	2067	
Cases where CPS[39] proceeded with the case (as % cases charged)	681	86
Cases that did not proceed to court (as % cases charged)	97	12
Service user withdrew	46	6
No evidence offered by CPS	41	5
Other	22	3
Missing	0	0
Total	790	
Supported by IDVA in criminal justice process (% of cases charged)	589	75

Of the service users leaving an IDVA service, 61% made a report to the police. A charge was made for 38% of service users exiting.

Where there was a charge made, the Crown Prosecution Service continued with 86% of cases and 12% did not proceed to court. In 6% of the cases the service user withdrew from the process and no evidence was offered by the CPS in 5% of cases.

Three-quarters of service users (75%) were supported by an IDVA through the criminal justice process.

39   Crown Prosecution Service

Cases proceeding to court	*n*	%
Cases heard at Specialist Domestic Violence Court (SDVC)	593	87
Cases where special measures were granted	139	20

Attendance at court (% cases proceeding to court)		
Service user	276	41
Perpetrator	532	78
IDVA	415	61
Witness service	118	17
Other	64	9

Outcome of cases proceeding to court		
Cases resulting in a guilty verdict	532	78
Perpetrator pled guilty	418	61
Perpetrator found guilty	114	17
Neither found nor pled guilty	67	10
Missing	82	12
Total	681	

A total of 681 cases proceeded to court, and 87% were heard at a Specialist Domestic Violence Court (SDVC). One in five clients (20%) were granted special measures and 41% of service users attended court.

There was a conviction in 78% of cases which proceeded to court. 61% of perpetrators pled guilty and 17% were found guilty. 10% of cases resulted in an acquittal and the outcome of the 12% of cases was missing or not known.

Table 21 Offences charged and convicted as % of charges brought				
	Charges as % of total charges		Convictions as % of total charges	
Offences against the person	*n*	%	*n*	%
Common Assault	455	58	321	41
Actual Bodily Harm	89	11	64	8
Grievous Bodily Harm S18	23	3	9	1
Grievous Bodily Harm S20	9	1	8	1
Threats to kill	32	4	16	2
Murder	1	<1	1	<1
Attempted murder	3	<1	2	<1
Rape	14	2	8	1
Indecent assault	3	<1	1	<1
Sexual assault	5	1	2	<1

Assault by penetration	2	<1	1	<1
Breach of non-molestation order	51	6	40	5
Witness intimidation	4	1	4	1
Public order offences	17	2	14	2
Harassment	100	13	66	8

Offences against property				
Burglary/attempted	6	1	3	<1
Theft	7	1	6	1
Criminal damage	126	16	102	13
Criminal trespassing	1	<1	1	<1
Arson	2	<1	2	<1
Telecommunications Act offences	7	1	6	1
Other	58	7	45	6

More than half of the charges brought were for common assault (58%).
The next most common charges were for criminal damage (16%),
harassment (13%) and actual bodily harm (11%).

Table 22 Penalties imposed as % of guilty verdicts (convictions)		
	n	*%*
Perpetrator programme[40]	78	15
Community sentence (not perpetrator programme)	200	38
Suspended sentence	83	16
Custodial sentence under 12 months	97	18
Custodial sentence over 12 months	38	7
Indeterminate sentence	3	1
Restraining orders	265	50
Bindover	6	1
Fine	99	19
Caution	1	<1
Other	90	17

A restraining order was imposed in 50% of cases resulting in a
conviction. Other common penalties imposed were community
sentences (38% of convictions), fines (19%) and custodial sentences of
less than 12 months (18%).

40   Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme/Community Domestic Violence
     Programme

Civil justice outcomes

Table 23 Civil justice outcomes (T2)	n	%
Service users supported by IDVA with civil orders (as % cases reviewed)	333	16
Support with orders under the Children Act (as % of cases reviewed)	109	5
Support with other civil orders (as % of cases reviewed)	260	13
Total	2067	
Legal aid (% of those supported)		
Service users qualifying for legal aid	205	62
Service users NOT qualifying for legal aid	37	11
Service users not applying for legal aid	51	15
Missing	14	4
Total	333	
Provision of legal support (% of those supported)		
Solicitor	276	83
IDVA (DIY order)	16	5
McKenzie friend	2	1
Other	25	8
Missing	1	<1
Total	333	

A total of 333 service users were supported with civil orders – 16% of those exiting a service. 5% were supported with orders under the Children's Act and 13% were supported with other civil orders.

