
WINSTON CHURCHILL FELLOWSHIP – DOMESTIC ABUSE AND HOUSING: INTERNATIONAL PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVES

Gudrun Burnet – 2017

**NATIONAL
HOUSING
FEDERATION**



WINSTON
CHURCHILL
MEMORIAL
TRUST



daha

Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance



PEABODY

CONTENTS

01	Thanks
01	About the Author
02	Executive summary
04	Introduction
04	Background
04	Objectives
05	Approach
05	Report overview
06	Key themes and findings
06	Theme 1: Self-determined advocacy and trauma informed services
10	Theme 2: Intersectionality
12	Theme 3: Differing housing models
27	Conclusion
28	Recommendations and implementation
31	Dissemination

THANKS

I would like to thank my family for their unwavering support, kindness and just pure brilliance. I am so lucky to have such an amazing family who support me in everything I do.

I would like to thank Lord Kerslake, Stephen Howlett, Stephen Burns, Joe Joseph, Theresa Ferebee, Marianne Jones, Danny Hardie, Paul Beaton, Robert Hackett, Ebun Atinmo, Nikki Langley-Essen, Benjamin Blades, Ijay Onyechi and Alice Cheatle and the whole of the Community Safety and Support Team for supporting everything I do at Peabody.

Thank you Patrice King, Lindsay Hodgson, Michelle Francis, Nicola Sharp-Jeffs, Aisha Sharif, Judith Banjoko, Carol Fregiste, Yvonne Matser Van T Oever, Esther Sample, Lucy Allwright, Maragaret Williams, Lisa Raftery, Permjit Chadha, Kat Sellers, Nicole Jacobs & the STADV team, Meghan Field and Kelly Henderson for being my rocks.

Special thanks to the formidable Cris Sullivan, Jessica Gonzales, Lisa Coffman, Sarah Rosenthal, Peg HacsKaylo, Linda Ohlsen, Deb Nicholson, Cathy Humphreys, Sue Cripps, Rosie Batty, Angela Spinney, Lois Gander, Gretchen Shaw, Laura Hurstfield & co, Bill Wray-Symons & co for making my trip so memorable and so inspiring. Honestly I cannot put in to words how much you changed my life.

And lastly thank you to The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust and the National Housing Federation (NHF) for making my dreams come true.

I will be forever thankful to all of you.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gudrun Burnet is a Senior Business Partner at Peabody and has worked in the field of domestic abuse for 10 years. Gudrun started her career on the National Domestic Abuse Helpline as a volunteer. She then worked for Refuge in London as a support worker and was promoted to floating support co-ordinator across South London. Gudrun co-founded the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) in 2014 along with colleagues from Gentoo and Standing Together Against Domestic Abuse (STADV). Gudrun has trained over 45 Housing Provider's globally and is the housing representative for the national Violence Against Women's and Girls (VAWG) stakeholder panel hosted by the Home Office. She has spoken at international conferences in Australia, Canada, USA, Czechoslovakia, Brighton, Belfast, Brussels, and The Hague about her work in housing and domestic abuse. She is a trustee of Against Violence and Abuse (AVA) and was shortlisted for Red Magazine's Pioneering Woman of the year Award 2016.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The key purpose of this Winston Churchill Fellowship was to learn about international practice and perspectives relating to domestic abuse, learning about different housing models, approaches and best practice in a global context.

This Fellowship identified areas of good practice in the USA, Australia and Canada and as a result Washington DC, Chicago, Edmonton, Seattle, Arizona, Sydney and Melbourne were visited (see map below)

Major Findings

- Domestic and Sexual Abuse services are not robust and diverse enough to cope with the differing needs of families affected by domestic abuse world-wide.
- Housing Providers are not being provided the right training and support in order to upskill them to deal with domestic abuse effectively.
- Housing is left off the agenda in many major initiatives, for example the Istanbul Convention only makes mention of housing in Article 20 as part of general support services and Article 23 in terms of Shelter.

- There has been and still is an over reliance on the Criminal Justice System (CJS) in dealing with domestic abuse.
- There has been and still is an over reliance on the Shelter/Refuge model when responding to domestic abuse.
- Across the world there is a lack of affordable housing and no housing infrastructure. In the UK we are fortunate to have a model for social housing but we need to find ways of making the most of this advantage.
- Housing and domestic abuse legislation/regulations are not adequate, linked or holistic.
- There is gender bias in the system and this needs to be acknowledged and addressed.
- Institutional racism relating to domestic abuse and housing exists across the world.
- There is a lack of awareness of domestic abuse globally.



Recommendations:

Campaigning, lobbying and awareness

- The housing, domestic abuse, VAWG and sectors dealing with any sort of vulnerability need to jointly campaign for affordable housing.
- We need to continue to raise awareness via conferences, media and meetings with premiers (leaders) and ensure everyone understands the impact, complexities and trauma caused by Domestic and Family Violence.
- The sector needs to focus and make central issues around Intersectionality, positionality, implicit bias, horizontal hostility and assimilation.
- We need to start applying a gendered and poverty lens to our social policies.
- We need to start talking about a standard of living for the most vulnerable and marginalised in our society.
- We need to assert that housing and personal safety are human rights.
- We need to ensure housing is at the core of everything we do.

Differing housing models

- We need to take a critical look at our programmes to ensure they are survivor centred and focus on those most marginalised.
- We need to critically review our practice and look at what other housing programmes might look like to augment the Refuge model.
- We need to ensure that our advocacy is truly self-determined.
- We need to make sure our services are truly trauma informed.
- Services should not be punitive i.e. mandate individuals on to programmes.
- Services should be 'screening in' not 'screening out' i.e. adolescent boys, substance / alcohol abuse, disabilities, multi-disadvantages.
- We need to stabilise and add to the funding for services.

- We need to move in to the private rented sector to increase awareness and improve practice whilst acknowledging that the private market will not solve social problems.
- We need to create technical assistance and capacity building for organisations to improve the housing response to domestic abuse.
- We need to disseminate best practice, training and guidance globally including the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA), accreditation (UK), the Pan-London Reciprocal, the toolkit for Community Housing Providers (Australia), the Domestic Abuse Technical Assistance Consortium (USA) and the 'Safe at Home' Project (Europe).
- We need to ensure that housing providers are not treating domestic abuse as anti-social behavior (ASB).
- We need to explore the use of Housing First models in relation to domestic abuse in the UK.
- We need to integrate work on housing with financial and economic abuse so that survivors can sustain tenancies (see Victoria Royal Commission recommendations).
- We need to implement Flexible Funding Assistance or a Social Resilience Fund (SRF).

Legislation and Regulations

- We need regulatory and legislative change.
- We need to improve the scale and quality of our data collection activities.
- We need to ensure our homeless, domestic abuse and VAWG strategies are linked at a local and national level.

We need to expand work relating to the Istanbul Convention, Restorative Justice, role of counselling services like Relate, European perspectives, the whole family approach and the impact of domestic abuse on youth homelessness.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Peabody is one of the largest London based housing providers (managing 27,000 properties and providing services to 80,000 residents) and has shown the vital role Housing Providers can play in identifying and supporting families affected by domestic abuse. Housing providers have unique entry [access] to the 'hidden' spaces occupied by perpetrators and individuals experiencing abuse, through regular contact with residents carrying out services such as repairs and community development activities. Housing provider employees are trusted and accessible and are considered by many more approachable than the police or other statutory agencies. In the UK, on average two women a week are murdered by a current or former partner. Each year around 2.1m people suffer some form of domestic abuse - 1.4 million women (8.5% of the population) and 700,000 men (4.5% of the population). In 2008, Peabody changed our approach to domestic abuse including training, updated policies and procedures and proactively publishing our work externally and internally. This has resulted in a 1425% increase in reporting of abuse to Peabody since 2008. This equates to 25% of the case load within the specialist Community Safety Team (CST) based at Peabody. As a result, Peabody are seen as a model of best practice in the UK housing sector and have co-founded the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) with Gentoo and Standing Together Against Domestic Violence, a national initiative, aiming to improve the housing sector's response to domestic abuse through a national accreditation process.

In a global context, practices in governance and housing related legislation varies especially regarding management and responsibilities in relation to domestic abuse. This Fellowship enabled the author to build upon learning in the international arena to expand and develop practice in the UK, most specifically in relation to practice, policy, procedures and legislation.

The three key themes that were identified in this Fellowship are Self-determined advocacy and trauma informed services, Intersectionality and Differing housing models.

Objectives

1. Formation of a global coalition for Domestic Abuse, VAWG, Housing and Homelessness.
2. Influence UK government policy on Housing, Homelessness, Domestic Abuse and VAWG.
3. Input in to the European Parliament via FEANSTA.
4. Gather and analyse data about housing provider's practices internationally including the Housing First model and produce a report on findings.
5. Convene at least 6 round table discussions with partner agencies in the 3 countries visited to assess and compare responses.
6. Use the international perspective to improve and enhance practice in the UK through DAHA, the Home Office VAWG Stakeholder panel, consortia of Housing Providers, Homeless Link, Shelter, Crisis, Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH), RESOLVE – ASB, National Housing Federation (NHF), Housing LIN, Capsticks and the VAWG sector.

Approach

Following on from speaking at the Global Network of Women's Shelter and creating links with women in USA and Australia, research was conducted on differing models across the world, identifying the USA, Canada and Australia as areas of interest for the Fellowship to have maximum impact. By utilising existing international networks practitioners, academics, government staff and activists were contacted to contribute to the project, thereby creating the broadest and most informative visit possible.

During the visit more than 60 services were visited across the USA, Canada and Australia. (See Appendix 1 with hyperlinks). The interactions ranged from face to face interviews, round-tables, workshops, presentations, conferences, small group work and even Facetime & Skype.

The first stop of this Fellowship was Washington DC, establishing an excellent understanding of the funding and governing structures of the USA before further visits to Chicago, Seattle and Arizona to speak at the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) annual conference.

Canada is renowned for its work around Housing First and Professor Lois Gander had already contacted DAHA in order to find out more information about the work we were doing with Housing Providers so a synergy already existed between our work.

In Australia as a result of the pioneering work of Rosie Batty, awareness of family violence has been raised resulting in an increase in funding from Government. The Global Network of Women's Shelters cited Australia as one of the leaders in combatting domestic abuse and VAWG therefore this visit aimed to determine what they were doing in terms of housing.

