



ENDING DOMESTIC ABUSE

SPECIALIST SERVICES REPORT



November 2021

Authors

Meena Kumari

Brandy Hubbard, M.A.



“

**Support with
preventative work is
a big thing - but
ideally this money
would come from a
different place to
funding for frontline
provision...**

Commissioners

SafeLives. Registered Charity No. 1106864

Contractors

H.O.P.E Training and Consultancy

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to thank the group participants, commissioners, funders, and service users who gave their time, energy, and expertise.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the commissioners.

About the authors



Meena Kumari

Meena Kumari is award-winning founder and director of Helping Other People Everyday (H.O.P.E).

Meena is a trainer and consultant in the domestic abuse, sexual violence, sexual abuse and safeguarding sectors. She also works in front line services and has worked with victims, perpetrators, children and young people, as well as the police, academics, social services, regional and national government.



Brandy Hubbard

Brandy Hubbard is Lead Trainer and Assessor, IDVA courses programme by SafeLives, England & Wales.

Brandy is an expert-by-experience and has worked in the domestic abuse and sexual violence sector since 2005. She obtained a Master's Degree in Sociology (2009) and focused her studies on Sex- and Gender- Based Violence and Human Service Organisations.

ENDING DOMESTIC ABUSE

SPECIALIST SERVICES REPORT

CONTENTS



	Page
<u>Glossary of terms</u>	07
<u>Introduction & background</u>	08
<u>Project aims, objectives & design</u>	10
<u>Section 1: Group consultation</u>	12
<u>Section 2: Commissioner/ funder survey</u>	20
<u>Section 3: Service user survey</u>	22
<u>Section 4: Recommendations</u>	23
<u>Concluding remarks</u>	26
<u>Appendix</u>	27

GLOSSARY OF TERMS



ASC – Adult’s Social Care

CSC – Children’s Social Care

CSP – Community Safety Partnership

CCT – Culturally Competent Training

DA – Domestic Abuse

DASH – Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour-Based Violence risk
assessment

EEDI – Equality, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

FTE – Full Time Equivalent

HBV/A – Honour-based Violence and Abuse

IDVA- Independent Domestic Violence Advisor

MARAC – Multi-agency risk assessment conference

MASH – Multi-agency safeguarding hub

VAWG – Violence Against Women and Girls

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND



SafeLives, a UK charity dedicated to ending domestic abuse, invited Meena Kumari and Brandy Hubbard to work with the organisation to understand some of the opportunities and barriers to being the ally it wanted to be to specialist individual practitioners, small/specialist services and their service users, and make recommendations on how SafeLives can go further and make this a more routine part of what it does.

This report outlines our findings from the project and reflects on the input from participants.

Background: Project brief

In summer 2020, SafeLives published a series of statements and an action plan [Equality, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion plan 2020-21 | Safelives](#) highlighting that we will not achieve our mission of ending domestic abuse for everyone and for good if we don't make changes to the way we operate.

While there have been some good individual pieces of work and initiatives, we lacked a structured, systemic approach to making sure everything we do relates to the lives and experiences of all adult and child victims/survivors, and perpetrators of abuse. More specifically, we were missing opportunities to make our work sufficiently relate to individuals with one or more protected characteristics.

We are determined to change this and have been developing multiple strands of work with that in mind since last summer. We most recently published an update on this in July 2021, entitled [Equity, equality, diversity and inclusion - 2020/21](#).

One of the problems we have identified in our work to date is an uneven level of engagement with frontline services in the voluntary sector who work specifically from a 'by and for' perspective as it relates to someone's sexuality, race, religion, disability or age.

As above, there have been some good pieces of work, but no structure and system through which this was a routine part of what we do.

We have identified several barriers to being the ally we want to be to these organisations, and their service users.

