

ITEM NO: 6

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET		
SUBJECT:	REPORT OF THE SAFER COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INQUIRY		
DATE OF DECISION:	19 APRIL 2010		
REPORT OF:	CHAIR OF THE SAFER COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Dorota Goble	Tel: 023 8083 3317
	E-mail:	dorota.goble@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None.

SUMMARY

From January to March 2010 the Safer Communities Scrutiny Panel undertook an inquiry into the how the incidence of domestic violence, including sexual violence and so called 'honour' based violence, can be reduced, particularly focussing on the services for standard and medium risk cases. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) considered the final draft of the inquiry report on 25th March 2010 and approved it for submission to the Executive. The scrutiny inquiry report contains 9 recommendations which have been highlighted in Appendix A. The Cabinet needs to formally respond to these recommendations to meet the requirements in the Council's constitution.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To receive the attached inquiry report on domestic violence to enable the Executive to formulate its response to the recommendations contained within it, in order to comply with the requirements set out in the Council's Constitution.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The overview and scrutiny procedure rules in part 4 of the Council's Constitution requires the Executive to consider all inquiry reports that have been endorsed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and to submit a formal response to the recommendations contained within them.

CONSULTATION

2. The inquiry report, attached as Appendix B, lists the individuals and organisations that have contributed to this review.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. None.

DETAIL

4. On 18th June 2009 the Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed the indicative Terms of Reference for an inquiry into reducing the incidence of domestic violence in the city. The Safer Communities Scrutiny Panel conducted the inquiry and reported back their findings to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC). The inquiry was undertaken over 5 meetings between January and March 2010 and agreed, at its meeting on 10th March 2010, 8 recommendations contained within the Inquiry report attached at Appendix A.
5. At the first meeting of the Inquiry, the Safer Communities Scrutiny Panel was given an introduction and context to domestic violence issues in the city. The key definitions, common patterns of behaviour, the national and local context and performance indicators were outlined to the Panel.
6. The second meeting looked at local structures, roles and particularly the Police response to domestic violence. Meeting 3 concentrated on how the city tackles the cases identified at high risk/crisis cases and received information the SDVF Risk Assessment Model, Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service (IDVAs), the Domestic Violence Specialist Court and sexual offences.. Evidence was given by the Police and the IDVA manager and the Panel notes the good work underway and national recognition of achievements in this area.
7. The fourth meeting looked at the services and support for standard and medium risk cases of domestic violence. The Panel heard evidence from the voluntary sector and the Safer Communities Manager and noted the gap in services for standard and medium domestic violence cases was an issue.
8. The fifth and final evidence meeting highlighted the impact of domestic violence on children and families and gave a focus on the support given by the Health Service on this issue. Diversity issues were also addressed.
9. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee considered the Scrutiny Panel's final report, attached at Appendix B, at its meeting on 25th March 2010. It agreed that the Domestic Violence Scrutiny Panel had met its terms of reference for the review and that the report should be forwarded to Cabinet to enable the Executive to formulate its response to the recommendations contained within it. OSMC also inserted an additional recommendation 9:

“If the Government publishes a consultation paper on the setting up of a DV Perpetrators Register, the scrutiny panel which will be responsible for scrutinising Crime and Disorder matters to be the statutory consultee”
9. The majority of recommendations from the inquiry require action from the Safe City Partnership and the Southampton Domestic Violence Forum. The chair of the Safe City Partnership's Performance Management Group and Southampton Domestic Violence Forum have been informed of the scrutiny panel's recommendations and a formal response has been requested.

10. Many of the recommendations also require specific actions from our partners. The chairs of the relevant partnerships, including the Children and Young People's Trust, the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Economy and Enterprise Board, have been informed of the scrutiny panel's recommendations and a formal response has been requested as appropriate.
11. The Executive needs to consider the Domestic Violence Scrutiny Panel's recommendations relating to these issues and to formally respond to this report in order to meet the requirements set out in the Council's constitution.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

12. A number of the recommendations within the appended report could be progressed by re-focussing council officer and partner's time and existing work programmes.

Capital

13. No additional capital costs were identified during the course of the inquiry.

Revenue

14. It will be for the Executive and various partnerships to identify whether they can accommodate taking forward any of the recommendations outlined in Appendix B. Precise revenue implications will depend on how the individual recommendations are implemented.

Property

19. None

Other

20. None.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

21. The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. This report is presented in accordance with section 7.1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules which requires the Executive to submit its response to the inquiry recommendations.

