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Research Phase 1: Case analysis
An analysis of five years of sentencing judgments from two offence groups will be undertaken. The research will undertake a national and state based study of:

- Remarks made about perpetrator interventions during the sentencing of domestic homicide offenders across Australia for a five-year period.
- Remarks made during the sentencing of offenders convicted of breach of an intervention order in Victoria.
- Data from a range of sources will be used.

Research Phase 2: In-depth interviews
These will be completed to examine judicial views on the use, management and extent of perpetrator interventions for domestic violence offenders. Interviews will be conducted in each state and territory with two levels of the judiciary – specialist family/domestic violence magistrates and criminal court judges. In each of the larger states (Victoria, NSW, Western Australia, Queensland) 10-12 interviews will be conducted. In each of the smaller jurisdictions (Tasmania, South Australia, Australian Capital Territory) five interviews will be conducted.

Research Phase 3: Documentary and policy analysis
Findings from the case analyses and in-depth interviews will be combined with a documentary analysis of current national and international best practice.
Professor Amanda Robinson is Reader in Criminology at the University of Cardiff. Her research includes a strong policy focus, and her research projects have contributed to significant changes in the services afforded to victims of domestic and sexual violence. Amanda’s initiatives have become the common framework for how services are delivered across the UK and Europe. Amanda was directly involved from inception through to legislation in shaping the Welsh Government’s White Paper proposals and legislative priorities for ‘ending violence against women, domestic abuse and sexual violence’ in Wales. Amanda has been the principal Investigator on numerous projects and has acquired a reputation for delivering practice-based messages for practitioners and policy-makers.
New initiatives to tackle domestic violence perpetrators using the Priority Perpetrator Identification Tool
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Domestic violence is a high volume crime...

- perpetrated by a heterogeneous population of offenders
- who tend to employ a wide range of abusive tactics and actions
- which are often deployed as a repeated pattern over time
- and that can result in extensive and harmful consequences for victims.

Yet the majority of harm from domestic violence is concentrated in the actions of a minority of perpetrators.....

This group should be our priority for receiving a more intensive and targeted multi-agency response.
What’s available?

• New law (e.g. coercive control)
• New policy (e.g. Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme)
• Police responding and taking positive action
• Prosecution and sentencing in criminal courts
• Probation and offender management
• Perpetrator programmes
• Civil protection orders
• Divorce and custody arrangements in the family courts
• Specialist services for victims (e.g. advocates, IDVAs, refuges)
• Child protection and safeguarding
• Health and mental health services
• Multi-agency partnerships (e.g. MARAC, MAPPA, MASH)
“There’s one... He’s just got two on his PNC and those are traffic offences, and his partner had described a quite long history of abuse between them... he’s assaulted her, she was pregnant, she’s lost the baby, but he doesn’t feature anywhere. Well, for somebody like that to show that level of aggression, they’ve just obviously not been reported, or just gone under the radar you know? It’s quite concerning, to be that aggressive and not have any previous convictions, you know. So they’re not managed by anyone. There’s no conditions, you know, there’s no probation.”

[Interviewee # 4 Dyfed Powys]
How can we systematically identify priority perpetrators, and adequately coordinate existing services and interventions, in order to significantly reduce their harmful behaviour and hold them accountable for their offending?
What is the PPIT?

• The PPIT is a simple form containing 10 items informed by research, domestic violence homicide reviews, and practitioner knowledge.

Offending

1) Active
2) Escalating
3) Repeated
4) Serial
5) Linked

Offender

6) MAPPA
7) Highly harmful
8) Mental health
9) Subs misuse
10) Weapons
# PPIT-PRIORITY PERPETRATOR IDENTIFICATION TOOL

**November 2016 (version 10)**

This tool has been designed to aid practitioners in the identification of domestic abuse perpetrators who will be considered priority targets for multi-agency monitoring and management within a local partnership. Please refer to the additional guidance at the end of this document before using the PPIT.