A blog was written throughout the Fellowship and got a lot of traction on Twitter, Linked in, Instagram and Facebook. This can be found at <http://www.salusst.com/blog>

Report overview

This report is going to focus on three key themes which were identified as part of this Fellowship. Within the key themes theoretical ideas will be discussed along with case studies, areas of interest and consequence recommendations.

1. Self-determined advocacy and trauma informed services
2. Intersectionality
3. Differing housing models
 - Overarching constructs
 - Legislation and Regulations
 - Housing First & Flexible Funding Assistance
 - Whole family approaches versus a focus on individuals
 - Risk assessment and multi-agency working
 - Programmes for perpetrators
 - Pan-London Reciprocal
 - Safe at home

KEY THEMES AND FINDINGS

Theme 1: Self-determined advocacy and trauma informed services

Jill Davies in her book 'Domestic Abuse Advocacy'ⁱⁱ sets out what is meant by the term self-determined advocacy. Davies calls this 'Victim-Defined Advocacy' and explains that women need to make their own decisions as they understand their situation better than anyone. Davies explains that 'who she is will in many ways determine what advocacy she will define' and that 'who she is, is also likely to be important to her and her decision making.'

Across the world there is a general belief that this is what advocates do but as part of this Fellowship and on true reflection of the systems and support that has been set up for individuals this is not the reality. Many advocates have advised that they feel constrained by how they work with people as you have a menu of options and it is a case of seeing which fits best. It could be argued that this is not true self determined advocacy. However in the UK services are commissioned for the point of crisis currently so are inherently limited. This Fellowship allowed a reflection of current practice not afforded to the author previously. A huge challenge for the sector and movement would include critical reflection of our own practice.

Mortality rates

It is clear to see that domestic abuse is a global epidemic as seen in reported mortality rates across the world:

- In the UK on average 2 women a week are murdered by a current or former partner.ⁱⁱⁱ
- In the USA 3 women a week are killed as a result of domestic abuse, 72% of all murder-suicides involve an intimate partner and 94% of the victims of these murder suicides are female.^{iv}
- In Australia on average at least one woman a week is killed by a partner or former partner.^v
- In Canada a woman is killed approximately every six days, by an intimate partner.^{vi}

Links to homelessness and housing

In the UK domestic abuse has been identified as a leading cause of homelessness; how housing providers should respond is outlined in the domestic abuse and homelessness supplementary guidance. Official statistics show that in 2008/9 6,820 households were accepted by local housing authorities in England and Wales as homeless on the grounds of domestic abuse (AVA, 2011). This equates to 13% of all acceptances (Quiglar and Pleace, 2010)^{vii}. However, a number of research studies, have found that domestic abuse is a much more common cause of homelessness than Government statistics imply, as these statistics only tell us about acceptances and not about applications (AVA, 2011). The Rebuilding Shattered Lives: the final report by St Mungo's (2014)^{viii} found that nearly 50% of their female clients had experienced domestic abuse, with a third of women claiming that their experiences of domestic abuse contributed to their homelessness.^{ix} Data in the UK on this subject is not comprehensive, which is a huge problem that DAHA is working to rectify.

The United States Conference of Mayors commissioned research that demonstrated that domestic abuse is the third leading cause of homelessness among families.^x Furthermore the research shows that housing instability is four times more likely for women who have experienced domestic abuse compared to other women (Pavao at al, 2007).

In Australia domestic abuse is also one of the leading causes of homelessness, accounting for 32% of people receiving assistance from specialist homelessness services (2011–12).^{xi} Researchers globally agree that domestic violence-related homelessness differs from other forms of homelessness, as affected individuals are more likely to cycle in and out of homelessness.^{xii}

It is widely accepted that housing is critical for survivors of domestic abuse. In Australia a study of women's economic wellbeing following and during domestic abuse, women advised that finding safe, affordable, appropriate accommodation was their single biggest concern.^{xiii} The costs to women leaving are substantial and include losing their home, full relocation, storage and potentially losing their job/income.^{xiv}

The National Youth Commission Inquiry into Youth Homelessness in Australia demonstrated that Domestic Abuse is a huge factor in youth homelessness, including family breakdown and conflict.^{xv} In a longitudinal study of Melbourne homeless young people, aged 12 to 20 years, researchers found one third of young people left home because of family violence, which in most cases had occurred over a long period of time.^{xvi}

Studies in Canada have found histories of family violence to be quite common among homeless persons, especially youth and women and more common than among non-homeless populations (Neal 2004; Novac et al. 2002b; Farrell et al. 2000; Gravel 2000; Gaetz et al. 1999; Poirer et al. 1999; Novac et al. 1999; Hagan and McCarthy 1997; Régie Régionale de la Santé et des Services sociaux de Montréal-Centre 1998; Mental Health Policy Research Group 1998; Peters and Murphy 1994; Breton and Bunston 1992; Radford et al. 1989; Janus et al. 1987; Kufeldt and Nimmo 1987). Research in this area is limited and it is notable that in a Canadian Observatory Homelessness research paper 'The State of Homelessness in Canada 2016'^{xvii} there is no mention of domestic abuse and the research conducted on homelessness did not include violence against women shelters. On a review of studies on homeless families, Rosenheck et al. (1999, 11) concluded that:

"Interpersonal violence may well be the subtext of family homelessness. Abuse and assault seem to be salient features of homeless mothers' childhood and adult experiences. Women suffer its devastating medical and emotional consequences for the rest of their lives."^{xviii}

The model of a refuge at crisis point and transitioning to independent living is well established across the world. However, this Fellowship highlighted to the author the critical need to consider whether it meets the needs for everyone impacted by domestic abuse.

In the UK the first well documented women's refuge opened in Chiswick, London, in 1971. Society has moved on greatly from the early 70s when a woman leaving an abusive partner was less likely to be in paid employment, highly-skilled or otherwise and less likely to be the named tenant on a tenancy agreement, leaseholder, or mortgage holder. We also need to critically reflect on the theory at this point which viewed women as 'battered women' or having 'battered women syndrome.' This theory meant that a lot of women were viewed as not being able or fit to make decisions for their family as they were in such trauma. However individuals experiencing domestic abuse will be at different points in their journey and will be depend on so many aspects of themselves, wider community, family, children and beliefs and we must hold this central if we are truly going to practice self-determined advocacy.

For some women, remaining in the home and removing the perpetrator is the approach they would prefer, for other women they want to leave the home, but wish to maintain employment links. Other women will be reluctant to disrupt their child's education, and still others will want to keep links with male friends and family and older male children which some refuges in the UK refuse to accommodate.

At a conference in Arizona one of the first session's was entitled from 'Caterpillar to Butterfly: The Trajectory of the Domestic abuse Movement' which involved professionals of the movement critically reviewing the journey of domestic abuse services. It was acknowledged that there has been an over reliance on the Criminal Justice System and the model of Shelter and Refuge. It is also highlighted that we have much to undo before we can move forward and that the needs of the most marginalised need to become truly central in everything we do. In the UK we also need to embrace this critical thinking and start reflecting on our practice asking ourselves:

1. Where we have been?
2. Where we are now?
3. Where are we headed?

Trauma Informed services or care is talked about widely in the UK but whether services are truly providing these is questionable. The National Resource Centre on Domestic Violence (NCRDV) in USA has created guidance on what this means breaking it down in to five core components:

- Providing the survivor information about the traumatic effects of abuse
- Adapting programmes and services to meet individuals trauma and mental health related needs
- Creating opportunities for individuals to discuss their response to trauma
- Offering resources and referrals to individuals
- Reflecting on our own and our programmes practice

In Sullivan & Ohlsen's paper on 'Domestic Violence Housing First' (2016)^{xix} they discuss the need for trauma informed services which includes established emotional safety, restoring choice and control, facilitating individuals connections to community support, supporting coping, responding to identity and context; and building strength (Anderson, 2009; Goodman et al., 2016; Harris & Fallot, 2001). Research has demonstrated that trauma reactions such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and depression may be suppressed whilst a person is occupied in trying to obtain housing but once safe an individual can be overwhelmed by the trauma. If this is not understood by the agencies trying to support that family it could have a negative impact on full recovery.

It is also pertinent to point out that the individual's position in society (positionality) may impact on what you assess to be the most pressing need for a person experiencing domestic abuse. An example of this is how lifetime trauma intersects with domestic abuse and mental health. One woman that was supported by the author was held hostage by her husband after arriving in the UK on a spousal visa from Somalia. The abuse included chaining her to the radiator and whipping her with electrical wires. It became clear that the individual was suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) but this was actually as a result of a far worse experience in her home country of Somalia where her father had been shot in front of her and her sister had been gang raped. The author had no lived experience of this trauma and had to understand that the former experience was seen by her as far worse so therefore needed to be addressed first.

This section demonstrates the need to start thinking differently about how we deliver and commission services in the UK. Currently we do not often have the opportunity to develop this work because services are only commissioned for a small (but critical – crisis) part of what they do. Below is a case study of Iowa and their decision to commission their sexual assault services differently. Following on from this the next theme will focus on why we need to create services that meet the needs of those most marginalised and then differing housing models will be discussed in the third theme.

A DIFFERENT KIND OF ADVOCACY

Case study

Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence^{xx}

In Iowa, state funders were extremely concerned about the high percentage of money being spent on Shelter/Refuge in response to domestic abuse and sexual assault (SA). It was clear that shelter although receiving the biggest portion of funding was serving a very small percentage of the estimated number of survivors needing domestic abuse or sexual assault support. According to the Iowa State Attorney General's Crime Victim Assistance Division only 11% of individuals' suffering domestic abuse served in Iowa during 2011 used shelter as an option. In 2011, the shelter vacancy rate was 42% across the state. After several rounds of funding cuts during and after the 2008 recession and the likelihood of more, state-wide change was imminent. The Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence (ICADV) and their sexual assault counterpart, the Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault (Iowa CASA), decided to be proactive in working out a solution that took in to account the specialism of programs, communities, and movement leaders. In collaboration with state funders, ICADV and Iowa CASA worked together in 2012 to create a plan for more equitable fund distribution across domestic abuse and sexual assault programs and across a wider spectrum of services to meet survivors' needs. This plan focused on two main objectives:

- Shifting funding to domestic violence advocacy services that could occur within communities and that could help survivors either safely stay in their homes or find safe, permanent housing.
- Dedicating more funding to comprehensive sexual assault services in order to increase and build capacity.

