

Minutes Tuesday 18 March 2014, 14.00-16.00
CR4, City Hall
Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) Panel Meeting

1. Attendees:

Co- CHAIR Stephen Greenhalgh (DMPC)
 Co-CHAIR Joan Smith (Co-Chair of London VAWG Panel)

- Sam Cunningham, MOPAC
- Jain Lemom, MOPAC
- Sarah Easey, MOPAC
- Gemma Woznicki, MOPAC
- Yeliz Osman, MOPAC
- Karen Ingala Smith (Nia – RCC)
- Colin Fitzgerald (Respect)
- Hong Tan (NHS England London)
- Sima Maqbool (London Councils)
- Betsy Stanko (MPS/ MOPAC)
- Jenny Hopkins (CPS)
- Susan Bewley

Apologies from:

- Steve Rodhouse (MPS)
- Keith Niven (MPS)
- Mark Jackson (MPS)
- Denise Marshall (Eaves)

(1) Minutes from the last meeting – Jain Lemom

Outstanding actions and updates

Action	Owner	Progress
Betsy committed to look at her 2012 data to support the CPS review of loss of victims post charge	Betsy Stanko	Betsy still awaiting info. Jean Ashton should provide this, JH to chase.
CPS, Met and NHS to review the above data to identify the issues and to use this data as a baseline for further work	CPS, MPS NHS	To be updated during the meeting

MOPAC to secure CPS data around the effectiveness of courts	MOPAC	There has been some progress regarding this for the rest of VAWG, as Betsy, Daniela and Sarah Easey met with the CPS VAWG leads, they suggested that MOPAC request this from Baljit. This is currently being taken forward.
---	-------	---

(2) VAWG Performance Dashboard

Betsy Stanko and Mat Pickering (MOPAC analyst) tabled a paper on proposals for the VAWG performance dashboard for comment by panel members.

Betsy explained that the purpose of the dashboard is to enable the VAWG panel to monitor at a high level whether London is being successful at reducing violence against women.

The proposal outlined in the paper is for the dashboard to monitor:

- A. The number and demographics of perpetrators of VAWG crimes and CJS outcomes;
- B. The number of offences of VAWG (and possibly the end to end outcomes for victims with learning difficulties/mental health issues) to monitor prevention and intervention work; and
- C. The number and demographics of victims and the levels of their satisfaction to monitor work supporting victims and their children to rebuild their lives.

The dashboard will also look at the specific needs of those parents and children mentioned in C (above) to enable us to see where commissioning services would have multiple impacts. This is a seminal document which can be proofed against the HMIC report due to be released next week.

JH asked whether we would capture conviction rates and unsuccessful outcomes as the CPS holds this data currently.

ACTION: CPS to supply MOPAC with above data

MM said she has been recently looking at how health can support DV work, the IRIS project is running successfully in several boroughs and we should look to build on this and consider carrying out research in this area, focusing on women accessing healthcare and the support they are provided afterwards. Also, how can we look into longer term services and their impact? Can we pick up on the London Councils work? A three year study conducted by CWASU is about to be released which looks into post victim services. It is important that we begin to capture the life journey of those who access services.

BS said this would only be possible where routine monitoring is accessible in electronic form and that we are currently trying to capture this at MOPAC. Work of this nature differs from the piece of bespoke research that MM is talking about. MM to circulate research at the end of May.

HT said he was aware of such discussions taking place nationally and that Jason (Ashwood) was working with the Havens and monitors information quarterly – this would be integrated further at some point in the future.

While it was recognised as positive that we are capturing this data we still need to remain focused as to why we are doing so. HT raised that Health should feature more in this type of work and also in the recording of information.

SG said he wanted to be mindful of how the information around schools and girls DV collected is broken down and that he would like to build a picture of schools/girl victims. BS said this may be difficult as she was unsure whether we would be able to get relevant searchable data, currently there is none. SG asked whether we could highlight the need for this to Ofsted?

ACTION: MOPAC to look at gaps in school data and consider proxies for the analysis of girls who are victims of DV

SB raised the recent release of NICE guidelines on joint commissioning to ensure this is fed into the development of any work around VAWG s

SC suggested looking at troubled families information for a proxy measure relating to girls that are victims/exposed to DV . HT suggested using information collected via MASH info may be a quick way to overcome issues associated with electronic recording.

