



*Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada
Research Unit*

Documenting resources for victims
& survivors of violence in Canada

A Workshop Discussion Paper

By Myrna Dawson, Mary Jane Hubbert, and Julie Poon¹

June 2010

¹ Authors listed alphabetically.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all those who found the time in their busy schedules to participate in the workshop and who provided detailed feedback on this workshop discussion paper. Thank you to Joan Riggs of Catalyst Research and Communications for facilitating the workshop discussions and to the members of the workshop organizing committee: Elizabeth Blaney, Carmen Gill, Holly Johnson, Barb McQuarrie, and Elizabeth Wells. Special thanks to those who recorded the workshop discussions through their detailed note-taking: Cheryl Fraehlich, Mary Jane Hubbert, Aaron Jacklin, Michelle Lawrence, Alison Maynard, Julie Poon, Lanette Ruff, and Elizabeth Wells. Finally, a thank you to the Policy Centre for Victim Issues, the Department of Justice Canada, the Canadian Observatory on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence, and the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, University of Guelph, for supporting the workshop.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This discussion paper is the result of a workshop organized and hosted by the Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada Research Unit, University of Guelph, to discuss the feasibility of systematically documenting resources available to victims and survivors of violence in Canada. The workshop was held in Guelph, Ontario on November 5 and 6, 2010, sponsored by the Policy Centre for Victim Issues of the Department of Justice Canada; the Canadian Observatory on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence, University of New Brunswick; the Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada Research Unit and the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, University of Guelph. Workshop participants represented various sectors including frontline service providers, community partners, researchers and policy makers from across Canada.

The workshop was structured around the exploration of the challenges and benefits to documenting resources for victims and survivors of violence in Canada. Background information was provided in a context paper written by the first author of this report and circulated among participants prior to the workshop. The overall objective of the workshop was to synthesize the current state of knowledge about what community-based, criminal justice, and other services and resources are currently available to victims/survivors of violence and to provide a starting point for research that can improve upon these current data systems. The long-term objective is the more systematic collection of consistent and reliable data that can, in turn, contribute to more informed public policy decisions about the distribution and allocation of victim/survivor resources in this country. The format of the workshop encompassed a mixture of individual and panel presentations with subsequent roundtable and full plenary discussions that focused on three broad questions: How do we define victim/survivor resources? What are our data gaps and needs with respect to these resources? What are appropriate measures of victim/survivor resources?

With respect to the first question, various issues were identified as challenges to achieving consensus as to how one defines 'victim/survivor resources' including exclusive versus inclusive definitions, the fact that victims do not always identify as victims, varying situational and demographic characteristics that may preclude an overarching definition, whether to include direct formal support only or more indirect supports, whether educational resources are important to include, how to categorize various specialized services and more practical resources (e.g. housing, employment issues), the role of informal networks, information as a resource, and so on. Despite the above issues, the roundtable and full plenary discussions largely agreed that a broad definition of services and resources should be adopted that is client-centred or victim-centred, not just criminal justice centred. As part of this broad definition, a more holistic approach was felt to be necessary that would place the victim at the centre of discussions and that would adopt a human harm perspective of violence, rather than the criminal justice perspective. Adopting the human harm approach, responding agencies would be able to consider the role played by the social determinants of violence including the social, political and economic context within which the perpetuation of violence and harm occurs. This approach would also comprise a human rights' perspective that recognizes violence and the provision of resources needs to be examined through an anti-discrimination and anti-oppression lens. Using the above approach, then, a definition of 'victim/survivor resources' would reflect the full range of services available; the full range of victims, including primary and secondary victims, witnesses to violence, as well as those close to primary and secondary victims; and, finally, the

full range of experiences, including a consideration of the intersectional nature of these experiences that acknowledges differences as well as commonalities in how violence is experienced. The definition would describe or encompass a coordinated, integrated system (or the desire for such) that includes policies, legislation, social and health services/resources, financial services, funding agencies, housing and employment services, and so on. In doing so, the definition would acknowledge the relationship between resources and the communities in which they exist by considering the role played by informal information and support systems, non-service support systems, services for perpetrators, and public education. Adopting the above approach means that we are documenting a definition of resources that considers various elements and incorporates services/resources that are housed inside and outside the criminal justice context, provides direct and indirect resources to victims/survivors of violence, and includes resources that are invested in ending, not just responding, to violence.