The results were staggering from 2012 – 2015:

- Standalone Sexual Assault programs went from 3 to 10.
- The number of dual domestic abuse/sexual abuse programs went from 24 – 0.
- Sexual assault survivors sheltered went from 105 to 253.
- Total sexual assault survivors served went from 4,149 to 6,221.

In summary they are seeing more sexual assault survivors, they are servicing more people; they are supporting more women of colour and are supporting more immigrants/ refugees and those with disabilities. The report showed that the difference was made by staff being able to concentrate solely on sexual assault, there was an emphasis on mobile advocacy, new partnerships with universities, prisons, employees were created and new approaches were formed such as art and play therapy. This was made possible in Iowa as a result of the close relationship between sexual assault and domestic abuse services. The Domestic Abuse Coalition in Iowa backed the notion to separate the services and the Attorney General was able to stand the criticism when closing the service.

However it is notable that when comparing this to the UK that due to our competitive commissioning there is not as much opportunity or space for front line services to share, discuss and challenge themselves about these types of potential changes.

Theme 2: Intersectionality

The term Intersectionality was first coined as a phrase by Kimberle Williams Crenshaw in 1989. Intersectionality is the study of intersecting identities which relate to systems of oppression, domination or discrimination. Intersectionality looks at all parts of your identity which intersect to make you who you are including race, gender, social class, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, religion, age, mental health and physical disability.

Crenshaw argues that in understanding these intersecting parts of a person's identity you get a better understanding of how 'systemic justice and social inequality occur on a multi-dimensional basis.'^{xxi}

Therefore discrimination like racism, sexism, classism and homophobia are not independent of one another. Instead they intersect and relate to a system of oppression that reflects the 'intersection' of multiple forms of oppression. It is also notable that positionality, implicit bias, horizontal hostility, assimilation all play a part in how domestic abuse is responded to and addressed by individuals, communities and systems. Throughout this Fellowship multiple forms of oppression were identified including race, class, sexual orientation and disability however the most startling stories and statistics raised were centred around race and ethnicity, therefore this report will focus on this aspect.

As Peggy McIntosh explains:

'White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools and blank checks.'^{xxii}

The Women of Colour Network in the USA produced a factsheet called 'Communities of Color' which highlights that:^{xxiii}

1. An estimated 29.1% of African American females are victimised by domestic abuse in their lifetime.^{xxiv}
2. African American females experience domestic abuse at a rate 35% higher than that of white females and about 2.5 times the rate of women of other races. However they are less likely to use public services including social service, domestic violence services or go to hospital.^{xxv}
3. The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) showed that African American women experience higher rates of intimate partner homicide than their white counterparts.^{xxvi}
4. As part of an Asian/Pacific Islander Institute Domestic Violence Survey 41-60% reported experiencing domestic abuse during their lifetime.^{xxviii}
5. The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) demonstrated that 23.4% of Hispanic/Latino females are victimised by domestic abuse.
6. NVAWS also found that 37.5% of Native American/Alaskan Women experience domestic violence in their lifetime.

As a result, the USA Department of Justice have a specific tribal fund as there are 567 tribes in the USA where there is a high level of domestic abuse and sexual violence. These communities are extremely isolated and often hard to hear.

In 2002, the Council of Australian Governments commissioned the production of reports on 'Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage' which included a focus on abuse in Indigenous communities. The 2011 report noted that Indigenous women and children were more likely to experience violence than any other section of society and that violence was so prevalent in some communities that it was regarded as an inevitable part of life.^{xxix}

While the availability of statistics and research on the extent and nature of family violence in Indigenous communities is not comprehensive, recent statistics summarised by Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety (ANROWS)^{xxx} show that Indigenous women face much higher risk factors than other women, finding that:

- Indigenous people are two to five times more likely to experience violence than non-Indigenous people.
- Indigenous women are five times more likely to be homicide victims than non-Indigenous people.
- Indigenous women are 35 times more likely to be hospitalised than non-Indigenous people.

In Canada there is much diversity among Aboriginal women. Some are First Nations, others Métis or Inuit. Some live on reserves, and many more live off reserve, in towns and cities across Canada. Despite their great variety, Aboriginal people are much more likely than non-Aboriginal people to be victims of violent crime and spousal violence.^{xxxi} For example:

- Statistics Canada report that 24% of Aboriginal women reported being victims of spousal violence in 2004, more than three times higher than the rate for non-Aboriginal women (7%).
- In addition, Aboriginal women are significantly more likely than non-Aboriginal women to report the most severe and potentially life-threatening forms of violence, including being beaten or choked, having had a gun or knife used against them, or being sexually assaulted.
- According to Statistics Canada, Aboriginal women are also seven times more likely to be murdered than non-Aboriginal women in Canada.
- Research conducted by the Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC) demonstrates that Aboriginal women and girls are as likely to be killed by a stranger or an acquaintance as they are by an intimate partner—very different from the experiences of non-Aboriginal women in Canada, whose homicide rates are often attributed to intimate partner violence.
- NWAC has documented that, over the past 30 years, more than 500 Aboriginal women and girls have gone missing or have been found murdered in communities across Canada.

In March 2010, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women passed a motion to undertake a study^{xxxii} on violence against Aboriginal women. The Committee heard from many witnesses, including representatives of Aboriginal organisations, academics, service providers, and Aboriginal women themselves in order to:

- Gain a better understanding of the extent and nature of the violence;
- Examine the root causes of the violence;
- Recommend solutions in consultation and with the full cooperation of Aboriginal women.

Witnesses who appeared before the Committee emphasised the high prevalence of violence in Aboriginal communities, the normalisation of violence within these communities, and the stigma surrounding discussing violence. While most of the violence is targeted at women, many men are also victims of all sorts of violence.

It was highlighted that violence in many communities is intergenerational and accepted as “normal” or inevitable. People explained that the root causes of violence against women include colonisation and the residential school system. The resulting loss of culture was seen as a significant manifestation of violence against Aboriginal women and men. It was recognised that this is not a new situation, and emphasised that this supports findings of the 1996 Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. That report identified a number of factors that are linked to violence in Aboriginal communities, including systemic discrimination against Aboriginal peoples, economic and social deprivation, alcohol and substance abuse, the intergenerational cycle of violence, the breakdown of healthy family life resulting from being brought up in residential school, racism, the impact of colonisation on traditional values and culture, and overcrowded, substandard housing.

MOVE TO END VIOLENCE

Case study

It was established that two key approaches to decrease the levels of violence which Aboriginal women face are:

- A coordinated, holistic approach to violence against women
- The definition of priorities and solutions tailored to their particular circumstances by communities.

People that took part stressed the importance of the family unit, and providing services not only to the women but also to the person committing the violence and abuse. They urged the Committee to take a comprehensive approach to the problem of violence against Aboriginal women, an approach which takes into consideration larger systemic issues such as poverty, housing, and racism.

People also highlighted the importance of communities developing their own tools to find their own solutions, rather than imposing a one-size-fits-all which reinforces the points made in theme one about services being truly self-determined.

It is clear from all of this that we need to be aware of specific cultural needs, and be aware that the wider life experiences will shape people's perceptions of services.

At the NCADV conference in Arizona there was a workshop called 'Building an Intersectional Movement: Shifts and Pivots' by Alex Lanagan, Patina Park and Sandy Davidson from Move To End Violence. Approximately every two years, Move to End Violence selects a group of inspired individuals who are committed to ending violence against all girls and women in the United States through social change. This session enabled you take a proper look at your position in society and asked yourself some very hard questions about your own privilege and how this translates in to your life and work. The UK need to adopt this in our conferences and events.

Theme 3: Differing housing models

So, having looked at what is meant by 'self-determined' advocacy, trauma informed services and intersectionality it was fascinating to see how these barriers are being overcome, and what innovative housing approaches are already in place. There are a number of topics that will be discussed as part of this section including:

- The overarching constructs
- Legislation and Regulations
- Housing First & Flexible Funding Assistance
- Whole family approaches versus a focus on individuals
- Risk assessment and multi-agency working
- Programmes for perpetrators
- The Pan-London Reciprocal
- Safe at home

The overarching constructs

This section identifies the overarching constructs of the political system and decision making powers regarding the approach to domestic abuse in the USA, Australia and Canada.

USA

In the US three federal agencies have joined forces including the Department of Justice (DOJ), Housing Urban Development (HUD) and Health and Human Services (HHS) to make vital links between homelessness and domestic abuse and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). This led to the formation of the Domestic Abuse Technical Assistance Consortium in November 2015. This consortium is a partnership between the National Alliance of Safe Housing (NASH), National Network to End Domestic abuse (NNEDV), National Resource Centre for Domestic abuse (NRCDV) and Collaborative Solutions and their aim has much synergy with DAHA in that they want to improve the housing sector response to domestic abuse nationally by disseminating best practice through their existing networks and joining up the work of the homelessness and domestic abuse/ VAWG sectors. As part of the initial work NNEDV undertook a survey of over 2000 organisations to provide a snapshot of the situation in the US on one day and demonstrated that they help over 70,000 people a day but turn away 10,000. In the USA they are working hard to expand the definition of 'Shelter' in statute to include a plethora of housing options as one size does not fit all. As part of this the consortium reports to the US Inter Agency Council of Homelessness who is responsible for combatting homelessness on a national level and which the consortium is ultimately part of. The key benefit of this mechanism is that the Inter Agency reports straight to the White House, therefore everything that is happening at the consortium level is fed back, they have oversight of what is happening and can provide influence if needed to ensure the successful collaboration within the consortium. The consortium also plays a vital role in lobbying and campaigning and like DAHA is well positioned to do so. This change was possible by including domestic abuse as part of the National Strategy to End Homelessness under the category of families.

Every year Housing Urban Development (HUD) give out formula grants to states which are worked out by population. They also have competitive grants awarded by points that HUD set which demonstrate the performance of each project. The fund totals \$1.9 billion per year and is split between 410 geographic areas. This funding is split between four homeless

categories: veterans, chronic homelessness, youth and family. Domestic abuse falls under the family category with 286 projects funded last year out of a total of 8,000 projects to an amount of \$40.8 million. This included renewing funding for 254 projects and awarding 32 new projects. These grants are awarded at a local level by the Continuum Care Collaborative Applicant (the UK equivalent of commissioners) and they make the decision about what applications are going to be submitted to HUD for a final decision. However this system leaves itself open to potential implicit bias for example if Domestic Abuse is not a priority for that area, a perpetrator has the decision-making power or it is a very patriarchal area and community. It was also discovered that HUD do not do any data analysis on the percentage of the population that could be experiencing domestic abuse and therefore the data is not guiding them in their decision making process. This is also the current situation in the UK in that we collect data on homelessness around domestic abuse but we have not done any further analysis on other routes that families take to escape domestic and family violence.