## PPIT Instructions:
Evaluate each of the following items in relation to this domestic abuse perpetrator. Determine whether there is evidence for the item (present and 1-present) for both recent (within past 6 months) and historic (beyond 6-months) timeframes. Note additional information and supporting evidence on the next page, giving details of significant/‘1’ scores.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OFFENDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Recent (&lt;6 mos.)</th>
<th>Historic (≥6 mos.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ACTIVE: Onset and duration of the domestic abuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ESCALATING: Offending increasing in frequency and/or severity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. REPEAT: Offending (2 or more incidents) against any single victim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SERIAL: Offending against multiple (2 or more) victims</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LINKED forms of offending (other violent/aggressive behaviour)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OFFENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Recent (&lt;6 mos.)</th>
<th>Historic (≥6 mos.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Subject of a MAPPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Highly harmful to victims (psychological and/or physical abuse)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Riskable escalation of mental health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Noticeable increase in alcohol and/or drug misuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Known history and/or current access to weapons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your primary concerns in relation to this perpetrator? (e.g. coer/civo control)

### TOTAL SCORE

(ranging from 0 minimum to 20 maximum)

---

### SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Note here specific examples, considering the robustness of the available information, and clarify when information was limited or missing.

1. ACTIVE DA OFFENDING
2. ESCALATING DA OFFENDING
3. REPEAT DA OFFENDING
4. SERIAL DA OFFENDING
5. LINKED DA OFFENDING
6. MAPPA (NOTE WHETHER DA-RELATED)
7. HIGHLY HARMFUL DA
8. MENTAL HEALTH
9. ALL/DRUG MISUSE
10. WEAPONS

In your professional judgement:
Is this a PRIORITY PERPETRATOR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of Completion (dd/mm/yy)

Your Name

Your Agency
The all-Wales PPIT testing
How can the PPIT be incorporated into practice?

Frontline agencies

Practitioners recognise DV perpetrators

Priority DV perpetrators identified

Multi-agency response to priority DV perpetrators

Police
IDVAs
Probation
Social workers

Health
• A multi-site process evaluation to increase understanding of the rationale and design of the pilots and how they make use of the PPIT to more proactively respond to domestic violence perpetrators.

• Key finding: previously ‘hidden’ priority domestic violence perpetrators have been identified and more intensive strategies put in place to manage their behaviour (e.g. IOM, MAPPA, active tracking, DVDS).

• A final report was published in Nov 2017 and is available here:  
  http://orca.cf.ac.uk/107138/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPIT pilots</th>
<th>Hampshire</th>
<th>Dyfed Powys</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date</strong></td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of pilot</strong></td>
<td>9 of 11 divisions</td>
<td>4 of 4 divisions</td>
<td>1 of 11 divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Force size</strong></td>
<td>1,602 sq. miles, 1.94 million pop.</td>
<td>4,230 sq. miles, 0.52 million pop.</td>
<td>493 sq. miles, 2.73 million pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot description</strong></td>
<td>Multi-agency behaviour change</td>
<td>Identification and focussed management</td>
<td>Engage or enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• “Hang on a second! Why are we not monitoring these people? We’re not ever doing anything about these perpetrators who are just going from victim to victim and appear to be getting away with it?”
  - [Interviewee #1 Hampshire]

• “The aim is to be more proactive and more disruptive…. [by] identifying the perpetrators maybe that slipped the net... what are we doing with them?”
  - [Interviewee #2 Dyfed Powys]

• “The current interventions that are available, it’s just enforcement and containment. They are reactive to domestic abuse incidents, and it was about having a proactive approach.”
  - [Interviewee #3 Greater Manchester]
“I’d be looking at all our knowledge of the history of that offender, because there’s always patterns to people’s offending generally. I’d also be thinking about the specific situation that perpetrator is in, because that is where I’d be starting in my mind to think about the safeguarding of that victim.”

[Interviewee # 3 Dyfed Powys]

“The PPIT’s been really beneficial for us [because] sometimes there’s information on there that we’re not aware of…. perhaps they’re a serial offender and they’ve got previous partners which we weren’t aware of.”

[Interviewee # 5 Hampshire]

“What I think is useful about the PPIT is that it’s manageable…. I feel like it adds value to an existing system, and at the moment it feels manageable, you know? So, that’s good. That’s useful.”