Other Legal Implications:

22. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

23. The proposals contained within the appended report are in accordance with the Council's Policy Framework and, if implemented, the recommendations will help to deliver priorities within Southampton's Domestic Violence Strategy and the Southampton Safe City Partnership Plan.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

A.	Domestic Violence Inquiry – Summary of Recommendations
B.	Final report of the Domestic Violence Scrutiny Panel

Documents In Members’ Rooms

	None.
--	-------

Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s)

Relevant Paragraph of the
Access to Information
Procedure Rules / Schedule
12A allowing document to be
Exempt/Confidential (if
applicable)

	None.	
--	-------	--

Background documents available for inspection at: N/A

KEY DECISION? No

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	All wards would be affected by the Executive’s implementation of the recommendations contained within the inquiry report.
------------------------------------	---

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FROM THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INQUIRY	Lead Agencies	Target Date	Comments/ Actions <i>To be completed for Cabinet's response</i>
Recommendation 1: The Safe City Partnership should ensure the voluntary sector is fully involved and part of any future solutions to support standard/medium risk cases.	Safe City Partnership SCC	2010-12	
Recommendation 2: The Safe City Partnership should consider how the SDVF can be better supported with leadership and direction and have clearer links to other partnership boards such as the Children and Young People Trust	Safe City Partnership SCC	2010/11	
Recommendation 3: The SDVF should agree a more coordinated approach to key processes such as the use of risk assessments, training and information sharing	SDVF SCC	2010/11	
Recommendation 4: Agree and share key information to provide more data at standard and medium risk levels across the partnership to overcome gaps in data. This should be supported by a programme of problem solving analysis to better understand the reasons and causes of high levels of DV reporting and hot spots to help target stretched resources to maximum effect.	SDVF SCC	2010/11	

Recommendation 5: Children and Young People's Services to explore the extent and options for each school's child protection liaison officer (CPLO) to include a focus on DV in the promotion of healthy relationships in the curriculum.	CYPT SCC Schools	2010/11 Ongoing	
Recommendation 6: Awareness of DV issues to be raised with the School Governor's Forum with the recommendation that Safe! Pack and Star projects are delivered at school and college cluster groups to stretch limited resources to a wider number of schools.	CYPT SCC Schools	2010/11	
Recommendation 7: The SDVF and Health Service is urged to work more closely to improve the identification of DV in their patients and develop appropriate pathways for responding.	HWB Health Service	2010-12	
Recommendation 8: The Safe City Partnership and SDVF should develop and agree a communication strategy to raise awareness of DV more widely to communities, businesses and partners.	Safe City Partnership SDVF	2010/11	
Recommendation 9: If the Government publishes a consultation paper on the setting up of a DV Perpetrators Register, the scrutiny panel which will be responsible for scrutinising Crime & Disorder matters is to be a statutory consultee.	SCC	Ongoing	

APPENDIX B

Report of the Safer Communities Scrutiny Panel

Domestic Violence Inquiry January to March 2010

Panel Membership:

Cllr Fitzgerald (Chair)

Cllr Beckett

Cllr Capozzoli (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Odgers

Cllr Parnell

Cllr McEwing

Cllr Thomas

The Chair's foreword

The Safer Communities Panel has held a wide ranging inquiry into Domestic Violence and how we can better target resources.

It is worth stating that Southampton has a record to be proud of in dealing with high risk cases. We are, in effect a beacon authority. This is down to a strong team at the council, good working relationships with the police and the fantastic and dedicated work charities and other agencies do.

In a desire to improve all aspects of services relating to Domestic Violence, the Panel was tasked at looking what can be done to boost responses to standard and medium risk cases. The impact on children and the consideration of the issues within minority communities was also assessed.

Despite a wide remit, I believe the panel has come up with sensible, practical suggestions which will drive further improvements.

The Panel believes despite the good work in the city, Domestic Violence provision has gaps. We feel all statutory and voluntary bodies should coordinate better to ensure that resources go to the front line and are focused on outcomes.

The report sets out in detail our recommendations. I would stress that in a time of economic uncertainty it is important to note the impact Domestic Violence has on the city economy. Agencies spend £22 million a year on programmes and services.

Finally, on behalf of the panel, I would offer my thanks and praise to those who presented evidence to the Panel and to council officers for their time and commitment. I would personally like to thank fellow members for their input and support.