The National Alliance to End Homelessness in the USA gave a whole new perspective to the debate as they deal with all types of homelessness and therefore use differing models. In the USA there has been a focus on rapid rehousing for all types of homelessness with a particular focus on value for money. As part of this, rather than what some people call 'shelter being a waiting room' the idea is to rehouse people temporarily and then get them in to more permanent housing in a shorter timeframe. The cost of transitional funding in the US is \$32,000 (this would be considered traditional refuge) compared to the funding for rapid rehousing which is \$6,000, therefore some argue there is an opportunity to help more people with this model and potential to free up beds for crisis situations more easily. Individuals have advised anecdotally of situations where women have got stuck in transitional housing for long periods of time (over 2 years) and the problem is moving them on and furthermore this means that it not as accessible to other women who may need it. It is clear that transitional housing is a key resource when responding to domestic abuse as it provides a supportive environment for a length of time, allowing families time and space to heal. This is specialist work

which cannot and should not be run by more generic service providers, however, it is just one option. This is a controversial but useful and necessary conversation to have globally in light of the current context including the housing crisis and extensive cuts to funding. However we also need to be reflective and innovative in ensuring that we are providing the best options for families and children.

Australia

In the Australian political system Parliament is responsible for setting the national strategy however each state or area has their own local strategy and plan on how they spend their money and what they prioritise. This is very similar to the localism that has occurred in the UK. The Home Office are responsible for the National VAWG Strategy and the Mayors Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) are responsible for the London VAWG Strategy however local authorities, districts and councils are responsible for implementing their own local strategies.

In New South Wales (NSW) Australia Homelessness NSW, NSW Federation of Housing Associations commissioned Sue Cripps to create a toolkit for housing providers using Peabody's, STADV's and Gentoo's work. Compass Housing and Link Housing in NSW have been part of the pilot roll out of toolkit for Community Housing Providers. This was formally launched on International Women's day (8th March 2017) and replicates the national work happening in the UK.



Canada

In Canada the Stop Family Violence initiative is undertaken by their Family Violence Initiative, which brings together 15 federal government departments and agencies to prevent and respond to family violence. The Initiative is led and coordinated by the Public Health Agency of Canada.

The following federal departments and agencies are partners in the Family Violence Initiative:

The Public Health Agency of Canada, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Canadian Heritage, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, Correctional Service of Canada, The Department of National Defence, The Department of Justice, Employment and Social Development Canada, Health Canada, Public Safety Canada's, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Status of Women Canada, Service Canada, Statistics Canada

Legislation and regulations

In the UK legislation was developed in order to improve our response to domestic abuse via the Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act 1976, the Domestic Proceedings and Magistrates Court Act 1978 and the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act of 1977. The first two pieces of legislation provide women with an option to stay in their own home with the aid of injunctions and the latter enable a local authority to register an individual as homeless due to the risk of harm posed to the individual in their existing accommodation. Social Housing providers are in a good position to provide additional services, and are often receptive to specialist services complementing their work. However, the introduction of the Housing Act 1996 restricted access to local authority accommodation with tougher rules of eligibility and assessment pertaining to the right to recourse to public funds. Many individuals experiencing domestic abuse found that their homelessness applications were met with scepticism and in some cases refusal. Although some later concessions were made, the new rules resulted in particular issues for migrant women who had entered the UK as a result of their marriage to a UK citizen, but who were then forced to flee the relationship due to domestic abuse.

Barron (2009) (cited by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), 2010)^{xxxiii} found that 41 per cent of women in refuges had left their abusive partner at least once before their first admission to a refuge. Binney, Harkell and Nixon (1981)^{xxxiv} had also found that securing safe move on accommodation was vital, with 59 per cent of the women surveyed advising that ‘problems with accommodation’ were a primary reason for their return to an abusive partner. The act of leaving an abusive situation is fraught with challenges and risks resulting in many individuals struggling to take that initial step. And often, when they do, they are faced with an ‘obstacle race’ of homelessness legislation (Robson 1981)^{xxxv} which exacerbates their situation further. Despite legislative changes that are professed to have improved responses to situations of accommodation crisis, structural issues such as limited housing stock have not been addressed, resulting in what Loveland (1994, p331)^{xxxvi} describes as an “exercise in legislative deceit”.

In April 2003 the government introduced the Supporting People Programme (HM Government, 2003), which ring fenced funds for housing related support for families experiencing domestic abuse. However by 2009 this ring fencing had been removed. Since April 2010 housing support relating to situations of domestic abuse has been funded by the payment of area based grants to local authorities, with local commissioners determining how the money is distributed locally. Overall spending has reduced and, as highlighted previously, specialist accommodation such as refuge places have decreased. Quick fix injections of additional government funds have occurred but with limited impact on women’s safety in the longer term. It is advocated, therefore, that the approach to housing support needs to pursue a coordinated community model, with a more holistic view of refuge provision, local authority responsibilities, floating support and outreach services (Kelly et al., 2014).^{xxxvii}

Private rented housing offers various levels of tenure security, and a property owner accessing the home with limited notice can be distressing. Additionally private providers may face legal costs if the police are called to their properties multiple times (as in some states in the US) which can create further problems if the survivor is facing harassment from the perpetrator. In the USA the case of Lakisha Briggs in Norristown, Pennsylvania demonstrated the lack of legal protection for women experiencing domestic abuse. Norristown had a local noise nuisance law which meant that if the tenant or anyone else called the police more than 3 times to their property for any reason including domestic abuse this could lead to eviction. Ms Briggs suffered serious domestic abuse from her ex-boyfriend and on calling the Police was told that she was on her 2nd strike as neighbours had also called them in order to protect her. She was advised that if she contacted the Police again that they would instruct her landlord to evict her. Her landlord advocated for her but there was not much he could do because of the ordinance that was already put in place which meant that the property was put on a 30-day probationary period, during which neither Ms Briggs or her neighbours could call the police. Her ex-boyfriend knew this and terrorised her, finally stabbing her in the neck. She did not contact the Police but thankfully the neighbours did and as a result saved her life as she was air lifted to the nearest hospital. When she got home from the hospital a few days later her landlord came with papers from Norristown saying that she had to leave her home within 14 days. Her landlord did not want to evict her, but the city gave him no choice but to file a case against her. There were two hearings, and fortunately, the judge denied the eviction. But even after that, Norristown told her landlord that she still had to leave her home. The local law gave the city the power to condemn the property if he did not remove her. The ACLU and the Pepper Hamilton law firm represented Ms Briggs in challenging Norristown’s ordinance. In September 2014 a settlement was reached that included Norristown repealing the law. Pennsylvania also passed a law that prohibits all municipalities across the state from punishing people for calling the police for help. However, Norristown is not the only city with this kind of “nuisance” law. There are hundreds of these kinds of laws across the US.

In the USA, Jessica Gonzales Lenahan brought the first ever case against the US government in a human rights tribunal. Her story is utterly horrifying and tragic. Her three daughters were murdered by her ex-partner, before he was killed by the Police as he crashed his car in to the front of the Police station. The girls were found in the back of his car. On initially reporting that her children had not been returned to her by her ex-partner the Police failed to take her concerns seriously or enforce the restraining order she had in place. Jessica advised that Castle Rock - Colorado have never completed an investigation in to the death of her children and that all the evidence was destroyed three weeks after their murders so it is still unknown how they died. A documentary has since been created and followed Jessica for 8 years of her life tells this tragic story and her plight and is entitled Home Truth.

The role of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)

In the UK the HCA is responsible for implementing regulations for social landlords and the Neighbourhood and Community standard (2012)^{xxxviii} which has a whole section on Anti-Social Behaviour and states that:

- 2.3.1 Registered providers shall publish a policy on how they work with relevant partners to prevent and tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) in areas where they own properties.
- 2.3.2 In their work to prevent and address ASB, registered providers shall demonstrate:
 - (a) that tenants are made aware of their responsibilities and rights in relation to ASB.
 - (b) strong leadership, commitment and accountability on preventing and tackling ASB that reflects a shared understanding of responsibilities with other local agencies.

- (c) a strong focus exists on preventative measures tailored towards the needs of tenants and their families.
- (d) prompt, appropriate and decisive action is taken to deal with ASB before it escalates, which focuses on resolving the problem having regard to the full range of tools and legal powers available.
- (e) all tenants and residents can easily report ASB, are kept informed about the status of their case where responsibility rests with the organisation and are appropriately signposted where it does not.
- (f) provision of support to victims and witnesses.

There is a real opportunity in the UK for DAHA to influence this regulation with the aim of including domestic abuse with the same provisions and stipulating that all Housing Providers need to obtain DAHA accreditation. This objective can be supported by looking at the mortality and reporting rates of domestic abuse. It is not disputed that ASB blights the lives of millions however, unlike domestic abuse; it does not lead to two women a week being murdered. Therefore this should be reflected in the funding proportioned to deal with both domestic abuse and ASB.

Restorative Justice

In the UK there is fierce debate currently on the use of the legal remedy of Restorative Justice in domestic abuse cases. This is a strong argument, however Restorative Justice should focus on repairing harm, be a voluntary process, be safe and accessible, be held with impartial facilitators and held with respect for all participants. It has been argued that it is not a suitable response due to the power dynamic in an abusive relationship and no person should be subjected to facing their abuser face to face. Furthermore, many campaigners feel that Restorative Justice could be used and will be seen as a soft option and consequently trivialises serious offences. It was not that long ago that domestic abuse was regarded as a private affair, and many fear that a lack of public accountability will set back the progress made in recent years in bringing domestic abuse out in to the open.

This is a strong argument however, Restorative Justice has been used in other parts of the world, where the individual elected to undertake this route and where there is a need for another way forward in criminal cases where women do not want to go to court. Their reasons may include:

- The criminal justice system not meeting their needs.
- They do not want to go to court.
- Punishment is not seen as a solution to the problem.
- They want the relationship to change.
- They want the abuse to stop.
- They want to find out the reason for the abuse.
- In poor communities if the perpetrator goes to prison or is issued with a fine, it may mean greater poverty and even destitution.
- They do not want to be re-victimised by the court process.