Of those supported, 62% qualified for legal aid. 11% did not qualify for legal aid and 15% did not apply. The majority of service users supported were provided with supported from a solicitor (83%). Smaller numbers were given legal support by the IDVA (5%) or a McKenzie friend (1%).

Table 24 Civil orders applied for/ granted/ breached as % of those supported						
	Applied for (as % supported)		Granted (as % supported)		Breached (as % granted)	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
None	87	26	–	–	–	–
Non-molestation order	132	40	103	31	26	25
Occupation order	34	10	19	6	2	11
Order u/ Protection from Harassment Act	3	1	3	1	0	0
Injunction u/ Forced Marriage Act	1	<1	0	0	0	0
Contact order	35	11	22	7	1	5
Other orders u/ the Children Act	46	14	36	11	0	0
Missing data	5	2	5	2	0	0

The most common orders applied for were non-molestation orders (40% of those supported), contact orders (11%) and other orders under the Children Act (14%).

CAADA Insights outcomes measurement

CAADA Insights is an outcomes measurement service designed specifically for the domestic abuse sector. The service evidences the outcomes that domestic abuse services have on victim safety, enabling services and commissioners to make a stronger case for funding and service improvement. The overall aim of CAADA Insights is to support both commissioners and services to work together to increase the safety of victims in their area.

The service offers:

Robust data collection Simple data gathering and reporting tools enable the collection of robust data on a range of outcomes. By actively supporting case management and service provision, the tools achieve excellent data quality.

A focus on outcomes The Insights service gathers evidence of impact on a wide range of priority outcomes such as risk reduction, increased safety, improvements in quality of life and increased conviction rates. The service enables commissioners and their partners to determine which strategies or interventions are working well, helping to inform policy and practice development.

Transparency CAADA Insights provides evidence of the number and demographic profile of victims supported, their needs, the work achieved and safety and well being outcomes achieved.

Comparability CAADA Insights enables commissioners and funders to compare performance against a national benchmark – this helps to evidence strengths and highlights gaps in service provision.

CAADA Insights costs from £7,500 per year (excluding VAT) with a subsidy for voluntary services and discounts for multiple purchases. Getting started is simple and only requires an initial half day training session with the service with their first report available for use after just six months.

CAADA is also able to offer substantial assistance to commissioners who would like to write Insights into a tender or contract for domestic abuse services in their local area.

New applications are invited on a quarterly basis: Spring (application deadline 1st March), Summer (deadline 1st June), Autumn (deadline 1st September), Winter (deadline 1st December). Contact us today for more information on how we can support your needs. Please email insights@caada.org.uk.

Domestic Violence Services submitting data

CAADA would like to thank the following services for submitting their data:

ADVANCE (London)

Blackburn, Darwen and District Women's Aid (Blackburn)

Blackpool Advocacy (Blackpool)

Bournemouth Churches Housing Association (Taunton)

Bristol Royal Infirmary (Bristol)

Domestic Violence and Abuse Service (South and West Devon)

Let Go (Cumbria)

Magna West Somerset Housing Association (West Somerset)

My Sister's Place (Middlesbrough)

North Devon Against Domestic Abuse (North Devon)

Pontypridd Safety Unit (Rhondda Cynon Taf)

Safer Families (Gateshead)

Stop Abuse For Everyone (Mid and East Devon)

WORTH Service (West Sussex)

Funders

About CAADA:

Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA) is a national charity supporting a strong multi-agency response to domestic abuse. Our work focuses on saving lives and saving public money. CAADA provides practical help to support professionals and organisations working with domestic abuse victims. The aim is to protect the highest risk victims and their children – those at risk of murder or serious harm.

caada
Co-ordinated action against domestic abuse

Insights

into domestic abuse

1