Cllr Neil Fitzgerald

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction
- 2 The issues
- 3 Development and projected impact on the issue
- 4 Recommended actions
- 5 Resourcing the actions
- 6 Measuring the impact of change
- 7 Appendices
 - a. Terms of reference and outline plan
 - b. Assessment against the DV Inquiry Plan
 - c. Summary of evidence
 - d. Summary of other information, including comparative data
 - e. Performance

Introduction

1. The Safer Communities Scrutiny Panel conducted the Domestic Violence Inquiry between January and March 2010.
2. This Inquiry focussed on domestic violence, a significant contributor to violent crime in the city (21.5%), which continues to be an issue and showing an upward trend, especially Assault with Injury.
3. The Panel commended the nationally recognised achievements in a city of the size of Southampton to reduce domestic violence through strong partnerships, even extending outside of the city boundaries where good relationships with neighbouring authorities ensure that victims are never without refuge. Significant improvements have been achieved in high risk cases with extensive joint-working across the city through the use of Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) which bring together many agencies across the city on each high risk DV case. The panel noted a national shift by the Police in their approach to domestic violence and also, locally, acknowledged that Southampton Police have a positive and supportive approach to this issue.
4. Southampton's MARAC has been cited as one of the top 4 in the country and seen a marked reduction of nearly 5% of repeat domestic violence incidents. More locally, the set up at Southampton's Surestart MRM (in Millbrook, Redbidge and Maybush) has been exemplified as a best practice model.
5. The Panel believe that the excellent work for high risk incidents of domestic violence in the city can be built upon to impact on the limited appropriate services for standard/medium risk cases to increase the capacity necessary to deliver improved services to Southampton. Domestic violence has been estimated to cost a population the size of Southampton over £22M per annum.
6. Overall, there were nearly 5,000 incidents relating to domestic violence reported to the Police with approximately a quarter subsequently recorded as crimes. It is estimated that at least 23% of victims do not report their abuse, a population the size of Southampton is estimated to have over 7,000 women and girls who have experienced domestic violence in the last year.
7. The purpose of the Inquiry was to examine how the incidence of Domestic Violence (DV), including sexual violence and so called honour based violence, can be reduced while still ensuring confidence to report, specifically how to reduce the amount of repeat victimisation. Evidence was gathered from a number of witnesses on the national and local context around domestic violence, the risk based response in Southampton, responses to high risk and crisis cases, medium and

standard risk cases, the health service and children's service response, the impact of domestic violence on children, young people and families and the diversity issues associated with domestic violence.

8. The Panel confirmed that despite a very high level of domestic violence cases in the city, Southampton's Domestic Violence Forum have successfully delivered an increased and strong 'risk based' response to victims of domestic violence through the MARAC process. The key areas of success and identified best practice are with those victims who are in crisis and at the highest risk of serious violence, with a reduction in repeat cases in the last few years. However, despite this best practice model and approach repeat offending rates are high.
9. Due to the well established response to higher risk cases the Inquiry focussed on potential improvements to the effectiveness for standard and medium risk cases, especially how these cases may avoid becoming high risk and how victims who have received a high risk intervention may be supported to avoid repeat victimisation. The Scrutiny Inquiry programme was agreed in summer 2009 and this Inquiry was scheduled from January – March 2010 to ensure that the lead officer for Domestic Violence/ Violent Crime was available to support the Panel.
10. During this period, some actions and initiatives were already underway although these need to be more focussed and coordinated to offer a more coherent and broader response to this issue. The work of the Think Family project will have an impact on the identification and support to families at risk of domestic violence at earlier stages.

The Issues

Objective 1: To examine the kind and level of support needed for standard/medium risk cases as well as the high risk cases that have stabilised or received a high risk intervention.

11. In 2008/09 Victim Support received 4,049 referrals from all sources in the city, although many did not take up contact. In the first 6 months of 2009/10 there were 1,326 medium and standard risk victims of domestic violence referred to Victim Support from the Police. It is estimated that each year in the city there are 750 domestic violence victims at medium risk, taking account of under-reporting and repeats, and 3200 standard risk cases. These numbers demonstrate the high levels of demand for these services.
12. Repeat victimisation of the highest risk cases has been reduced over the last few years but is still makes up about 33% of those cases referred to MARACs. The overall repeat domestic violence crime rate across the city

is recorded as about 28%¹. It is important to remember that a victim will experience an average of 35 incidents before reporting domestic violence to a service.