Restorative Justice has been used successfully in many countries. A recent European Research Project 2012-2015 included six countries: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Netherlands and the UK^{xxxix} and identified that the most frequently used model in these countries was victim-offender mediation, usually pre-trial. This project showed positive results for victims and also produced a guide for practitioners, available from the European Forum for Restorative Justice.

This report is not able to explore this issue in great depth however it is important that this is discussed as part of our critical review of services and making sure that our response is truly self-determined.

Housing First and Flexible Funding Assistance

Housing First was first founded in the USA and is a fairly new initiative. This approach has become a popular alternative to the 'housing ready' approach and is based on the concept that a homeless individual or household's primary need is obtaining stable housing, and that other issues including mental health, substance or alcohol misuse should be addressed once housing is obtained. (Pleace and Bretherton, 2013)^{xl}

The core principles of Housing First include:

- To move people into housing directly from streets and shelters without preconditions of treatment acceptance or compliance.
- The provider is obligated to bring robust support services to the housing. These services are predicated on assertive engagement and not coercion.
- Continued tenancy is not dependent on participation in services.
- Units are targeted to the most vulnerable homeless members of the community.
- Embracing a harm-reduction approach to addictions rather than mandating abstinence. At the same time, the provider must be prepared to support resident commitment to recovery.
- Residents must have leases and tenant protections under the law.
- Implementation as either a project-based or scattered site model.

As part of this research trip a number of Housing First projects were visited:

Edmonton

In Edmonton, Ambrose Place has a Housing First approach for individuals of indigenous descent. They have a total of 42 units and as part of a holistic approach, they provide addictions counselling, peer support, support from recreational workers, elders, independent living support workers and a triage service to co-ordinate this. When they first opened they had over 600 applications to work through and they had to pick the most vulnerable. The gender split is about 50/50. There have been evaluations of this project and where each individual was previously costing the province on average around \$100,000 a year on court, short term homeless stays, health issues, and emergency room visits, this project costs \$27,000 per person per year. This equates to a massive saving and almost all of their residents have maintained their accommodation. Ambrose Place has a harm reduction approach to their residents. They have a managed alcohol programme so alcohol is not completely banned as they realise this is not a realistic expectation. So instead all alcohol is declared to staff and residents are allowed two beers at first and then another one every 2 hours - a total of six. Their way of life is based on four rules kindness, honesty, sharing and strength.

E4C in Edmonton also run a Housing First service which includes a Shelter Exit Team (SET) which delivers rapid rehousing for men and women. The programme lasts six months but this has some flexibility and at assessment point they use the VISPDAT/SPDAT created by Iain De Jung. The work of this programme focuses on finances, of vital importance in cases of domestic abuse due to the impact of financial abuse.

This programme adheres to the Critical Time Intervention model:

- Phase one – Transitional (2 months - intense support)
- Phase two – Trying out (2 months - support and signposting)
- Phase three – Pulling back (2 months - reduce support to create dependence)
- Phase four - Graduation

During this Fellowship a meeting was held with a woman who had fled domestic abuse and been rehoused through this model. She said that if it wasn't for the support she received 'she does not know where she would have ended up'. She was living in substandard hotels with her three children for one and half years before she got the support she needed. 98% of the properties they use are market rent. It is fair to say that in the UK we utilise this opportunity, however we also have housing providers that could support these models of rehousing. Homeless Link in the UK is currently at the forefront of this work however there is scope to expand this work with a specific focus on domestic abuse.

Seattle

Seattle has the first Housing First programme for women experiencing domestic abuse in the world. The Gates Foundation gave Seattle \$2,000,000 for a pilot project of 5 years in January 2010 to 13 projects. 13 Housing First domestic abuse advocates were employed and a financial assistance fund was put in place for every project. More recently the Gates Foundation gave the project another \$2,500,000 to continue the work and to complete a 5 year evaluation looking at the outcomes and impact made. Cris Sullivan, one of the leading researchers in housing and domestic abuse in the world, is carrying out the 5 year evaluation. Linda Ohlsen has pioneered the approach in Seattle and has dramatically changed the way housing programmes are viewed in Seattle with staggering outcomes.

The evaluation of the 13 projects demonstrated that 96% of the families receiving Housing First retained their housing at 18 months (Sullivan et al). The evaluation also showed they were able to support 125 individuals with the flexible assistance fund in one year and proactively divert families from homelessness and keep them safe.

The evaluation also held focus groups with the families and recorded positive outcomes including increased feelings of safety, improved health and well-being and dignity being restored.

The pilot project also allowed the Washington State Coalition against Domestic Violence (WSCADV) to identify four pillars of the Domestic Abuse Housing First model which are:

- Survivor driven, mobile advocacy
- Flexible engagement, including flexible funding (see below)
- Trauma-Informed practice
- Community Engagement

Domestic Abuse Housing First focuses on matching each person to the best housing option to the suit their needs. This could be Refuge/ Shelter, support into the Private rented sector, access to flexible funding or legal advice for joint mortgages.

Half the individuals of this pilot said they wanted to remain safely in their current home or in a home they obtained when immediately leaving the abuser but could not manage or afford this long term.

It is widely accepted that housing is critical for survivors of domestic abuse. In Australia a study of women's economic wellbeing following and during domestic abuse, women advised that finding safe, affordable, appropriate accommodation was their single biggest concern (see also Kelly et al. 2014).



Advocates often supported individuals to keep their property, preventing evictions by paying the landlord for damages, paying rent that the abuser had accrued, fixing their car so they could get to work or paying for a security system (see also Sharp-Jeffs, 2017)

In the UK it would be great if we could get funding to sponsor projects like the Flexible Assistance fund, however it is of vital importance that this is additional funding rather than taking away from existing services. There is the potential for this to work in the form of grants, something being considered by the charity Surviving Economic Abuse (see also Sharp-Jeffs, 2017)

Furthermore some individuals who have relatively stable economic status and support may require a limited intervention whereas those on the other side of the spectrum facing multiple disadvantages will need much more support for example those with no recourse to public funds (NRTPF). This flexible funding allows you to account for this as an advocate.

The Social Resilience Fund (equivalent to flexible funding assistance) at DASH is funded through philanthropy and can be provided to any women who has experienced domestic or sexual abuse and is in need of funds to bridge a gap to stop them becoming homeless. A great example is a woman who was suffering domestic abuse, worked full time and was safe to continue to live in her own public housing property. Her main issue was that she needed her car for work in order to pay the rent but needed to replace four tyres which she could not afford. DASH were able to give her these funds therefore stopping her from losing her job so she was able to keep her home. The fund is \$100,000 a year and grants are on average \$2,500 depending on the need. This project is all about survivor need and frontline staff enjoy the flexibility that comes with it and can see real outcomes immediately for people.

Dan Malone from Opening Doors to End Homelessness – DESC in Seattle also discussed their purely Housing First model and its success. In Seattle there has been a move towards mobile advocacy and trauma informed advocacy. Furthermore at the Supreme Court of ‘Olmstead’ it was decreed that people have a right to live in the least restrictive places as possible. Many women suffering domestic abuse advised that they find the refuge setting restrictive in that there are many rules around age of male children, drinking, drugs, curfews, no pets, no male visitors and often they are housed miles from where they live making them more isolated.

Cris Sullivan advised that our thinking should focus on ‘what is the least disruptive option for women and children, rather than what is restrictive?’ And Dan Malone advised that ‘we need a focus on harm reduction not harm elimination’.

Most of the Refuges visited in the USA have scrapped the rules that had been in place for so long on age of male children, drinks and drugs and are moving to a harm reduction approach instead of harm elimination. Interestingly when Dan Malone did this at DSEC they put aside a pot of money for damage to property as this is what they predicted with the cohort of people they were aiming to target and they found this concern was never realised. We need to see this kind of innovation in our sector and beyond. Women often abuse drugs and alcohol as a coping strategy to cope with the abuse. Furthermore perpetrators often force the person they are trying to control to abuse substances to make them dependent on them. So if we understand this, why are we screening women on these grounds? The answer of course is safety, lack of funding to support individuals appropriately and meeting the needs of other women and children in a community setting where up to eight families could be living in the same house. The overarching argument is that we that we need more funding to enable us as a sector to meet the needs of women suffering multiple disadvantages.

These are valid arguments but if this is the case then it is not even more essential that we have a variety of housing options to suit the specific needs of women and children rather than have blanket policies such as ‘no men, no drugs, no alcohol and no complex mental health issues’. It could be argued that Housing First models could be more suitable for some families as it seeks to relocate a family back in to the community like E4C do with wrap around support instead of placing families in to communal refuges.

Whole family approaches versus a focus on individuals

Throughout the Fellowship it became clear that most of the services catered to individuals need; predominantly women and children. However interesting conversations were had about the benefits of a whole family approach. In the UK it is recognised by professionals that often the perpetrators become invisible as part of the response which means that a co-ordinated community response is not actually realised. There is often no inclusion on child protection plans and refuges have no contact with the perpetrators. This is similar globally with exceptions being in programmes that deal with those most marginalised. At Ambrose Place they discussed working with whole families especially if the individual does not want to leave the abusive person and instead wanted them to get help. It could be argued that the language of all of this is not helpful either as an individual may not see their ex-partner as a perpetrator and narrative is very important. In the UK this raises concerns over child protection issues as the amount of children who are hurt via child contact and in the most tragic cases killed after separation. The difference is when there are no children and the person chooses to remain in the abusive relationship. In the UK we are not able to provide a lot of support for individuals who make this life choice as our interventions are crisis driven. Furthermore individuals can be judged harshly by some services as a result of the choices they make. Therefore many couples will get support from the counselling sector for example Relate in order to support their relationship. If we are unwilling to explore this avenue we are not truly meeting the needs of people. Therefore a whole family approach is very much needed, including the partner or ex-partner.

In the UK this has been recognised in the Care Act and in guidance developed in 2015 which talks about different steps in implementing whole family approaches:

Step one: Think family

Step two: Get the whole picture

Step three: Make a plan that works for everyone

Step four: Check it's working for the whole family

In the context of domestic abuse this also means addressing the needs of the perpetrator and perhaps this is where the attention needs to be focused. The next sections are going to look at risk assessment, multi-agency working and work with perpetrators so this will be explored in greater depth.

Risk assessment and multi-agency working

In the UK we use the Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence (DASH) Risk Identification Checklist as an evidenced based tool that should be used with every individual that discloses domestic abuse in order to gain a better understanding of their situation and to guide the professional on whether a person meets the threshold to be referred to Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC).