Action: People to send in ideas for routine data collection that would facilitate information gathering for girls that are affected by DV

4) Development of a pan London domestic abuse service

Mat Pickering (MOPAC analyst) presented MPS and Refuge data on the victim and offence profile in London, overlaid with services and interventions, in order to identify gaps which a pan London domestic abuse service could seek to address. The Panel were then presented with a table (below) outlining options for a pan London domestic abuse service which MOPAC will then develop a business case for.

presentation to be circulated

Option
1. Young women's service
2. Specialist IDVA service (particular groups e.g. children and young people, BAMER women, those with complex needs OR settings e.g. within housing departments, health centres or courts)
3. Prevention service (schools and other youth settings)
4. Domestic violence recovery service (counselling similar to the rape crisis centre model)
5. Criminal Justice Support service (SDVC provision)
6. Domestic violence perpetrators service (Community perpetrators programmes)

KIS raised that the MPS data did not account for the fact that young women are less likely to report to the police; neither did it accurately account for the fact that women are more likely to go to the police after a series of incidents.

KIS also felt strongly that we cannot state that the change in age consideration for victims of DV cannot be accurately measured as we have not had long enough to see the direct impact of the changes yet.

The independence of IDVAs was also raised as an issue in that many are local authority staffed and as such these posts are not independent.

SG stated that MOPAC accepted that there is room for the data to be improved but this is a starter for 10, and that the discussion at the meeting is about setting a hierarchy of priorities, that data is there to give a choice for moving forward.

MM said that it was not appropriate to use national data as a baseline against which to measure London as features such as high levels of BMER women and women with complex needs mean the profile on London is too unique to be comparable. She also questioned whether the London Councils £3m funding has been reflected here?

The group felt that there was still a very piecemeal approach to tackling DV in schools and that there needs to be an embedded whole school approach and a package of support on offer.

Mulberry school for girls was cited as a good example of a whole school approach to tackling DV. The panel suggested visiting the model to assess replicability and possibly a pilot in order to take forward the approach to other schools.

ACTION: SG to visit Mulberry school for girls

CF said that there was no consensus as to the definition of perpetrator programmes and as such we are not accurately capturing information around this work. We need to work towards a national standard definition of perpetrator programmes which we will adhere to if we take that option forward.

LB and JH expressed a preference for IDVA provision. LB stated that Bexley currently had an IDVA co-located with the local authority and have formed a panel to look at reasons for non-attendance at court.

BS suggested developing an iterative wiki/map as part of MOPAC's data publication. She suggested it could be self-updated, as long as it is monitored (peer reviewed). We would need to decide whether we were looking for a long term solution or provision regarding a whole school approach if it is to be applied here.

HT felt we should be asking what needs to be pan London and why. Taking forward the specialist IDVA service would be his choice from the options presented. He raised the integration agenda and discussed the link between SV and DV, which was not evidenced by the data pack, and asked whether we could look towards integrating these services.

The forum discussed the postcode lottery which applied to ISVAs. This service is not consistently available throughout London boroughs. HT also said that Increasing Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) services are already accessible to domestic violence clients and counselling should not be duplicated in the pan London DV model. This is on the mental health agenda. He also felt that that the Government investment in IAPTs was not being used effectively in London. There is a huge disparity between SV and DV and this area which would benefit from a conversation regarding how to engage on the matter.

MM said that we need to support victims for longer and more IDVAS are definitely needed alongside more low level support. Short term support leaves women more vulnerable to re-victimisation. MM said that a recovery service is not just about counselling, but about 'drop ins' and case work at lower level than IDVAs that is about aiding recovery. She suggested that there should

be a point of contact in each borough for women to go to and suggested it could be funded by some core funding, supplemented by the voluntary sector.

SG proposed that options 1, 3, 5 and 6 could be taken as action points and dealt with outside the pan London DV service commissioning and options 2 and 4 could be looked at, to see how we could commission these and work with London Councils and Health to make money work together. Further discussion led to a view that option 4 should be taken as an action point rather than an option for a pan London DV service.

HT said that MOPAC and NHS England are looking at alternatives to women in custody and have put a concept forward to the PCC that looks at specialist women's needs. We now need to look at aligning funding and engaging partners, focusing on what needs to happen next.

HT spoke about the roundtable event that had taken place the day before the meeting to discuss women offenders.

SG said that the rape crisis model has been successful and suggested a specialist hub that encourages spokes to feed off. He highlighted that 'complex needs' is a striking theme emerging from the data.