13. The Panel endorses the view of the Southampton Domestic Violence Forum that there is a gap in provision at standard and medium risk - and recognises the need for further investigation into how best to respond to this gap.
14. The SDVF commissioned a separate piece of work to assess the gap in provision due to the vacuum left by the focus and funding on high risk cases by Standing Together Against Domestic Violence. As a consequence, the Southampton Partnership Delivery Board have recommended that an 'invest to save' business case is developed to identify the potential cost savings to all key services if more funding was provided at the earlier intervention stages of domestic violence incidents. These will be reported in June to the Safe City Partnership and Southampton Partnership Delivery Board.
15. The Panel notes the potential positive effect that additional funding for those at high risk will have on the standard/medium risk cases and supports further investigation into the feasibility of further actions. The acute funding difficulties faced by all agencies are recognised by the Panel.
16. It is clear the voluntary sector has a lot to offer but is reliant on short term funding much of which is running out in April with no signs of changing. There is also a wide use of volunteers at medium/standard risk cases from Southampton Women's Aid helpline and Victim Support.
17. Although there are initiatives in place to deliver actions, these are limited in scale to deal with the potential numbers involved. Through out the Inquiry voluntary agencies have stressed the additional capacity needed to sufficiently deal with the high. However the wealth of experience and commitment to support domestic violence victims by a large number of volunteers should not be ignored.

Recommendation 1: The Safe City Partnership should ensure the voluntary sector is fully involved and part of any future solutions to support standard/medium risk cases.

18. In addition, processes are not always consistent or clear amongst agencies providing standard and medium risk services, for example there are various approaches to undertaking risk assessment. This can cause

¹ This is a figure from the Police and not a universal statistic – some victims will not report an incident to the Police.

difficulties, delays and inconsistent information, especially once a referral is needed to another agency.

19. As a result although there is a great deal of activity at individual agency/risk level there is currently limited joint working between agencies; ultimately this means that victims could fall foul of the system. Access to funds, training, risk assessment, information sharing and signposting of services is not given a sufficiently strategic or co-ordinated approach.
20. The Southampton Domestic Violence Forum has worked well for the operational delivery of the partnership, however it appears to have had limited strategic influence. Although individual agencies are all committed to supporting victims of domestic abuse there has been a lack of accountability to making the partnership work.
21. The Panel believes that better targeting of resources and a more strategic leadership structure will help further improve Southampton's status as a lead authority on reducing domestic violence.

Recommendation 2: *The Safe City Partnership should consider how the SDVF can be better supported with leadership and direction and have clearer links to other partnership boards such as the Children and Young People Trust*

Recommendation 3: *The SDVF should agree a more coordinated approach to key processes such as the use of risk assessments, training and information sharing*

22. It has also been identified that the statutory sector needs to improve ways of recognising and identifying domestic violence as a risk factor that impacts on the lives of their clients and customers.
23. This lack of identification of DV also links to limited availability and sharing of data, particularly at standard and medium risk levels. This is coupled to a heavy reliance on police data which understandably relates more to high risk cases and therefore not necessarily relevant or appropriate for other levels of risk. It is therefore difficult to identify the underlying causes of domestic violence and ultimately the success of intervention at the lower levels of risk.
24. The Panel heard that Southampton has well above average levels of reporting of DV which impacts on the city's crime figures. It also puts a lot of pressure on those responding to highest risk cases - i.e. more than national average number of cases through Multi Agency Risk Assessment

(MARAC²), pressure on Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs³) etc.

25. There was also discussion about hot spots areas such as Millbrook and Thornhill - however it is not clear if there is a real understanding of the causes for the high level of reporting and the issues specific to hot spot areas. Data is not readily available, shared or consistently recorded/monitored for standard and medium incidents and referrals and therefore the outcome of services provided are more difficult to assess.
26. Wider availability of better and more detailed information from standard and medium risk cases will enable further analysis of what the problems and potentially provide more targeted solutions to specific areas or issues.

Recommendation 4: Agree and share key information to provide more data at standard and medium risk levels across the partnership to overcome gaps in data. This should be supported by a programme of problem solving analysis to better understand the reasons and causes of high levels of DV reporting and hot spots to help target stretched resources to maximum effect.

Objective 2: To examine the impact of domestic violence on children and young people

27. The impact of domestic violence on children and young people (CYP) is well documented⁴ including a wide range of physical and emotional symptoms alongside the possibility of moving home and schools, coupled with the risk of losing friends, and one or more parent. The Children's Service and Learning Safeguarding Division have seen an increase of 15% of children and young people affected by domestic violence. The Department of Health estimates that nationally about 75% of children on the 'at risk' register live in households where domestic violence occurs.
28. Intervention and support services for children and young people are established to some extent, through safeguarding processes for high risk cases, and through Southampton Women's Aid. Existing IDVA and MARAC systems ensure the safety of adult survivors and their families and the mental health service 'Saucepans' is also available (although domestic violence is not often identified as an issue at referral point).