The MARAC is part of a co-ordinated community response to domestic abuse, including representatives from statutory, community and voluntary agencies working with individuals/survivors, children and the alleged perpetrator. In a single meeting, a MARAC combines up to date risk information with a comprehensive assessment of a individual's needs and links those directly to the provision of appropriate services for all those involved in a domestic abuse case: individual, children and perpetrator.

There are three criteria to consider when making a referral to MARAC and these include:

- The number of 'yes' ticks on the DASH. Usually 14 or more 'yes' ticks means the case meets the MARAC threshold. However this will depend on the area the professional is working in so check with the MARAC Coordinator or the Police Community Safety Unit.
- Professional judgement.
- The number of police call outs to the individual as a result of domestic abuse in the past 12 months.

In Canada most domestic abuse services use Jacqueline Cambell's danger assessment which also looks at high risk indicators and homeless services use the SPDAT. The SPDAT is a pre-screening, or triage tool that is designed to be used by all providers within a community to quickly assess the health and social needs of homeless people and match them with the most appropriate support and housing interventions available. However there are issues raised in reference to domestic abuse as the SPDAT has been criticised for not being holistic enough to capture the needs of survivors of domestic abuse. Further issues raised are who should be using the tools, who should be the lead agency, who delivers the training and the issue of multiple assessments which then traumatises the individual.

It is widely recognised across the world that we need to work in a multi agency context however a gap exists in how we work with abusers and this will be explored next. In the UK currently many people feel there is an overreliance on the risk assessment and MARAC process and the ambitious co-ordinated community response would ensure that risk assessment and MARAC work alongside a broader understanding of the whole person and self-determined advocacy.

Programmes for perpetrators

Drive project – UK

Drive is a new initiative in the UK and aims to challenge and support perpetrators to change their behaviour, while holding them to account. The pilot programmes are going to be delivered at three sites in Essex, South Wales and West Sussex by a cross-sector group of stakeholders and delivery partners. The Drive Partnership consists of Respect, SafeLives and Social Finance.

The outcomes being worked to are as follows:

- To reduce the number of repeat and new victims;
- To reduce the harm caused to victims and children;
- To reduce the number of serial perpetrators of domestic abuse;
- To intervene earlier to protect families living with the most harmful domestic abuse;
- To develop an evidence-based approach that has the potential to become a model for wider use;
- To provide an interventions for perpetrators who are not eligible for a Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programme (DVPP);

Drive is focussing on high-risk/serial perpetrators. The three sites aim to work with around 100 perpetrators per year for three years. It will build on existing services/interventions to maximise impact, providing a coordinated multi-agency response to challenge the perpetrator's behaviour, while ensuring there is support for the individual experiencing domestic abuse. Case managers will work with perpetrators on a one-to-one basis. They will use a dual support and challenge strategy which means supporting people to address issues that might contribute to their abusive behaviour while ensuring they experience the full consequence if they continue to be abusive.

The individual experiencing abuse and child safety are the key priority of the Drive Project. Individuals will be offered support from an IDVA (domestic violence professional) or another caseworker if appropriate, for the period of the Drive intervention for their partner or ex-partner.

The Drive Project will have an independent academic evaluation. This will assess the efficacy and sustainability of the intervention, including a cost benefit analysis. The evaluation will cover:

- Longitudinal assessment of outcomes such as reduced repeat abuse, level of violence and abuse and improved outcomes for victims and children.
- Outcomes will be measured for a significant period of time post-interventions to establish whether changes are sustainable.
- Evaluation of the model and key features; an understanding of the contextual factors that promote or inhibit implementation and effectiveness.

The evaluation will establish whether there is a human and economic case for national roll-out. This could be considered more of a whole family approach to domestic abuse as it ensures that perpetrators do not become invisible in the process. Learning from the evaluation will inform commissioning and delivery of services for perpetrators nationally; with a view to integrating the intervention into a whole family response and widening it to address risk at any level.

In Perth, Australia, there has also been a shift similar to that in the UK towards holding perpetrators to account and dealing with the cause of the issue, male violence, through the 'Breathing Space' programme. This has raised controversy just like in the UK as the money that was being spent on survivor services is redirected to perpetrators. The argument being that government need to add to funding and do not redirect it at the sake of other programmes. This programme has not been evaluated from the start but anecdotally is showing some good outcomes.

The Multi-Agency Tasking and Coordination (MATAC) in the UK is similar to the MARAC but puts perpetrators at the center of the process in order to try to reduce re-offending and change perpetrator behavior. It aims to identify and target the most harmful perpetrators through analysis of recent events, frequency and gravity of offending via a multi-agency tasking and co-ordination (MATAC) process.

Identified perpetrators are referred to the MATAC process where key partners will agree a bespoke set of interventions using a domestic abuse 'toolkit'. This can include targeting and disrupting perpetrators and or supporting them to address their behaviour. This is not a UK wide initiative. It originated in Scotland and has been adopted by Northumbria. Northumbria along with their partner Gentoo are currently undertaking an evaluation which will be available this Spring.

This type of initiative needs to be expanded and researched further to add to the work done by Liz Kelly and Nicola Westmareland in their Mirabal Research 'Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes: Steps to Change,' (2015)^{xli} in order for us to ensure that we are providing a holistic response to domestic abuse.

Pan-London Reciprocal

The Pan-London Housing Reciprocal Agreement is unique to the UK and is a voluntary collaboration between local authorities and registered housing providers in London, which aims to prevent homelessness in cases of domestic abuse, VAWG; hate crimes; those at risk of gangs and other high risk community safety reasons. The Agreement achieves this by increasing housing options for people with a social housing tenancy in London, who are at high risk of harm and need to move to a safe area of London. In doing so, the reciprocal supports individuals and families to avoid homelessness, makes better use of housing stock, and ensures that those at risk do not lose their tenure.

Safe at home & staying home, leaving violence

There has been a lot of awareness raised in Australia as a result of the amazing work of Rosie Batty who tragically lost her son in 2012. He was murdered by his father and Rosie has been campaigning for change ever since. As a result of her tireless campaigning and work she won Australian of the Year in 2015 and her work has changed the face of Family Violence across Australia.

As a result of Rosie Batty's work the Royal Commission undertook an enquiry into Family Violence in Victoria and delivered its report to Government House in March 2016. The report is the culmination of a 13-month inquiry in to how to effectively:

- prevent family violence
- improve early intervention
- support victims
- make perpetrators accountable
- better coordinate community and government responses
- evaluate and measure strategies, frameworks, policies, programs and services

The report contains 227 recommendations which are directed at improving the current system; seizing opportunities to transform the way that Victoria respond to family violence, and build the structures that will guide and oversee a long-term reform program that deals with all aspects of family violence. The report weighs 4.7kg, has 2000 pages and 999 references. The housing section is entitled 'A safe home' which on its own is 57 pages long, a summary of this section is detailed below:^{xliii}

The Royal Commission report argues a housing response for people experiencing family violence should have the following characteristics:

- be tailored to the victim's circumstances, choices and goals, whether they live in metropolitan, regional or rural Victoria;
- be non-discriminatory and responsive to the full range of people who might be victims of family violence;
- ensure safety and provide options commensurate with victims' level of risk;
- follow a simple pathway so that people can obtain the help they need, whether they are able to stay in their home or have to leave;
- recognise that keeping victims in their home is optimal if it is safe and the victim's choice and provide support accordingly;
- provide alternative safe accommodation when a victim cannot remain or return home, while minimising the number of moves they need to make and the time taken to acquire permanent housing;
- ensure that accommodation is of good quality, affordable to the victim and in a location that will help them retain or build on protective factors to support their recovery—including employment, training, education and natural supports such as family and friends;
- complement other forms of support in a manner that reflects the victim's needs and aspirations—including referral to other services they might need;
- be part of a broader, integrated system of support so that the system keeps the woman safe by maintaining a focus on the perpetrator and reducing the burden on the victim no matter where she is living.

The Commission therefore proposes the following:

- There should be greater support, both financial and non-financial, for women to retain their existing housing or to gain access to private rental properties in their community; ^{xliii}
- A more concerted shift towards individualised assistance is needed in order to meet the specific needs of people affected by family violence. This means amending the existing Family Violence Flexible Support Packages to include a longer period of rental or mortgage subsidy and further assistance with costs to support economic recovery;
- Housing options should be expanded so that there is a much greater capacity to rapidly rehouse people and, in doing so, free up places within refuges and crisis accommodation and bypass transitional housing when the victim's full range of needs are better met in the private rental market with other supports as necessary;
- Better integration between accommodation and support is essential so that a victim's housing and other needs—such as counselling, legal advice, financial counselling and employment assistance—are considered at the same time and the link between housing assistance and the support to improve the victim's financial security and employment status is made explicit.

These findings and recommendations have been echoed in the research undertaken as part of this fellowship. The findings also highlight the fact that in the UK we are in a good position to do this with our current housing infrastructure, as 17% of our housing stock is social housing, in comparison to 3% in Australia.

In New South Wales, ten years ago under the influence of Ludo McFerran 'Staying Home, Leaving Violence'^{xliv} was created under the pretext that individuals should not have to leave their homes and instead we should look at how can we make it safer for people to stay and retain social networks, children's schools and tenure. 25 services were set up across NSW to carry out case work, safety assessment and sanctuary schemes. Angela Spinney at Swinburne University who the author met on the Fellowship has carried out a lot of research in the effectiveness of 'Safe at Home' programmes and the benefits for women experiencing domestic abuse. This is summarised in 'Landscapes: State of Knowledge' (2015)^{xlv} and highlights that safe at home programs can benefit families as they:

- Prevent homelessness
- Hold perpetrators accountable
- Provide option of early intervention
- Cause less disruption on the families circumstance
- Have moderate longer term consequences on safety, economic security, housing and social support networks.

This is the same as sanctuary schemes and floating support/mobile advocacy in the UK however although this approach has shown great outcomes it is still under threat from lack of funding.


Research has also been done by Solace Women's Aid in the UK in their report 'The Price of Safety: How the housing system is failing women and children fleeing domestic abuse.' (2016).^{xlvi} The chart below demonstrates in dark purple the tenure before entering a refuge and the tenure on leaving in light purple. As you can see those with secure tenures are disproportionately affected by losing their secure tenure.

For many women in Solace Women's Aid study their housing status became more insecure as a result of fleeing domestic abuse. Of the 27 service users living in a secure tenure at the time of fleeing, only 38% received an equivalent secure tenure upon being rehoused with 62% experiencing insecure housing. In contrast, many perpetrators remained within secure tenancies, despite having perpetrated abuse, with majority of those properties being family sized units.