- Size and income level; services provided by SafeLives such as training and accreditation (our Leading Lights process) are intensive, requiring an investment of time as well as money. The most specialist services are often smaller, and not well funded
- Perceptions/reality of who we are and therefore our relevance; who has been represented (and who hasn't) in our imagery, data, training materials, projects, reports, staff and associate team and Board, what values we bring to our work
- Our willingness to engage; our failure to do this work at an earlier stage in our development as an organisation
- Alternative forms of support; some frontline organisations or individuals working in the DA sector will have membership of structures, forums and bigger organisations who provide the support they need, and if they are not commissioned services then links to local commissioners may not be a priority

PROJECT AIMS, OBJECTIVES & DESIGN



Safelives wanted to hear thoughts on ways in which the organisation might offer practical support (for example, from guidance on accreditation and data analysis, to training bursaries, policy influencing or funding advice) or seek paid for professional input into its work.

Safelives intends to dedicate staff capacity and funding to this over the coming year, informed by the recommendations of this report. It is also undertaking some further research into data on service provision and service users with protected characteristics to understand any differing experiences and needs and wanted to know more about existing data sets held by services, understand the gaps, and share the aggregated findings back.

This project opted to use three methods to gather information to answer the research questions. To gather information from specialist services, we used virtual group consultations, completed one-to-one interviews with commissioners and funders, and created an online survey for service users of small and/or specialist services, with support from SafeLives research team.



The key objectives SafeLives set out for us were:

- Survey a minimum of 10 independently employed individuals or smaller, specialist services providing support to people with protected characteristics, to ask them the 2 questions above
- Survey a minimum of 10 service users, to understand how they have valued the response they've received from a specialist service
- Survey a minimum of 5 commissioners, who commission smaller specialist services, to understand the value of SafeLives 'brand' to them (this might be e.g., practitioners holding accredited SafeLives qualifications, a service holding Leading Lights accreditation, involvement with SafeLives research, training delivery and/or interventions), and any other support they would welcome on quality assurance
- Identifying any additional barriers to good relationships between SafeLives and specialist individuals and services, further to the ones identified above, understanding whether these relate to one or more specific 'offers' SafeLives makes to frontline organisations – such as our training, Leading Lights, research/evaluation work, involvement in our delivery of training and innovations in practice, our political influencing, or other work
- Make recommendations about how we close the gap between our aspiration to end domestic abuse for everyone and for good, and our current operations, with a specific focus on our relationship with specialist individual practitioners and small specialist services

SECTION 1: GROUP CONSULTATION



The list of potential participants for the group consultations was generated by gathering information about known small and/or specialist services across England, Scotland, and Wales. This included asking for contacts from the SafeLives staff as well as using the professional networks of Meena Kumari. The resulting list included small and/or specialist organisations across all nine protected characteristics, mainly based in England.

An invitation to a virtual group consultation was sent out to all services on the list. Participants who attended one of the two group consultations were compensated for their time and in a few instances, we had more than one participant from the same organisation. The group consultations were held over Zoom, lasted two hours, and were recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions and facilitator notes were reviewed, and key themes were identified along with key quotes from participants. The discussions were semi-structured to allow for flexibility in the discussion.

The prepared questions included asking services how their service differs from a mainstream service, what their interactions with SafeLives has been, what are some of the barriers they face in engaging with SafeLives, and opportunities where SafeLives could support their organisation. A copy of the discussion questions can be found in Appendix 1.

Summary of findings

Participant response

Across the two sessions there was a total of 33 participants from 28 different organisations. The organisations spanned the nine protected characteristics and included individuals delivering front line services, CEOs, and researchers and academics.

How small and/or specialist services differ from mainstream services

The group participants shared their views on how their small and/or specialist services differed from mainstream organisations. Most participants felt that their service better met the unique needs of their service users compared to mainstream services.

“

...there is not necessarily a long-term support that is needed for a lot of women, and not a flexible support.