² A multi-agency response to the highest risk cases of domestic violence which focuses on improving the victim's safety and the safety of their children. Agency representatives attend MARACs to share all the know risks to the victim with one another, actions are then agreed to reduce these risks. In Southampton these meetings happen fortnightly.

³ IDVAs are trained specialists who work with clients identified as being at very high risk of significant harm and / or murder, the majority of clients will be identified by using a risk indicator checklist.

⁴ <http://www.womensaid.org.uk/domestic-violence-survivors-handbook.asp?section=000100010008000100380001>

29. The service provision at the standard and medium risk levels however is more limited. The NSPCC, Southampton's Woman's Aid and No Limits provide therapeutic services although these are limited although demand is high and funding at risk. There is the possibility for there to be no work of this kind in Southampton next year due to funding and restructuring.
30. An independent investigation by Standing Together Against Domestic Violence urges statutory agencies to do more as a key response to the volume of cases and limited resources. They advised that it should be possible to build on current good practice in services that work with children and young people - such as Sure Start MRM (for Millbrook Redbridge and Maybush area) which was cited as best practice for running a parent support group for DV victims. The Panel recognises that improving the provision for medium risk cases through an 'invest to save' business case would also provide improved care for children and young people experiencing DV at this level.
31. Evidence points to a current lack of identification of domestic violence as an issue within agencies referring cases to Children's Services given the high estimated proportion of children experiencing or witnessing some level of domestic violence. This is particularly in the statutory sector. In Southampton, the Police make 76% of all DV referrals to Children's social care, 11% of the referrals from schools indicate DV, and 3.4% of health referrals. Less than 1% of cases referred to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service indicated DV.
32. The importance of embedding domestic violence into child protection activities has already been identified, and Children's and Learning Services are working in partnership with the police, schools (through education welfare officers) and other partners to develop a triage system of identifying risk factors for children.
33. The Panel heard evidence that education is crucial in preventing harm to those young people experiencing domestic violence now or later in life. It is still too early to say whether the initiatives in place will achieve greater awareness of DV issues. Healthy relationships are already being promoted in the school curriculum through 'SEAL' (Social and Emotional aspects of learning) and 'Every Child Matters'; and it is expected that DV issues will continue to develop on an ongoing basis in schools.

Recommendation 5: Children and Young People's Services to explore the extent and options for each school's child protection liaison officer (CPLO) to include a focus on DV in the promotion of healthy relationships in the curriculum.

34. The Panel heard that efforts to raise awareness of DV and encourage healthy non-violent relationships through the Safe! Pack and Star project was proving difficult to deliver as settings such as schools were finding it

hard to commit time to this despite recognition of its impact on child safety and well being.

Recommendation 6: *Awareness of DV issues to be raised with the School Governor's Forum with the recommendation that Safe! Pack and Star projects are delivered at school and college cluster groups to stretch limited resources to a wider number of schools.*

35. Health services are also limited in their identification of DV as an issue within their patients. Referrals to children's services saw 3% from GPs and less than 1% from mental health services 'Saucepans'. The introduction of a 'family health assessment tool' which all practitioners and health visitors will use should help raise the profile of DV issues however it is too early to identify the success of these initiatives.

Recommendation 7: *The SDVF and Health Service is urged to work more closely to improve the identification of DV in their patients and develop appropriate pathways for responding.*

Objective 3: To examine ways to improve prevention activities and awareness raising on domestic violence, sexual violence and so called honour based violence issues.

36. The evidence to the Panel raised awareness amongst members of the scale and impact of DV. This is an issue that is clearly not fully or widely understood despite the level of activity in responding to DV at many levels of the community as well as amongst partners and agencies who may not appreciate the prevalence of domestic violence and their potential input into supporting and preventing future incidents.

37. The Panel heard that more training and support should be given to private and public sector employers in recognising DV as an issue which can affect staff attendance and productivity. Other groups such as charities and unions also have a role to play.

38. There are potentially significant gaps in awareness of the prevalence of, and response to DV, along with the effect and implications of domestic violence both to the victims and perpetrator. The success of the partnership in reducing and preventing incidents and the need for intolerance to it at all levels of the community.

39. Overall, it is clear that training and education work were crucial in preventing domestic violence incidents for future generations and the Panel believe a more strategic approach to training by the SDVF (**rec 2**) and promotion of healthy relationships in schools (**rec 5**) would lead to greater awareness and prevention.

Recommendation 8: *The Safe City Partnership and SDVF should develop and agree a communication strategy to raise awareness of DV more widely to communities, businesses and partners.*

40. Currently Police take the main responsibility and response for honour based violence and forced marriages. Given the sensitive and individual nature of these cases this was seen as appropriate, although it was clear that these cases were increasing alongside the estimated rise in BME population in the city.