In 2014, two years ago, in New South Wales, Australia there was reform to 'Going Home, Staying Home', which was a shift from crisis aimed at prevention. This reform focused on the idea that categories of homeless like youth, women and children and men would all be

under homelessness and services would have to go for funding under this generic stream. However this has catastrophic consequences for the women's sector and specialist services, especially in rural areas. This is due to the fact that the change was so huge that many smaller providers could not create partnerships for joint bids, therefore quickly lost their funding or felt overwhelmed and left employment positions they had held for 10 years. In rural areas where women and children are most isolated this had dangerous consequences. It is clear that the Department of Family and Community (FACS) quickly realised their mistake and tried to remedy it by providing Domestic Abuse Response Enhancements to the now generic services however this money is enough to work with 20 clients out of 500 generic clients who may or may not be dealing with domestic abuse.

It is clear from all of this work that there has been a shift in thinking over decades to how we can support people to stay safe in their own homes where it is safe to do; therefore minimising disruption whilst holding perpetrators accountable through sanctions or modifying behavior. This is the start of critically reviewing Refuge/ Shelter as an one option and accepting that we need to diversify our models if we are truly going to end domestic abuse.



CONCLUSION

This Fellowship allowed the author to gather and analyse data about housing provider's practices internationally in the context of domestic abuse and VAWG. During the visit up to 60 services were visited and a number of alternative approaches were found in order to influence UK practice. In total 8 round table discussions and 2 conferences in Canada and Australia were arranged with partner agencies to assess and compare international responses to domestic abuse and VAWG from the housing sector. At these roundtables and conference participants were able to share and learn about best practice in responding to domestic abuse including self-determined advocacy, trauma informed services, intersectionality and differing housing approaches.

The implementation of the key findings of this Fellowship is currently underway and is explained in full below. The author is already using international perspectives to improve and enhance practice in the UK through existing channels including consortia of housing providers, the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) and in the role of the housing representative on the Home Office VAWG Stakeholder panel. This is most clearly demonstrated in the six funding bids DAHA and Peabody have been successful in obtaining, in partnership with a number of agencies including Kadera in the Netherlands and FEANTSA who work across Europe to expand this work. The EU Project includes an opportunity to provide evidence and examples of best practice to be disseminated at international conferences and input in to the European Parliament via FEANSTA. Findings have been discussed with a myriad of interested stakeholders including Mayors Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC), Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Home Office who have requested copies of this report.

Opportunities have already arisen to use the international perspective to improve and enhance practice and relationships in the UK through Shelter, Crisis, Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH), RESOLVE – ASB, National Housing Federation (NHF), Housing LIN, Capsticks and VAWG sector via conferences, meetings, social media and publicity.

Every place visited as part of this Fellowship was keen to be involved in the formation of a global coalition for Domestic Abuse, VAWG, Housing and Homelessness. First steps towards this have been made on social media with the collective hashtags #DAHousing and #DVHousing. As this work expands, especially as part of a European Project, this coalition will grow in size and influence and the end result will be an international conference at an appropriate time. The key recommendations of this fellowship are outlined below in terms of:

- Campaigning, lobbying and awareness
- Differing housing models
- Legislation and Regulations

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Campaigning, lobbying and awareness

- The housing, domestic abuse, VAWG and sectors dealing with any sort of vulnerability need to jointly campaign for affordable housing.
- We need to continue to raise awareness via conferences, media and meetings with premiers (leaders) and ensure everyone understands the impact, complexities and trauma caused by Domestic and Family Violence.
- The sector needs to focus and make central issues around Intersectionality, positionality, implicit bias, horizontal hostility and assimilation.
- We need to start applying an intersectional, gendered and poverty lens to our social policies.
- We need to start talking about a standard of living for the most vulnerable and marginalised in our society.
- We need to assert that housing and personal safety are human rights.
- We need to ensure housing is at the core of everything we do.

Implementation

The organisations already involved in national campaigns are Shelter, Crisis, Homeless Link, Women's Aid, Solace Women's Aid, Safer London, Against Violence and Abuse (AVA) and the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA). As a result of this Fellowship the author has already met with key individuals to discuss how to take this recommendation forward.

DAHA have already contributed to consultation on the Homeless Reduction Bill (2016), which has recently become an Act, led by Crisis.

A meeting with Rick Henderson the CEO of Homeless Link took place to expand existing joint working.

Peabody submitted a response to the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) consultation on the refresh VAWG strategy including all of the recommendations from this Fellowship.

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), the Home Office and MOPAC have requested a copy of this report and will consider the findings and recommendations for future work.

DAHA attended the All Party Parliamentary Group for Ending Homelessness inquiry session on, 'How to prevent survivors of domestic violence from becoming homeless' in the Houses of Parliament.

There is an opportunity to speak to the VAWG lead group in London to get their thoughts and ideas.

The tri-borough held a conference on Intersectionality on 29th November 2016 which was well attended and had representation from IMKAAN, Stay Safe East, Standing Together Against Domestic Violence (STADV), Against Violence and Abuse (AVA) and Surviving Economic Abuse (SEA). The DVCN network is also having an event on Intersectionality co-ordinated by STADV which the author will be attending.

Differing housing models

- We need to take a critical look at our programmes to ensure they are survivor centred and focus on those most marginalised.
- We need to critically review our practice and look at what other housing programmes might look like to augment the Shelter/Refuge model.
- We need to ensure that our advocacy is truly self-determined.
- We need to make sure our services are truly trauma informed.
- Services should not be punitive i.e. mandate individuals on to programmes.
- Services should be 'screening in' not 'screening out' i.e. adolescent boys, substance/alcohol abuse, disabilities, multi-disadvantages.
- We need to stabilise and add to the funding for services.
- We need to move in to the private rented sector to increase awareness and improve practice whilst acknowledging that the private market will not solve social problems.
- We need to create technical assistance and capacity building for organisations to improve the housing response to domestic abuse.
- We need to disseminate best practice, training and guidance globally including the DAHA accreditation (UK), the toolkit for Community Housing Providers (Australia), the Domestic Abuse Technical Assistance Consortium (USA) and the 'Safe at Home' Project (Europe).
- We need to ensure that housing providers are not treating domestic abuse as anti-social behavior (ASB).
- We need to explore the use of Housing First models in relation to domestic abuse in the UK.
- We need to integrate work on housing with financial and economic abuse so that survivors can sustain tenancies (see Victoria Royal Commission recommendations).
- We need to implement Flexible Funding Assistance or a Social Resilience Fund (SRF).

Implementation

This report is going to a consortium of housing providers and organisations like Solace Women's Aid who have already expressed an interest in critically reviewing their services with these recommendations as a focus. It is hoped that other specialist services will take up this approach.

Strong links are already in place with AVA and Agenda who both work with multiple disadvantages and have done research on trauma informed services.

DAHA and Peabody have been successful in being awarded 6 funding bids including a European Project called 'Safe at Home' with Kadera, STADV and FEANTSA.

DAHA has won two funding bids for 2 Business Development Managers who have been recruited. This will focus on capacity building and dissemination of good practice nationally. As part of this bid an evaluation of DAHA and its work and impact on reducing homelessness is being undertaken by the Centre for Housing Policy at York University.

The author of this report took part in a Skype panel in NSW Australia to roll out their toolkit on 8th March 2017. This toolkit is based on Peabody, Gentoo's, STADV and DAHA's work.

STADV have been successful in securing capacity building for Housing First work as part of their transformation fund from DCLG.

DAHA have secured funding from the Home Office to create an on-line assessment for housing providers to go for DAHA accreditation more quickly. This will be launched in June 2017.

DAHA have been successful in being awarded Tampon Tax funds to create a post to explore opportunities in the Private Rented Sector.

Legislation and Regulation

- We need regulatory and legislative change.
- We need to improve the scale and quality of our data collection activities.
- We need to ensure our homeless, domestic abuse and VAWG strategies are linked at a local and national level.

Implementation

There is a real opportunity in the UK for DAHA to influence the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Neighbourhood and Community Regulation to get domestic abuse written in with the same provisions as ASB and directing all housing providers to obtain DAHA accreditation. The author has made contact with HCA to start discussions.

The Housing Operation Group in West London coordinated by STADV is currently organising a workshop on data with support from DAHA, Safer London, MOPAC, Gentoo and other housing providers in West London to look at how we can improve this.

Dissemination and implementation has already begun but will also involve the following activities:

Representation at national and international conferences

- DAHA spoke at the All Party Parliamentary Group for Ending Homelessness inquiry session on, 'How to prevent survivors of domestic violence from becoming homeless' in the Houses of Parliament 26/4/17
- Key note speaker at conference in Wales, Barry 24/4/17
- Presentation at Cambridge Regional meeting for NHF 16/3/17
- Presentation at L8 meeting with Directors of Housing Providers in West London 3/3/17
- Skype Panel member for Safe as Houses Conference in New South Wales - Australia – 8/3/17
- International Women's Day at Peabody – Guest Speaker – 8/3/17
- Pan-London Housing Reciprocal Agreement – City Hall - 30/1/17
- Home Office announcement of DAHA self-assessment tool kit – 20/1/17
- Presentation at Brighton Coercive Control Conference – 8/12/16
- Presentation at East London Housing Partnership annual conference – Barking - 30/11/16
- Control and coercion in the context of domestic abuse: using section 76 Serious Crime Act 2015 effectively - Nottingham 24/11/16
- Meetings attended with Mayors Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC), Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Home office.
- Conferences as part of European project with STADV, Kadera (NL) and (FEANTSA)
- Submission to Portuguese conference in September 2017
- Talking at Capsticks regional meeting

Funding

1. London Councils (4 year London based project) for a DAHA Development Manager and evaluation
2. Comic Relief (2 year national project) for a DAHA Development Manager and evaluation
3. Home Office (30K for development of online DAHA self-assessment toolkits
4. 'Safe At Home' project via European funding for (2 years) in partnership with STADV, Kadera (NL) and FEANTSA (Europe)
5. Tri borough have been successful for securing funding for Housing First Co-ordinator and flexible funding assistance via the transformation fund – Home Office
6. Tampon Tax fund for Private rented sector research

Further Research

Kelly Henderson (2016) 'The role of housing providers in a coordinated community response to domestic abuse'. The research questions are:

1. How do Registered Housing Providers identify and respond to victims and perpetrators of domestic abuse?
2. What good practice exists currently and what potential is there for development?
3. How do Registered Housing Provider interventions support the work of a DVPP and what are the experiences of those that use it?