With respect to the second question about the current data gaps and needs, important issues were identified that limit current data systems, including the inability to accurately capture the victim/survivor perspectives, the lack of data/research on rural service provision, the need for more longitudinal data on victims, the need for more innovative methods for capturing those victims who access help through less traditional or more informal mechanisms (i.e. not the criminal justice system), difficulties access/sharing data across sectors, ineffective use of current data that is available, uncoordinated or inconsistent data collection efforts and inability to standardized data sources that are available, emphasis on quantitative rather than qualitative research methods, the time commitment/constraints/resources required for data collection efforts.

Four themes were identified in discussions related to the final question of what are appropriate measures of victim/survivor resources related to resource availability, accessibility, and utility. Four themes were identified. First, the need to make sure that measures capture how well resources targeting intimate partner violence are responding to the needs of victims/survivors and communities was emphasized. To capture the quality of resources in terms of availability, accessibility, and utility, the perspectives of those who use them are crucial and will help providers, researchers and policymakers more comprehensively and practically understand what the needs are of victim/survivors. Furthermore, when gaining such perspectives, both positive and negative aspects are important to document. Second, measuring resources based on such factors as wait times and turn-away rates was cautioned against; thus, measures used in prior research need to be assessed in detail. Third, measuring whether policies and practices are reflective of each other was emphasized. Some felt that we should measure this at the more macro-level so that we can achieve a better understanding of what the resource needs are for victims/survivors as well as how complex these needs may be. Finally, it was argued that, when determining best measures of the various resource characteristics, it will be important to recognize that various issues or factors will affect the level of these resources which also often overlap.

In conclusion, some themes were common throughout workshop discussions. The theme that many individuals do not identify as victims or are not identified as such by others was discussed frequently. It was noted many times these and other victims often go to friends or family members for help rather than to formal services and this would possibly affect some measures and their documentation. Further, the perceived harm that can sometimes result from

labeling individuals as victims was evident across all three sectors represented at the workshop. Second, the need for more qualitative data that can capture perspectives of victims/survivors and the greater complexity of their experiences was also consistently noted throughout the two days. That is, discussions often highlighted, regardless of the question being focused upon, that researchers and policymakers need to be asking the victims/survivors about their perspectives when conducting research because, after all, they are the ones who will know what is useful and accessible to them. Related to this, throughout the discussions, participants continuously expressed concerns relating to the need to conduct more research pertaining to victims in rural communities and the difficulties these groups may face regarding accessibility and availability of services and resources made available to them since they often face unique challenges compared to other victims of violence. Finally, the importance of collaboration was dominant in all discussions across all sectors. The comments related to this theme mainly expressed that those involved in responding to victims/survivors of violence through resource or service provision needed to work together and share information to more effectively provide better resources to those who need them. However, it was evident that all participant types – government, community service providers, and academic researchers – were eager and willing to work collaboratively on initiatives that would work to better document resources for victims/survivors of violence.

INTRODUCTION

This discussion paper is the result of a workshop organized and hosted by the Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada Research Unit, University of Guelph, to discuss the feasibility of systematically documenting resources available to victims and survivors of violence in Canada. The workshop was held in Guelph, Ontario on November 5 and 6, 2010, sponsored by the Policy Centre for Victim Issues of the Department of Justice Canada; the Canadian Observatory on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence, University of New Brunswick; the Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada Research Unit and the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, University of Guelph. Workshop participants represented various sectors including frontline service providers, community partners, researchers and policy makers from across Canada (*see participant list in Appendix A*).² The workshop was structured around the exploration of the challenges and benefits to documenting resources for victims and survivors of violence in Canada. Background information was provided in a context paper written by the first author of this report and circulated among participants prior to the workshop (*see Appendix B*; Dawson 2010). The overall objective of the workshop was to synthesize the current state of knowledge about what community-based, criminal justice, and other services and resources are currently available to victims/survivors of violence and to provide a starting point for research that can improve upon these current data systems. The long-term objective is the more systematic collection of consistent and reliable data that can, in turn, contribute to more informed public policy decisions about the distribution and allocation of victim/survivor resources in this country.³

The transformations that have occurred during the past several decades in society's response to crime victims, or survivors of violence more generally, have led to a pressing need to begin to identify reliable and valid standardized measures to document these new resources. Identifying these measures can help us understand the role of this growth in resources and how it has affected the lives of the victims they are meant to serve and in the communities in which they live. An examination of the distribution of these initiatives is vital to the development of public policy over time but, as argued by DeLeon-Granados and Wells (2003), any efforts to document and ultimately examine the effect of resources requires "a dialogue among key stakeholders, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers on an important and growing research area; a discussion of the ways to improve data systems and to improve the manner in which data are used for social science; and an enhanced awareness of methods to track efficacy of state and federal policy over time (p. 150)." This dialogue can begin to respond to the call for efforts to identify what programs, policies and/or legislative reforms have provided protection to victims/survivors of violence (Campbell et al. 2007). This workshop and discussion paper begins that dialogue in the Canadian context.