41. Overall information on ethnicity for domestic violence cases is inconsistently recorded or not recorded at all. Current information suggests that there is a high level of under-reporting against the forecast BME population levels.

42. Once consistent and widespread information is available further analysis could be done to ascertain the depth of the problem and potential gaps in BME access to services. This should form part of the partnership data collection approach (**rec 3**) and problem solving work (**rec 4**).

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS	Safe City Partnership	Children and Young People's Trust	Economy and Enterprise Board	Health and Well Being Board	Lead agency	Measurement	Timescale
Recommendation 1: <i>The Safe City Partnership should ensure the voluntary sector is fully involved and part of any future solutions to support standard/medium risk cases.</i>	✓				Safe City Partnership SCC	Voluntary sector included in future solutions	2010-12
Recommendation 2: <i>The Safe City Partnership should consider how the SDVF can be better supported with leadership and direction and have clearer links to other partnership boards such as the Children and Young People Trust</i>	✓	✓		✓	Safe City Partnership SCC	Agenda item and resolution on this issue at Safe City Partnership Board	2010/11
Recommendation 3: <i>The SDVF should agree a more coordinated approach to key processes such as the use of risk assessments, training and information sharing</i>	✓	✓		✓	SDVF SCC	Agenda items on this issue	2010/11
Recommendation 4: <i>Agree and share key information to provide more data at standard and medium risk levels across the partnership to overcome gaps in data. This should be supported by a programme of problem solving analysis to better understand the reasons and causes of high levels of DV reporting and hot spots to help target stretched resources to maximum effect.</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	SDVF SCC	Information sharing and problem solving schedule agreed	2010/11

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS	Safe City Partnership	Children and Young People's Trust	Economy and Enterprise Board	Health and Well Being Board	Lead agency	Measurement	Timescale
<i>Recommendation 5: Children and Young People's Services to explore the extent and options for each school's child protection liaison officer (CPLO) to include a focus on DV in the promotion of healthy relationships in the curriculum.</i>		✓			CYPT SCC Schools	Agenda items and resolution at C&YPT	2010/11 Ongoing
<i>Recommendation 6: Awareness of DV issues to be raised with the School Governor's Forum with the recommendation that Safe! Pack and Star projects are delivered at school and college cluster groups to stretch limited resources to a wider number of schools.</i>		✓			CYPT SCC Schools	Agenda item on School Governors Forum and School Cluster groups	2010/11
<i>Recommendation 7: The SDVF and Health Service are urged to work more closely together to improve the identification of DV and develop appropriate pathways for responding.</i>	✓			✓	HWB Health Service	Health service agenda item and resolution	2010-12
<i>Recommendation 8: The Safe City Partnership and SDVF should develop and agree a communication strategy to raise awareness of DV more widely to communities, businesses and partners.</i>	✓		✓		Safe City Partnership SDVF	Communication strategy in place	2010/11

Development and projected impact on the issue

43. Standing Together against Domestic Violence was commissioned to assess the gap in provision due to the vacuum left by the focus and funding on high risk cases.
44. While the good reputation of the council and other agencies is recognised they have identified that the statutory sector processes are not currently set up to identify domestic violence as a factor of the lives they impact.
45. They have also recommended an invest to save business case is developed to identify the potential cost savings to all key services if more funding was provided at the earlier intervention stages of DV.
46. The Panel received evidence about partnership work already planned including:
- HR policy development
 - SCC's Children's and Learning Services Directorate are coordinating the development of a triage system together with the Police, Schools (through Education Welfare Officers) and other partners to enable a more coordinated response to children in need.
 - Health services are introducing Family Health Assessment across their services to provide a more coordinated response to family health issues such as mental health and substance abuse which are often evidence in domestic violence cases.
 - Joint work is ongoing to improve engagement with BME Communities. Initiatives include workshops during International Women's Week, discussions with the Muslim and Sikh community to raise awareness, confidence and levels of reporting, and Sure Start undertaking encouraging work with women with young children.
47. In addition, the Safe City Partnership's draft Action Plan for 2010/11 contains the following action to address this issue:
- *Improving responses to Domestic Violence especially focusing on medium and standard risk cases and the impact of DV on children and young people, but also ensuring joined-up approaches to reduce repeat offending.*