This research will be published in 2017 and has also provided a foundation for the research being undertaken by FEANTSA as part of the 'Safe at Home' Project across Europe.

We also need to expand work relating to the Istanbul Convention, Restorative Justice, role of counselling services like Relate, European perspectives, the whole family approach and the impact of domestic abuse on youth homelessness.

REFERENCES

- i ONS (2015), Crime Survey England and Wales 2013-14. London: Office for National Statistics.
- ii Davies, Jill and Lyon, Eleanor (2014) 'Domestic Violence Advocacy: Complex Lives and Difficult Choices'. Sage Publications, Inc
- iii Ibid
- iv Sharon G. Smith, PhD, Katherine A. Fowler, PhD, and Phyllis H. Niolon, PhD 'Intimate partner homicide and corollary victims in 16 States: National Violent death reporting system, 2003 – 2009.' June 22, 2013 <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/abs/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301582>
- v Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC), 2015.
- vi Homicide in Canada, 2014, Statistics Canada, Table 6. In 2014, 67 women were killed by their intimate partners; this number divided by 365 days in the year comes out to 5.4. Available: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14244/tbl/tbl06-eng.htm>
- vii AVA (2011) Domestic Violence and Housing briefing for Independent Domestic Violence Advocates
- viii St Mungo's (2014) Rebuilding Shattered Lives: the final report
- ix Solace Women's Aid (2016) 'The Price of Safety: How the housing system is failing women and children fleeing domestic abuse.' http://solacewomensaid.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Solace-Womens-Aid-housing-report_The-price-of-safety_Mar16.pdf
- x The United States Conference of Mayors: Hunger and Homelessness: A status report on hunger and homelessness in America's cities December 2012
- xi AIHW, Specialist homelessness services 2012–13, Canberra, 2013, p. vii, accessed 3 July 2014
- xii S Tually, D Faulkner, C Cutler and M Slatter, Women, domestic and family violence and homelessness: a synthesis report, prepared for the Office for Women, Canberra, August 2008, p. 16, accessed 4 July 2014.
- xiii R Braaf, I Barrett Meyering 'Seeking security: women's economic wellbeing during and following domestic violence, Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, Sydney, 2011, pp. 7–8, 43–45, accessed 3 July 2014.
- xiv Kelly, L., Sharp, N. and Klein, R. (2014) Finding the Costs of Freedom. London: CWASU and Solace Women's Aid.
- xv National Youth Commission, Australia's homeless youth: a report of the National Youth Commission Inquiry into Youth Homelessness, Brunswick, 2008, pp. 7, 89, 92, accessed 3 July 2014.
- xvi S Mallett, D Rosenthal, D Keys, and P Myers, Moving out, moving on: key findings, Key Centre for Women's Health in Society in partnership with the Office of Housing, Department of Human Services, Melbourne, 2004, quoted in National Youth Commission, op. cit. p. 80.
- xvii A Canadian Observatory on homelessness research paper 'The State of Homelessness in Canada' 2016 http://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/SOHC16_final_20Oct2016.pdf
- xviii Public Health Agency of Canada 'Family Violence and Homelessness: A Review of the Literature.' <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/sfv-avf/sources/fv/fv-homelessness-itinerance/review-analyse-eng.php>
- xix Sullivan & Ohlsen 'Domestic Violence Housing First' (2016)
- xx Kris Billhardt, MEd, EdS, Linda Olsen, MA, MSW, Chiquita Rollins, PhD 'Domestic Violence and Housing Stability: A Role For DV Programs' June 2014
- xxi Crenshaw, Kimberle (1989) 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.' The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 140: 139-167.

-
- xxii 'Lecturer & Writer on White Privilege, Male Privilege and Equitable Curricula'. Speak Out Now. designaction. Retrieved 7 October 2014.
- xxiii 'Domestic Violence: Communities of Color' (2006) Women of Color Network. National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. http://www.doj.state.or.us/victims/pdf/women_of_color_network_facts_domestic_violence_2006.pdf
- xxiv USDOJ, OJP, (2000) 'Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey.'
- xxv Bureau of Justice Statistics 2001
- xxvi Feminist Majority Foundation's Choices Campus Campaign, 'Women of Color and Reproductive Justice: African American Women.' Available <http://www.feministcampus.org/fmla/printable-+materials/WomenofColor/AfricanAmericanWomen.pdf>
- xxvii Lee, R.K., Thompson, V.L., and Mechanic, M.B. (2002) Intimate partner violence and women of color: A call for innovations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 530-534
- xxviii Asian & Pacific Islander Institute on Domestic Violence, Fact Sheet: Domestic Violence in Asian Communities. Available at: http://www.apiahf.org/apidvinstitute/PDF/Fact_Sheet.pdf
- xxix Productivity Commission, Overcoming Indigenous disadvantage key indicators 2011, Canberra, 2011, pp. 4119–4129, accessed 19 September 2014.
- xxx ANROWS, Indigenous family violence, Fast facts, ANROWS website, May 2014, accessed 3 July 2014.
- xxxi Jodi-Anne Brzozowski, Andrea Taylor-Butts, and Sara Johnson, "Victimization and offending among the Aboriginal population in Canada," *Juristat*. Statistics Canada—Catalogue No. 85-002-XIE, Vol. 26, No. 3
- xxxii Parliament of Canada: 'Violence against Aboriginal women' March 2010 <http://www.parl.gc.ca/housepublications/publication.aspx?docid=5056509&file=18>
- xxxiii Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2010) Meeting the needs of households at risk of domestic violence in England: The role of accommodation and housing-related support services. York: University of York. Pg 24
- xxxiv Binney, V., Harkell, G. and Nixon, J. (1981) Leaving Violent Men: Study of Refuges and Housing for Abused Women. Bristol: Women's Aid Federation.
- xxxv Robson, P. (1981) 'The Homeless Persons' Obstacle Race Parts I and II' *Journal of Social Welfare Law* 3(5) and (6): 1-15 and 65-82.
- xxxvi Loveland, I. (1994). ' "Cathy sod off!" The end of homelessness legislation' *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 16 (4): 367-89.
- xxxvii Kelly, L., Sharp, N. and Klein, R. (2014) Finding the Costs of Freedom. London: CWASU and Solace Women's Aid.
- xxxviii Homes and Community Agencies 'Neighbourhood and Community Standard.' April 2012 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/419766/Neighbourhood_and_Community_Standard_2015.pdf
- xxxix Lisanne Drost , Birgitt Haller , Veronika Hofinger, Tinka van der Kooij, Katinka Lünemann 'Restorative Justice in Cases of Domestic Violence: Best practice examples between increasing mutual understanding and awareness of specific protection needs' January 2015
- xl Pleace, N. and Bretherton, J. (2013) Camden Housing First: A Housing First Experiment in London (York: University of York).
-

-
- xli Kelly, L. and Westmareland, N. (2015) Mirabal Research 'Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes: Steps to Change,' <http://respect.uk.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Project-Mirabal-executive-summary-EMBARGO-00.01-MONDAY-12-JANUARY-2015.pdf>
- xlii Royal Commission in to Family Violence Volume 2: 'Report and Recommendations' March (2016) <http://www.rcfv.com.au/MediaLibraries/RCFamilyViolence/Reports/Final/RCFV-Vol-II.pdf>
- xliii Sharp-Jeffs, N. (2016) Supporting Survivors of Financial Abuse: Learning for the UK
- xliv NSW Governement 'Program Guidelines for Staying Home Leaving Violence Program'. May 2014. http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/321137/staying_home_leaving_violence_program_guidelines.pdf
- xlv Jan Breckenridge, Donna Chung, Angela Spinney, Carole Zufferey 'Landscapes: State of Knowledge' July 2015
- xlvi Ibid

ORGANISATIONS INVOLVED OR VISTED (with hyper-links)

01. Winston Churchill travelling Fellowship
02. Peabody – London
03. Gentoo – Sunderland
04. Standing Together Against Domestic Violence – UK
05. Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) – UK
06. FEANTSA – Brussels, Europe
07. Homeless Link – UK
08. Shelter – UK
09. Crisis – UK
10. Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) – UK
11. RESOLVE – ASB
12. National Housing Federation (NHF) – UK
13. Housing LIN – UK
14. Capsticks – UK
15. Global Network of Women's Shelter
16. National Resource Centre for Domestic Violence (NRCDV) – USA
17. Department of Justice (DOJ), Housing Urban Development (HUD) – USA
18. Health and Human Services (HHS) – USA
19. National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) – USA
20. DC Coalition of Domestic Violence – DC, USA
21. National Alliance to End Homelessness – USA
22. The Shriver Centre – Chicago, USA
23. Metropolitan Family Services – Chicago, USA
24. Legal Assistance Foundation – Chicago, USA
25. Family Rescue – Chicago, USA
26. Chicago Housing Authority
27. Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network (CMBWN)
28. HomeTrust – Edmonton, Canada
29. Ambrose Place – Edmonton, Canada
30. E4C - Edmonton, Canada
31. Capitol Regional Housing – Edmonton, Canada
32. Wings of Providence – Edmonton, Canada
33. Interim Housing – Edmonton, Canada
34. Opening Doors to End Homelessness – DESC – Seattle, USA
35. Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence (WSCADV) – Seattle, USA
36. Michigan State University – Seattle, USA
37. Northwest Network of Bi-sexual, Trans, Lesbian and Gay survivors of Abuse – Seattle, USA
38. Lifewire – Seattle, USA
39. Coalition Ending Gender-based Violence. – Seattle, USA
40. Domestic Violence Services of Snohomish County – Seattle, USA
41. NCADV – USA
42. House of Ruth Maryland – USA
43. Move To End Domestic Violence – USA
44. Naremburn Family Centre – NSW
45. Manly Warringah Women's Resource centre – NSW
46. Homelessness NSW
47. NSW Federation of Housing Associations
48. Domestic Violence NSW
49. Bridge Housing – NSW
50. Wentworth Community Housing – NSW
51. Compass Housing – NSW
52. Link Housing – NSW
53. Melbourne University
54. Launch Housing – NSW
55. Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning – Melbourne
56. Cohealth – Melbourne
57. AMES Australia – Melbourne
58. Fitzroy Legal Service – Melbourne
59. Safe Steps – Melbourne
60. Melbourne Graduate School of Education
61. Department of Health and Human Services – Victoria
62. Swinburne University – Melbourne