In some cases, this was related to speaking the primary language of the service user, having roots and trust in the local community, and offering a broader range of flexible support. This sentiment is echoed in the following comment by a participant working predominately with victims and survivors from a Traveller background:

"So, I don't have personal experience my colleagues who do some advocacy said that, at that same as other large, larger organisations that the, the help for the women is quite crisis oriented. And there is not necessarily a long-term support that is needed for a lot of women, and not a flexible support. Because let's say a Traveller [inaudible 01:11:05] has a little bit different life experience than someone who is a white middle-class woman. So that's it, that it's the same for SafeLives as it is for other bigger organisations." Group Consultation Participant

Many of the participants highlighted that their services were not funded by local authorities or with large grants but that they were mainly voluntary based services or services operating on very small insecure budgets. They presented this in contrast to larger, established organisation and related this to capacity, security, and access to opportunities. One participant pointed out that while the mainstream services were larger and often more financially secure, they felt that it is often the small and/or specialist services that are holding up the larger services.

Interaction with SafeLives and barriers to engagement

There was a wide variety of experiences of working with SafeLives among group participants, ranging from participants never having worked with SafeLives to being a SafeLives Associate.

Most participants who had interacted with SafeLives reported positive experiences and those who hadn't worked with SafeLives said they were eager to learn more. The participants noted that they would like to see visible representation of organisations associated with SafeLives highlighted on the website and in literature.

Several participants shared that they would like to see the senior management make the organisation more inclusive and noted that the majority of people on the Senior Leadership Team are white women. There was a general consensus that SafeLives needed to have more diversity among their staff, particularly in terms of race.

For those who were aware of SafeLives, many of the participants raised cost as a significant barrier to accessing trainings. One participant noted that

“... the training is quite pricey. And when we're talking about grassroots organisation, working with grassroots organisations who make less than ten thousand pounds a year, because most of them are using their own [inaudible 01:05:59] and they're reliant on volunteers, they cannot afford out of ten thousand pounds that they get from community donations to pay three thousand pounds for IDVA training. But they are doing the work; they're doing incredible work, they engage in the communities, they're doing exactly what we should be doing. But they can't afford to pay the three thousand pounds, and even subsidised at one thousand nine hundred and ninety pounds, which is for charities, what if you are not a charity? What if your community interest company? You know, and another group of non-profit, I think that needs to be looked at. If you really want to engage and marginalised communities, then we need to realise that they often don't have the capacity or the availability to pay this kind of money and [inaudible 01:06:39] as I said, offering maybe one training or two training sessions free [like a? 01:06:42] scholarship or something like that, or say you know what you can pay in, in, in monthly instalments. Something that can help out organisations to pay this money to get their staff trained.”

Another barrier to engaging with SafeLives that was raised by participants was in relation to SafeLives' messaging around certain topics and areas. Participants felt that SafeLives' actions, or inactions, did not always align with some of their messaging. This was discussed in terms of anti-racism and trans* inclusion. Participants were aware of statements that SafeLives had published in terms of Equality, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion but felt that their relative silence on social media regarding comments related to racism and trans* issues made by people associated with the organisation appear to conflict with the stated values and EEDI statement.

Other areas where participants felt the messaging of SafeLives was unclear centred around SafeLives' position on the gendered nature of domestic abuse in relation to male victims and the role of medium risk, early intervention, and prevention in relation to Idva provision. Some participants felt that having unclear or inconsistent messages made it difficult for small and/or specialist organisations to have faith in SafeLives.

Opportunities for SafeLives to support small and/or specialist services

Overall, the group felt positive about the possibility of SafeLives supporting their work and highlighted a number of ways in which SafeLives could be a better ally. The ideas that were discussed fell mainly into the following categories: research, training, and collaboration, funding support, influencing, and promoting services. The participants felt that all of this work needs to be rooted in the culture of SafeLives where there was long term, organisational commitment that is embedded across the organisation. The group discussed that actions are as important as words, statements, and policies when it comes to SafeLives' support for small and/or specialist services. They felt that all of this work needs to be based in trusting relationships.

Research and Training

Group participants noted that there is often a lack of research, data, and best practice when it comes to working with their particular group of service users. Participants felt that SafeLives is well placed to assist in building an evidence based in conjunction with small and/or specialist services.