Specific objectives of the workshop were: (1) to bring together those who provide victim/survivor resources in the community, researchers, policymakers, and other stakeholders; (2) To identify the strengths and limitations of current national, provincial and other data systems

² The only provinces/territories not represented were Newfoundland and Nunavut because invited participants were not able to attend.

³ The authors recognize that there is variation in how individuals, agencies, and sectors refer to those individuals who have experienced violence in their lives and who may access resources available to them (e.g. victims, survivors, clients and so on). In this paper, we use the term 'victim' and/or 'survivor' to refer to the population being focused upon, recognizing that many who are victimized, violently or otherwise, may not self-identify as such.

that currently document available resources; (3) to reach a consensus on what is meant by ‘victim/survivor resources’; (4) to determine the types of resources that are important to document and why; (5) to identify the most appropriate measures to capture the existence and type of resources and services, including those that relate to resource availability, accessibility, utility and quality; (6) to explore methods for collecting standardized data on these measures at the local, provincial, and national level; (7) to begin to lay out a research agenda for a multi-level initiative that will examine the feasibility of more systematically and consistently documenting victim resources; and, finally, (8) to demonstrate the value of interdisciplinary and multi-sector collaborations among frontline service providers, community members, researchers, and policymakers when conducting research that can better inform social and public policy.

The format of the workshop encompassed a mixture of individual and panel presentations with subsequent roundtable and full plenary discussions that focused on three broad questions:

- How do we define victim/survivor resources?
- What are our data gaps and needs with respect to these resources?
- What are appropriate measures of victim/survivor resources?

The first day of the workshop focused broadly on victims/survivors of violence and the first two questions. As Dawson (2010) highlighted, however, resources related to intimate partner or domestic violence have drawn the most attention in other countries given their growth in recent decades. Therefore, the second day focused more specifically on intimate partner violence as a case study, building on the previous day’s discussion with respect to the first two questions, but focusing in more detail on the third question (*see program agenda, Appendix C*). These three questions and related sub-questions were provided to participants in advance of the workshop. Sub-questions highlighted some of the potential issues that might be relevant when thinking about how one might respond to the main questions; however, they were not meant to be an exhaustive representation of potential issues (*for full list of questions and sub-questions, see Appendix D*). The workshop was chaired by Dr. Myrna Dawson, University of Guelph, and facilitated by Joan Riggs, Catalyst Research and Communications. Roundtable and plenary discussions were recorded by individual note takers at each of the roundtables. The discussion paper follows the structure of the program, describing the main themes identified in an analysis of the recorders’ notes conducted by the authors of this paper (*for methodology, see Appendix E and for participants’ evaluation of the workshop in meeting its goals, see Appendix F*).

WORKSHOP CONTENT & FINDINGS

To provide some national context on research related to victim/survivor resources in Canada, the workshop began with presentations by Pam Arnott, Beth Heinze, and Dr. Susan McDonald, Department of Justice Canada, who summarized federal activities and research related to victim resources. As explained by the presenters, the federal and provincial/territorial governments share powers with respect to the criminal justice system. The federal government creates laws and prosecutes criminal offenses in the territories. The provincial government

enforces criminal law, administers justice, prosecutes offenders, provides victim services and develops provincial and territorial legislation. In 2006, the federal government made a commitment to improve the experiences of victims in the federal criminal justice and corrections systems and to establish a victim's ombudsman office. An extra \$13 million dollars per year is to be divided between the Departments of Justice and Public Safety as well as the Ombudsman's office, the three departments that provide services to victims. The Department of Justice houses the Policy Centre for Victim Issues (PCVI). Within the Department of Public Safety services are provided to victims through the National Office for Victims, the Correctional Services of Canada Victim Services Program and the National Parole Board. The Department of Justice's Policy Centre for Victim Issues has many roles: among them to improve the experience of victims of crime in the criminal justice system; act as a victim lens for criminal law reform; and be a centre of expertise on victims' issues. The PCVI undertakes law reform and policy development, international activities, research, consultation, communication and public education as well as provides support through the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group on Victims of Crime, to Directors of Provincial/Territorial Victim Services by hosting face to face meetings, informal sharing of information as well as maintaining informal contacts. In addition, the PCVI administers the Victims Fund, a grants and contribution funding program.