[Interviewee #1 Greater Manchester]
• “So they were not managed by anyone…. [but now] the PPIT, that is fed into the WISDOM system which is managed through a multi-agency umbrella, of integrated management of serious and dangerous offenders.....so it's a tool for managing people that are not managed from a conviction.”
  • [Interviewee # 4 Dyfed Powys]

• “Because of the PPIT, she’s been able to liaise with Offender Managers and say, ‘You need to be aware of this stuff!’ and literally... they’ve changed their tactic, if you like, with that perpetrator. So, those kind of things have been really useful, particularly when we get information from victims’ agencies.”
  • [Interviewee # 2 Hampshire]

• “I think it’s identified an avenue to get to people who are not on the radar or who are on the radar but have not been charged at the moment.....We’re looking at contacting children’s social care, [or] I’d do the Clare’s Law disclosure to the new partner. If we’re picking these people out of a pot and saying these are the high risks, where there is strong possibility of either domestic homicide or serious harm, it’s a no-brainer...”
  • [Interviewee # 3 Manchester]
## Comparison of the pilots

### Similarities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic identification of a cohort of priority perpetrators via the PPIT</td>
<td>Use of police crime recording systems to identify suitable cohort for PPIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots integrated within police offender management/intelligence hubs and key personnel have access to police crime recording systems</td>
<td>Number and type of practitioners involved in completing PPITs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority perpetrators are subject to increased enforcement and focused management</td>
<td>Some variation in scoring and use of professional judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements are in place to refer eligible priority perpetrators onto the MAPPA/IOM and WISDOM (Wales only) cohorts</td>
<td>Geographic spread of pilot and number of partner agencies involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-agency partnership working and data sharing is central to the perpetrator-focused approach taken by each of the pilots</td>
<td>Range of actions/tactics used to manage perpetrator behaviour; availability of perpetrator interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding thoughts

• **Key strategic lesson**
  - Producing innovative and meaningful changes in the way that domestic violence perpetrators are dealt with in local areas requires reinvigorating the old and investing in new collaborations.

• **Key operational lesson**
  - Using the PPIT in a multi-agency context helps identify new opportunities to share information and intervene more effectively with known DV perpetrators as well as those previously unknown as DV perpetrators.

• **Future learning**
  - To identify the extent to which these new approaches produce significant improvements across a range of outcomes (e.g. recidivism, safety, well-being).
Thank you for listening!

RobinsonA@Cardiff.ac.uk
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You can keep up to date by following these projects on ResearchGate:
• Research on domestic violence risk assessment
• New initiatives to tackle domestic violence perpetrators using the PPIT
Professor Nicole Westmarland is the Director of the Durham Centre for Research into Violence and Abuse (CRiVA) at Durham University. Nicole teaches on the MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice and she convenes and teach the Violence and Abuse module within the Department of Sociology. Nicole’s research consists of around thirty projects in the field of male violence against women. Nicole is particularly known for her work on rape, domestic violence and prostitution. Nicole’s work has underpinned a number of policy changes which she has spoken about all over the world. Nicole’s research has directly underpinned two major government policy reform processes, the HM Government Stern Review into Rape and the Home Office Coordinated Prostitution Strategy.
The perpetrator web of accountability?

Reflections from the UK following Project Mirabal.

Professor Nicole Westmarland
Bottom lines

- Criminal justice system is *one* answer but not *the* answer to perpetrator accountability

- Similarly, Men’s Behaviour Change Programmes are *one* answer but not *the* answer

- Nearly all of the women, children and men connected to Project Mirabal had lives which were better ‘to some extent’ following their ex/partner’s attendance on a DVPP (MBCP)

- A strategically clear, highly consistent, whole systems response which makes perpetrators visible and accountable is needed
What is happening here, now, in Victoria is the most exciting experiment in the world in terms of responding to intimate partner violence
Project Mirabal … in brief

- Multi-site study of Respect (accredited) DVPPs

- Longitudinal telephone survey (quantitative)
  - 100 women whose partners or ex-partners had attended a programme
  - Women whose partners or ex-partners had not attended a programme
  - Before the programme to 12 months after the start date.
  - 5 interviews covering 6 time points.

- Longitudinal in-depth interviews (qualitative)
  - 64 men on programmes
  - 48 partners or ex-partners of men on programmes
  - 2 interviews near the start and the end of the programme
What counts as success?

1. An improved relationship between men on programmes and their partners/ex-partners which is underpinned by respect and effective communication.
2. For partners/ex-partners to have an expanded ‘space for action’ which empowers through restoring their voice and ability to make choices, whilst improving their well being.
3. Safety and freedom from violence and abuse for women and children.
4. Safe, positive and shared parenting.
5. Enhanced awareness of self and others for men on programmes, including an understanding of the impact that domestic violence has had on their partner and children.
6. For children, safer, healthier childhoods in which they feel heard and cared about.
For the majority of women whose partners and ex-partners attended a DVPP, the physical and sexual violence stopped completely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made you do something sexual that you did not want to do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a weapon against you</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to kill you or someone close to you</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to strangle, choke, drown, or smother you</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched, kicked, burnt, or beaten you</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped you, pushed you, or thrown something at you</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched or kicked walls or furniture, slammed doors, smashed things or stamped around</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst the use of harassment and abuse also showed strong and consistent decreases, it remained in the lives of around half the women.