Participants also identified an opportunity for SafeLives to support services data collection, analysis, and in evidencing impact. One participant felt this could be accomplished by a workshop or best practice toolkit and stated,

"I'd like a training event on monitoring in relation to the bigger picture of commissioned DV services"

Collaboration

At the heart of all of these suggestions was a genuine invitation to collaborate. The group participants noted that they have expertise to bring to SafeLives and that there are opportunities to work together creatively that benefit both organisations. The group talked about joint and/or supported bidding as one area for collaboration. Small and/or specialist organisations would like to see the pool of organisations that SafeLives partners with expand to include new groups that they've never previously worked with.

"I think this is a massive opportunity for SafeLives to work with smaller organisations. [Organisations? 01:13:34] I think, often like we said they can't apply for funding or when they do, they can only be allocated five thousand pounds a here ten thousand pounds here. That makes a lot [inaudible 01:13:43] of difference, but not much in the communities. This is the time to apply for partnership funds, you know, when they are allocated funding, not just to look at the organisations they already work with that already make two hundred fifty thousand pounds a year but to [inaudible 01:13:55] small organisations and actually say okay, this organisation is doing great work with FGM and domestic violence in, in Brighton led by volunteers, let's help them out in, in whatever they need, and see how we can best support them."

Another example of collaboration that was discussed ties into the accessibility of SafeLives Training. One participant suggested that Safelives should ensure materials recognise the unique experience of Deaf victims and survivors and are fully accessible to them. Another participant captured how SafeLives and small and/or specialist services can partner in ways that benefit both parties.

"And also, definitely invite those organisations or specialist organisations into your training delivery you know, when you are creating new training content, how can you best incorporate their expertise into your training, you know, Jenny can come and tell you more about the Traveller community and in return, you can train two of her [inaudible 01:14:53], you know, and give them an IDVA qualification. You know, we can come and tell you more about black women and their needs and in return, you can train two of our IDVA's right. And so, we can help one another, even if it's a free [inaudible 01:15:05] service from us, and therefore, we would like to receive a [service back from you? 01:15:09]. And I think that would be a wonderful partnership [inaudible 01:15:11] as well."

Influencing

For those participants who were familiar with SafeLives, they asked for SafeLives to use their position within the sector to influence commissioners to see the value in commissioning culturally informed, small, and/or specialist services.

They felt that SafeLives could advocate for services to receive the funding that they need to continue to provide the critical services that they provide in a more secure funding circumstances.

“We would love support with advertising our training wider as we can offer it outside of the South West by running it online now. However, we would then need the capacity to deliver and meet demand and as a volunteer team with other responsibilities we are not currently in a position to offer a lot more than we already do without more funding and paid staff”

“Support with preventative work is a big thing - but ideally this money would come from a different place to funding for frontline provision to not compete - so ringfenced funding for preventative work is an idea?”

Promoting Services and Raising the Profile

In addition to using their influence to shape commissioner’s decision making, the group see an opportunity for SafeLives to share their platform with small and/or specialist services. By doing this, participants felt that more people would become aware of the work they are doing and reach more service users. Help with promoting and advertising specific services and training on social media would go a long way in helping to expand their reach. The group would like to see:

“SafeLives using their platform, using their profile, to really advocate for the work that [we’ve] been doing”.



“

**SafeLives using
their platform,
using their profile,
to really advocate
for the work that
[we've] been doing.**

SECTION 2: COMMISSIONER/FUNDER SURVEY



In order to understand what ‘value’ SafeLives has to commissioners of DA services, and therefore what parts of it might most benefit specialist services when they go through commissioning processes in their local area, we conducted interviews with Commissioners and funders identified by SafeLives. The pool of interviewees included local authorities, Police and Crime Commissioners, and charitable trusts. A copy of the interview questions for commissioners can be found in Appendix 2.