SC said that the crisis in caseload of ISVAs and IDVAs will get worse and is the critical juncture in supporting women. She suggested we could question why the DWP aren't contributing resources to this issue.

SG said we would develop a model based on specialist hubs in 4 areas of London to support the issues concerning IDVAs as described, asking agencies such as housing benefits departments to feed in. He committed that MOPAC will come back with actions against all the other options as well. We would also be transparent about level of provision, for example the number of IDVAs in Southwark.

ACTION: MOPAC to draw up table of actions against all options

ACTION: MOPAC to Scope a pan London DV service for specialist IDVA provision based on a model of specialist hubs in 4 areas of London, incorporating other agencies, e.g. housing benefits departments, to feed in and question DWP on why they are not putting resources into this.

ACTION: ALL to provide further comments and thoughts on the proposed way forward for scoping the pan London domestic abuse service

5) Business plan

JL outlined a high level business plan, seeking sign off for the VAWG team's work programmes over the life of the strategy refresh. The group were in general agreement that they were happy for the plan to be taken forward; however further time for commenting on the plan would be provided for the Panel. BS asked that all work was evidence based so that outcomes could be developed to measure the delivery of the work programmes.

ACTION: MOPAC to circulate the high level business plan and ALL to provide comments on this before the next meeting of the VAWG Panel.

SC said that it should be noted that there is no budget against most of the programmes, including the Prostitution Exit work. She asked for the resource implications of this to be highlighted and

raised the need for a collaborative approach and advice from the panel to take all this work forward.

KIS asked for more data regarding women as victims, this will help us inform the 'why' part of our work. JL said that this is an area MOPAC have already begun work on.

6) Updates from partners

JH said from 1st April the CPS will have a dedicated DV prosecutor's team. They will not be conducting cases in court, but will be reviewing cases early in the office and considering victimless prosecutions and the evidence required to secure a prosecution as early in the process as possible. SC commented that we will need to review how this works with boroughs and ensure their coordinator resource is working with this.

BS asked about data capture, to which JH explained that information was already being recorded and measured.

SG mentioned the FGM event at City Hall that JL and YO were also present at this week. Jane Ellison spoke and promoted the good work that is taking place.

KIS asked what the panel thought of mandatory checking in FGM cases. SG said that we don't believe in a silver bullet and the pilot currently being developed by MOPAC in conjunction with selected boroughs will provide the right evidence base for us to explore our approach going forward.

HT said that the Havens were looking at expanding the SARCs and other specialist support . The Duchess of Cornwall recently visited a Haven.

A HMIC report has been published with recommendations on children who are in environments which feature DV or DA. There is a training package for staff which has been highlighted and a six month review of operation dauntless has been suggested.

ACTION: MOPAC to draft letter/ consultation response to DWP consultation on the impact of welfare reforms on women experiencing VAWG

ACTION: MOPAC to circulate the HP Business case

ACTION: MOPAC to look into impact of welfare reform pilot that took place in Hammersmith and Fulham

Action	Owner	Progress
CPS to provide conviction rates and unsuccessful outcomes data	CPS	There has been a change in personnel affecting this. CPS to update.
Consider Mulberry school as a whole school approach pilot/ visit for DMPC	MOPAC	Complete. The VAWG team attended the school on Stephen's behalf.
MOPAC to look at gaps in school data and consider proxies for gender analysis	MOPAC	Ongoing
People to send in ideas for routine data collection	MOPAC	To be covered under agenda item 3 – VAWG dashboard

MOPAC to drawn up table of actions against all options	All	Our IDVA survey and further discussion with stakeholders has moved this on and the approach to establishing a pan London DV service will be picked up under item 3.4
Scope a pan London DV service for specialist IDVA provision. Develop a model based on specialist hubs in 4 areas of London, with other agencies, e.g. housing benefits departments, to feed in and question DWP on why they are not putting resources into this.	MOPAC	Pan-London DV service will be discussed under agenda item 3.4
Letter/ consultation response to DWP consultation on the impact of welfare reforms on women experiencing VAWG	MOPAC	Draft complete but awaiting sign off
Review CPS change to dedicated DV prosecutor's team and ensure that this works effectively with boroughs and their co-ordinator resources.	MOPAC	Picked up through the VAWG Co-ordinators
MOPAC to report back on progress of six month review on operation Dauntless	MOPAC	Operation Dauntless to be discussed under agenda item 5.
MOPAC to circulate the HP Business case	MOPAC	Complete