### Harassment and other abusive acts (% yes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did things that scared or intimidated you</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belittled or humiliated you in front of other people.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulted you or made you feel bad about yourself</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately interfered with or damaged your property</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed you or waited outside your home or workplace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed you using letters, emails, texts or phone calls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Expanded space for action

## Space for action (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Month 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel afraid of how DVP would react if I got a new partner</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I have to be very careful around DVP if he is in a bad mood</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the final decision about whether people can visit/stay in the house</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to restrict where I go</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells me to change the way I dress or my appearance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribes or criticises the way housework is done</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to look at my messages and contacts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to use money/finances to control me</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to prevent me participating in activities or groups outside the home</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is suspicious that I have been with another man/someone else</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insists on knowing where I am or what I am doing</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to prevent me seeing or contacting my friends/family</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-perceived safety

Figure 6. How safe do you feel? (%)

Baseline 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not safe at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little unsafe</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are we aiming for?

Where is our line on whether something is worthwhile?

What is worthwhile?

The lives of nearly all the women and children in our study were better ‘to some extent’.
Thanks for listening!

Durham Centre for Research into Violence and Abuse (CRiVA)
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1. To reflect on what is meant by the ‘web of accountability’.

2. To reflect on how the role of the police has been framed over the last 35 years as part of that web.
Spaces between the spokes assume equal role for the component parts in keeping the perpetrator in view.

How has this been played out= varied/variable.

Unidimensional model.

Denies the complexity of organisational behaviour messiness of people’s lives, and culture.
Change of focus and a cautionary tale.
Positive action and the role of arrest - Despite very clear guidance in Authorised Professional Practice, there appears to be confusion about what positive action involves. Police officers have a duty to take positive action when dealing with domestic abuse incidents. Often this means making an arrest, provided that the grounds exist, and it is a necessary and proportionate response. The use of arrest is falling at an alarming rate, which can be explained in part by the misguided belief of some officers that their actions in not arresting the perpetrator are ‘victim-focused’. Officers need clear supervision and direction to ensure that all opportunities for an early arrest are taken. This is particularly true in relation to perpetrators of domestic abuse. It is crucial that such an approach is part of an effective process to protect victims and ensure their continuing safety. (HMICFRS: 2017: 10)

**HMICFRS (2017) A progress report on the police response to domestic abuse**
Since 1984 ‘pro-arrest’/positive policing responses to IPV have travelled the globe. Goodmark (2015) calls this ‘exporting without a licence’.

i) Shaky empirical foundations

ii) Questionable capacity of the CJS to support women and children

iii) Barriers to effective implementation: cop culture and discretion

Result: constant calls for improved training/education, and rule tightening (more law). All focused on the front-line officer
Three ‘elephants in the room’:

1. Discretion is vertical as well as horizontal = holistic (Gundhus 2017)
2. Is positive policing victim focused or offender focused?
3. Are criminal justice professionals primary prevention agents in relation to IPV?

Positive policing as a ‘boundary object’
Spencer (2016: 227) states,

A web of accountability comprises various strands including the actions of legal systems (criminal, civil, child protection and family law), service systems and informal networks of victims, families and communities that together hold the perpetrator to account by intervening and monitoring ongoing behaviour.
This requires much more than positive policing and/or multi-agency conferencing.

IPV and its costs needs to be centred across and between a wide range of agencies.

It demands shared understandings of the problems faced, shared definitions of those problems, and data sharing, as just an initial agenda (see for example, Walby et. al. 2017).

All of the above makes demands of senior police officers (and other senior managers) not just front line workers.

A holistic vision?
This holistic vision has many strands/links/varied spaces between them. It is multi-dimensional and dynamic. It is not uniform: different things will work differently with different population groups.

The stronger the holistic vision, the stronger the web sharing one focus:

Keeping the perpetrator in view.
doi:10.1093/police/pay001


QUESTIONS?

Thank you

Follow us on twitter:
@MonashGFV
@ANROWS