Summary of findings

Participant response

SafeLives initially identified 11 possible people to interview from which 5 interviews were completed. The virtual interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes and notes were taken by the interviewer during the session. The notes were reviewed, and key themes were identified along with relevant quotes.

Commissioning for small and/or specialist services

There was a consensus among interviewees that commissioning for small and/or specialist originations is a very different style to other funding. The interviewees felt that this type of commissioning was more relationship based compared to commissioning mainstream services. Some interviewees felt that the process couldn’t be rushed and because of that, might take a bit longer.

From the perspective of some of the commissioners and funders interviewed, they were more focused on providing funds to grassroots organisations who can demonstrate that they are responding to the needs of their community, and they had a general compassion for how difficult it can be to exist as a small and/or specialist services. They felt that this was more important than funding services with healthy finances or quality marks, so long as the service was providing quality support. The quality marks could come later.

This view about quality marks was indicative of how they saw small and/or specialist services' policies and infrastructures, choosing to focus more on track record of delivery. The only exception to this was in relation to safeguarding, where commissioners and funders placed significant importance. In terms of monitoring, evaluation, and impact measuring, many of the interviewees volunteered that data collection by small services is not very rigorous and were eager to find a way to evidence the impact of their funding of these services without putting lots of pressure on the grantees.

Reflections on commissioning

Throughout the interviews the concept of value for money was explored, particularly in relation to the work of small and/or specialist services. One charitable grant funder was clear that for them, value for money wasn't just about the physical pounds they pay out for a contract but something more than that. The value of small and/or specialist services extends beyond the money into social value. The interviewees noted that there is a lot of additional work that extends outside of the specifications in the bids, such as education and awareness raising, which is critical in making sure social change is happening within the community. Understanding the true value of small and/or specialist services must consider the depth and breadth of services that they deliver.

Opportunities for SafeLives

Having already recognised that quality assurance processes for small specialist organisations aren't as robust as they would like, the interviewees identified a role for SafeLives in helping to develop this. They would welcome a set of standards that would not burden front line services but provide key information to funders and commissioners.

They would also welcome guidance around safeguarding, setting out specifications for bids, and training standards to help guide their decision making and monitoring. They felt that not only could SafeLives provide these toolkits or best practice to commissioners and funders but that this is something that SafeLives could offer to small and/or specialist services around training, governance, and policy development.

They also saw an opportunity for SafeLives to advocate for joint standards so there was a more joined up approach and consensus among the leading accreditors in the sector.

SECTION 3: SERVICE USER SURVEY



To better understand the value of small and/or specialist services and the unique needs of their service users, we created an online survey. The survey was designed by Meena Kumari and Brandy Hubbard with support from the Research, Evaluation, and Analysis Team of SafeLives. The survey was reviewed by an internal Pioneer from SafeLives. A copy of the survey questionnaire can be found in Appendix 3.

Summary of findings

The survey was shared with participants from the small and/or specialist services group consultation requesting that they share the survey link with their service users. The link was also shared with the wider list, including those who did not attend the group consultations. The link was shared on social media with a specific ask that small and/or specialist services share it within their networks.

The survey was open for over two months with several attempts to promote; however, the response rate was deemed too low and not representative of the target demographic. The Project Team took the decision not to progress the survey but to include the learning regarding the reach of the survey to inform the recommendations of the project.

SECTION 4: RECOMMENDATIONS



A key aim of this project was to identify how SafeLives can be a better ally to small and/or specialist services and it is paramount that any recommendations and actions that come out of this report be rooted in allyship and accountability. Drawing on the rich information gathered directly from the small and/or specialist services and the people who fund them, we make the following recommendations that detail how SafeLives can use their position, expertise, and influence to do just that.