Resourcing the actions

48. Domestic violence is estimated to cost a population the size of Southampton over £22M per annum (based on a Ready Reckoner).
49. Southampton City Council has committed funds of approximately £538,000 to DV specific services, for 2009/10 this was broken down as follows:
- £45,000 Safeguarding (Southampton Women's Aid CYP work in refuge)
 - £355,000 Supporting People (Raglan and Stonham - Refuge and outreach)
 - £23,572 Voluntary Sector Grants (Southampton Women's Aid - Outreach)
 - £114,000 Safer Communities budget (1 Manager and 2 IDVA's)
50. Safeguarding work already underway in Children's Services also addresses many issues which support domestic violence work, although these resources have not been specifically identified as part of this Inquiry. The Standing Together report urges Children's Services to review its funding arrangements relating to supporting children through DV.
51. The recommendations of the Standing Together report to prepare an invest to save business case may have some financial implications in the future but these will be the subject of future reports.
52. The recommendations of this Inquiry do not have any additional financial implication on the council and its partners, except in terms of additional input of people's time.

Measuring the impact of change

53. The potential impact of the work already underway and implementation of the emerging recommendations of the DV Scrutiny Inquiry aim to achieve:
- A reduction in the repeat incidents of DV incidents
 - A reduction of cases referred to MARAC
 - Less escalation of cases from standard/medium to high risk cases
 - Improved potential for children and young people within their current circumstance through the provision of support and earlier intervention, therefore avoiding the possible impact witnessing domestic violence may have later in life
54. The recommendation (6) of the Panel for the SDVF to identify and measure a clear consistent data set should enable a much clearer picture in future of the impacts of intervention and prevention work.

Terms of Reference: Domestic Violence

1. Scrutiny Panel: Safer Communities
2. Nature of Inquiry: Full
3. Membership:
 - a. Councillor Fitzgerald (Chair)
 - b. Councillor Capozzoli
 - c. Councillor Rayment
 - d. Councillor Parnell
 - e. Councillor Beckett
 - f. Councillor Odgers
 - g. Councillor Thomas
4. Purpose:
 - a. To examine how the incidence of Domestic Violence (DV), including sexual violence and honour based violence, can be reduced.
5. Background:
 - a. The Safe City Partnership Plan identifies that violent crime continues to be a concern and Assault with Injury (which forms 44% of violent crime offences) has increased by 29%.
 - b. The annual Southampton Domestic Violence Forum Snapshot Survey measures the volume of domestic violence and incidents reported to all services in the city. This shows an upward trend in the reporting of Domestic Violence, which features in the increase in the statistics for Assault with Injury
 - c. Significant improvements have been made to multi agency working with DV victims in the city, which in turn has resulted in increased confidence in reporting repeat DV incidents to the agencies
 - d. However, there are still few appropriate services for referring for low/medium risk cases for DV, sexual offences and honour based violence.
6. Objectives:
 - a. To examine the kind and level of support needed for low/medium risk cases as well as the high risk cases that have been stabilised
 - b. To examine the impact of Domestic Violence on children and young people
 - c. To examine ways to improve prevention activities and awareness raising on domestic violence, sexual violence and honour based violence issues

7. Methodology and Consultation:
 - a. Undertake desktop research
 - b. Identify best practice
 - c. Seek stakeholder views
 - d. Conduct interviews with Cabinet Members leading on issues related to Enforcement, Executive Director for Neighbourhoods, Policy Co-ordinator, Assistant Solicitor to the Council, relevant Heads of Services, Safer Communities Manager and other agencies, particularly the Police, Probation and the voluntary sector

8. Proposed Timetable: 7 meetings from Jan – March 2010 and report to the OSMC in May 2010.

Meeting 1: Domestic Violence - Introduction & Context
Definitions, common patterns of behaviour
National and local context
Performance Indicators

Presented by:

Linda Haitana – Safer Communities Manager

Michelle Barry – Southampton Domestic Violence Forum Chair

Meeting 2: Domestic Violence - Local structures, roles and responses

Presented by: Ch/Inspector Dick Pearson, Sgt Melanie Morgan and Linda Haitana

Meeting 3: Domestic Violence - High Risk / Crisis Cases

Risk Assessment model

Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARACs)

Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service (IDVAs)

Domestic Violence Specialist Court

Sexual offences

Presented by: Karen Marsh – IDVA Manager, Sgt Mel Morgan and Jo Pearce
- Manager Rape Crisis

Meeting 4: Domestic Violence - Standard and Low Risk Cases

Current Provision

Issues and Gaps

Presented by: Women's Aid; Linda Haitana or Anthony Wills

Meeting 5: Domestic Violence - Children and Families Impact and Diversity
Issues

Current provision, issues and gaps

Presented by:

Head of Safeguarding

Representative from Health

Representative from the Local Safeguarding Children Board

Representative from Southampton Domestic Violence Forum (SDVF)

regarding diversity issues including No Recourse to Public Funds and Honour

Based Violence.