Collaboration

1. Expand SafeLives' pool of specialist services partners to support SafeLives with their delivery of training and EEDI work
2. Recruit and retain more independent associates matching all equality strands (maybe go to the specialist services to support us with recruitment, be on interview panels etc.)
3. SafeLives to conduct joint research, which could be a thematic workshop (e.g., what does good data collection look like, how do we ethically use the voice of service user) and/or a thematic data dive, if there is data available from one/more datasets to look at together and form up possible recommendations arising, or perhaps
4. SafeLives undertaking a guided literature review which might be useful to the service to help them with making a case for local funding or influencing
5. Provision of two spaces free on IDVA courses and ensure that these go to staff from small and/or specialist services
6. Explore barter-based quid pro quo relationships with small and/or specialist services
7. Increase the number of bursaries for training and ensure they are awarded to small and/or specialist services
8. Consider joint bids with small and/or specialist services
9. SafeLives to support with development of quality standards and approaches, through on-site support and or online workshops with seniors



More collaboration



Help with bids, data, and impact reporting



Clear messaging



Access to training and workshops



Quality marks



Influencing and championing

Help with bids, data, and impact reporting/commissioning/funding

1. SafeLives to lead, develop and deliver a bid writing workshop for specialist services
2. SafeLives to conduct a review into what relevant data collection tools are out there for domestic abuse sector and produce a toolkit for small and/or specialist services to use
3. SafeLives continue to influence commissioners with service specification setting and to hold an annual commissioner day inviting those with responsibility of tenders to understand the needs of specialist services
4. Help develop data collection, quality assurance & other standards to guide commissioners

Clear Messaging

1. Review how SafeLives manages relationships with associates, Pioneers, other voices in the sector
2. Clarify messaging around risk led model, prevention/early intervention, medium risk, Anti-racism, Trans* Inclusion, consider unconscious bias that excludes male victims, review Dash to ensure it is inclusive of all genders

Quality Marks, Case management systems, and best practice

1. Try to partner smaller specialist organisations with more established organisations for mentoring
2. Advise on case management recording and systems that are fit for purpose and support services to capitalise on case management systems to evidence impact
3. Review Leading Lights process so it can find ways of accommodating the needs of specialist services and or consider creating an allied quality mark for smaller organisations

Influencing and Championing – SafeLives Reach

1. Address lack of diversity within SafeLives, particularly at senior management level, focusing on recruitment and retention
2. Influence commissioners to see value of small and/or specialist services by holding annual event on specialist services and always building information about them into evidence-based reports
3. Consider collaborating with H.O.P.E on a further set of cross-cultural training webinars for 2022
4. Promote small and/or specialist services via website, social media and other routes
5. Continue to centre the voices of survivors by using tailored methodologies that reach the target audience in ways that work for them in terms of accessibility, language, format etc.

CLOSING REMARKS



"... we seem to be bouncing around and different people are saying sort of different things... SafeLives need to be that kind of that tree, that tree and those foundations, that actually we all kind of turn to as actually being this kind of rock... I almost feel a little bit with SafeLives that there's not that rock, and not SafeLives, but even domestic abuse sector... I feel what's sort of lacking in the sector at the moment is this, this rock, this tree almost, with these foundations that everything kind of grows from and sits around. Whereas at the moment I feel like everybody's just floating in silo around it."

This final quote captures the theme of the feedback we received in preparing this report. Professionals often talk about the Domestic Abuse Sector as if it is one unified entity. This project has highlighted that on the ground, for small and/or specialist services, this is not their experience.

Just as some survivors experience a siloed approach when accessing support, at times, the sector is prone to replicate this fractured approach. Participants in this project, whether frontline practitioners or commissioners and funders, talked about SafeLives as having the skills and position in the sector to address the fractures and fissures that are dividing the sector and leaving those pushed to the margins even further from the centre.



APPENDIX 1

Focus Group Questions for Specialist Services

Project brief: SafeLives would like to build the most effective relationships with and best support smaller specialist services, particularly those working with communities with protected characteristics.

SafeLives wants to increase the mutual opportunities to learn from each other and increase capacity and capability in both directions, so that all victims and survivors of domestic abuse get the best possible response: one that meets their particular needs.

SafeLives would also like to understand how it can support specialist services through commissioning or fundraising processes locally – this could be through quality assurance via Leading Lights, subsidized training for IDVAs, practical tools and guidance or networking for example. What might be most of value to help your service be sustainable?

1. Some of you have completed the registration survey and we are pleased that there are a spread of services here today. Can you describe how your organisation is different from mainstream domestic abuse services?
2. How have you interacted with SafeLives?
3. Have you experienced any difficulties in using SafeLives?
4. Can you think of any opportunities for SafeLives to work with your organisations?
5. Thinking about funders and commissioners, how do you demonstrate your impact and the work you are doing?

APPENDIX 2

Interview Questions for Commissioners

Project brief: SafeLives would like to build the most effective relationships with and best support specialist services, particularly those working with communities with protected characteristics.

SafeLives want to increase the mutual opportunities to learn from each other and increase capacity and capability in both directions, so that all victims and survivors of domestic abuse get the best possible response: one that meets their particular needs.

SafeLives would also like to understand what 'brand value' SafeLives has to commissioners of DA services, and therefore what parts of it might most benefit specialist services when they go through commissioning processes in their local area.

1. What is your understanding of needs for your area? - demographics / protected characteristics. How do they know? What do they do to get this data?
2. As a commissioner of VAWG/ and or Domestic Abuse services in your local area what are you looking for within Quality Assurance?
3. Why might you fund domestic abuse training spaces for specialist services?
4. Why might you fund specialist services locally?
5. Are there any Gaps in accreditation locally and if they are what are they?

APPENDIX 3

Specialist Services Survivor Questionnaire

About SafeLives

We are SafeLives, the UK-wide charity dedicated to ending domestic abuse, for everyone and for good.

We work with organisations across the UK to transform the response to domestic abuse. We want what you would want for your best friend. We listen to survivors, putting their voices at the heart of our thinking. We look at the whole picture for each individual and family to get the right help at the right time to make families everywhere safe and well. And we challenge perpetrators to change, asking ‘why doesn’t he stop?’ rather than ‘why doesn’t she leave?’ This applies whatever the gender of the victim or perpetrator and whatever the nature of their relationship.

Last year alone, nearly 13,500 professionals received our training. Over 70,000 adults at risk of serious harm or murder and more than 85,000 children received support through dedicated multi-agency support designed by us and delivered with partners. In the last four years, over 2,000 perpetrators have been challenged and supported to change by interventions we created with partners, and that’s just the start.

About this survey

SafeLives are committed to making sure that everything we do relates to the lives and experiences of all adults and child victim/survivors: we want to understand what you feel, and what you need.

This survey is designed to help us understand your experience of using a specialist domestic abuse service. The information you share in this short survey will be used to help us develop the ways in which we support survivors and their families. We would be grateful if you could take 5 minutes to share your experience.

Your experience of specialist domestic abuse services

We would like to collect some information about your experience of specialist domestic abuse services. The information you provide will be kept entirely confidential and will never be traced back to you as an individual.

Please specify if you have used any of the following specialist domestic abuse services:

- Black, Asian and racially minoritized women
- Service for deaf and disabled women
- Service for women with insecure immigration status
- LGBT+ service
- Service for older women
- Service for men
- I have not used a specialist domestic abuse service
- Other
- If other, please specify

Were there any barriers or difficulties in you approaching a domestic abuse or specialist service in the past?

What needs did you want support from the service with? Please tick all that apply.

Do you feel the service met your needs for the following?

Yes No Partially Don't know

Alcohol misuse

Children and parenting

Drug misuse

Employment, education and training

Finance, benefits and debt

Housing

Immigration

Mental health

Physical health

Safety

Social and community support

Other

Can you describe the type of support that you received from the service? (e.g., face to face sessions, group work etc.)

What three words would you use to describe what the support you received from the service means to you?

How would you rate the level of support you received from the service?

Very Poor Poor Neither Good Very Good


Service level

Registered charity no. 1106864

Scottish Charity reference number SCO48291

To enquire about this report, please contact

SafeLives

 0117 403 3220

 info@safelives.org.uk