Meeting 6: Focus on Health and views from Stakeholders, including Children and Young People's perspective written case histories without names to be considered by the Panel

Meeting 7: Agree Recommendations

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

APPENDIX 3

- Introduction and background information on DV presented by Linda Haitana, Safer Communities Manager
- Police response to domestic violence, 'honour' based violence and forced marriage presented by PS Melani Morgan
- Southampton's response to high risk and crisis DV cases presented by Karen Marsh and PS Melani Morgan
- Southampton's response to standard/medium risk DV incidents presented by
 - Lynn Shannon & Annett Odom - Woman's Aid
 - Jo Black – Victim Support
 - Anthony Wills – Chief Executive of Standing Together Against Domestic Violence
- The impact of DV and DV support/services for children and families and diversity issues for domestic violence presented by:
 - Trish Roscoe – Children's Social Care
 - Karen Watts – IDVA manager
- Focus on health response to DV:
 - Trish Newcombe – Health safeguarding lead
- Case studies of children affected by DV – anonymous

All presentations and notes on witness evidence available on request

SUMMARY OF OTHER INFORMATION, AND COMPARATIVE DATA

Evidence submitted to the Panel

- Southampton city council DV funding breakdown
- Ready reckoner of DV issues and costs to the city
- Domestic violence, incidents, crimes and level of repeats by ward including information on Surestart centres and priority areas in the city
- Southampton Strategy against DV 2007-2010
- Police key 20 questions used to assess risk for every DV incident they respond to
- Rick indicator check list used by IDVAs and other non-police agencies for MARAC case identification when DV, 'honour' based violence or stalking is identified
- Southampton DV Forum Snapshot Survey report of 2009 = service provider responses

Desktop research:

- Devon County Council Task Group on DV and Abuse
- Report on child victims of domestic abuse – Overview and Scrutiny Birmingham City Council
- Various BBC new reports covering:
 - New Government Policy to promote healthy relationships
 - Issues around disproportionate level of female DV victims
 - Tougher powers by the courts to impose restraining orders
 - Television campaigns against DV

All evidence, presentations and research are available on request

Performance

APPENDIX 5

PI Description	Target	Qtr. 1	Qtr. 2	Qtr. 3	Qtr. 4	Current Status	Perf since prev Qtr	Projected Outturn	Previous Year Outturn	Forecast Direction of Travel from 2008/09 to 2009/10	Comments
Economic Development Portfolio											
Neighbourhood Services Division											
LAA 4b i Number of clients referred to the Independent Domestic Violence Advisory (IDVA) service (LAA Local Indicator)	300	72	147	244		On Target	Improved	300	272	Improved	
LAA 4b ii Percentage of potential clearly identified victims of domestic violence engaged with the Independent Domestic Violence Advisory (IDVA) service (LAA Local Indicator)	69	74	64	69		On Target	Improved	69	67	Improved	
LAA 4b iii Overall provision and effectiveness of local authority services designed to help victims of domestic violence and prevent further domestic violence. (BV225) (LAA Local Indicator)	90	90.9	90.9	90.09		On Target	Declined	90.9	90.9	No Change	It is not possible to report against this indicator. It was proposed to remove this from the suite of SCP measures at the start of 09/10.
LAA 4b iv Reduce the percentage of repeat attendances at MARACS by IDVA clients (LAA Local Indicator)	33	45		33.6		On Target	N/C	33	30.5	Declined	
NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence (LAA Designated Target)	33	45	43	33.6		On Target	Improved	33	36	Improved	Like many other cities Southampton has been seeking interpretation of guidance and definitions for this measure in previous months. Following this clarification and agreement from the local MARAC Strategy Group on the definition and criteria for what cases should return to Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC's), we have seen a drop in the number of NI32 cases. Work continues to

<u>PI Description</u>	Target	Qtr. 1	Qtr. 2	Qtr. 3	Qtr. 4	Current Status	Perf since prev Qtr	Projected Outturn	Previous Year Outturn	Forecast Direction of Travel from 2008/09 to 2009/10	Comments
NI 34 Number of domestic homicides per 1000 population	0	0	0	0.004		On Target	Declined	0.004	0	Declined	reduce the number of repeat cases. Unfortunately a domestic violence homicide occurred during this quarter. Southampton is recognised as one of the top 4 areas in the country for its progressive model of dealing with those at high risk of death or serious injury as a result of domestic violence. However the nature of this crime dictates that even with these robust mechanisms in place victims are still placed at significant risk from partners or ex partners.