The Victims Fund receives \$7.75 million dollars per year. It has three components: provincial/territorial; projects and activities; and financial assistance. Within these components funds are available to provide financial assistance to present victim impact statements at sentencing, programs and enhancements for underserved victims of crime, the Northern Victims of Crime Emergency Fund and the implementation of victim-related provisions of the *Criminal Code of Canada* or provincial/territorial victim legislation and the *Canadian Statement of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime*. The Victims Fund also supports projects that expand victim services in Northern and rural areas, address the impact of victimization, and raise awareness about victimization. It also provides emergency financial assistance including: financial assistance for registered victims to attend parole hearings; financial assistance and support for a registered victim (including child or dependant care); emergency situations where no other assistance is available, and financial assistance for Canadians victimized abroad. The Department of Justice also participates in international activities such as the United Nations' (UN) *Guidelines on Justice Matters involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime*, implementation of UN guidelines, and a victim's questionnaire.

The National Office for Victims within the Department of Public Safety is a central resource for victims of offenders under federal jurisdiction. It provides: general information for victims and the public; referrals to the Correctional Services of Canada (CSC) and the National Parole Board (NPB) for specific enquiries; and a victim's perspective in national policy development. In addition, the Office responds to complaints about the services provided to victims by the CSC and the NPB once all existing avenues for complaints have been exhausted. The Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime works to promote access to existing federal government services and programs, reviews concerns regarding noncompliance with federal legislation, and identifies and explores systemic and emerging victim issues.

Related to the workshop topic, one mechanism that seeks to document victim/survivor resources is the Victim Services Directory which is an online resource for victims of crime and victim services providers. Administered by the Policy Centre for Victim Issues, the directory is a searchable database that includes listings of victim service agencies from across Canada. Housed on the Department of Justice Canada website, the directory was launched in April of 2009 and, as of October 2009, the directory housed 542 listings. The purpose of the Victim Services Directory is to help service providers, victims, and individuals locate services for victims across Canada. It also allows victims to determine which services they require, to link organizations and victims together, and assists individuals who wish to access victim services. All of the directory listings consist of: the agency name, street address, mailing address, phone number, fax number, text telephone number (TTY), website, generic e-mail address, agency description, types of victimization served and types of services offered. The directory allows victims to search services for a wide variety of victimization types and a wide variety of services. Agencies are responsible for providing information to the directory via an online form if they wish to be listed in the directory or if they need to change their information.

The Department of Justice also participates in the federal Family Violence Initiative which has the goal of reducing the occurrence of family violence in Canada. The Family Violence Initiative (FVI) receives \$7 million dollars per year split between seven government departments, agencies and Crown corporations. Eight other government organizations that do not receive this funding also participate in the Initiative. The mandate of the FVI is to enhance awareness about family violence, build the knowledge base and strengthen the ability of the housing, health systems, and communities to prevent and respond to family violence. The Department of Justice participates in the FVI by reviewing, reforming, and developing criminal justice laws and policy, conducting research to develop family violence policy and laws, providing project funding for community-based family violence projects, and providing public legal education and information on family violence.

The Department of Justice participates in many other activities to reduce violence. The Research and Statistic Division undertakes research on a range of victim and family violence topics. All research proposals go through a review committee which examines ethics, methodology, data sources, etc. Most research is conducted by in-house researchers, but data collection and certain studies may be contracted out. Research studies are prioritized based on a number of criteria including: the current federal government's agenda, the needs of policy/program partners in the Department, upcoming parliamentary reviews, mandates from Treasury Board, active litigation court cases, departmental priorities, existing commitments and other practical considerations such as resources and feasibility. Research topics tend to fall within one of these three broad areas: victim-related *Criminal Code* provisions; understanding the needs of victims; and responding to those needs/victim's services. Research topics for the FVI include *Criminal Code* and other legislation; policy, protocols and programs; needs, impacts, and prevention as well as emerging issues. This presentation led into the first roundtable discussion that focused on how victim/survivor resources should be defined.

I. HOW DO WE DEFINE VICTIM/SURVIVOR RESOURCES?

Today there are a multitude of new initiatives that co-exist with long-standing resources for various types of victims/survivors (Dawson 2010). In the area of violence against women, for example, rape/sexual assault centres and shelters that grew out of the domestic violence movement in the 1970s are easily identifiable resources. The more recent implementation of specialized domestic violence courts and police units in some jurisdictions can also be easily used as examples of victim/survivor resources. However, focusing only on the more obvious albeit important initiatives does not recognize the wealth of social, health, community and other resources directly or indirectly related to helping victims/survivors of violence. Therefore, defining what is meant by ‘victim/survivor resources’ – the *what are they* question – is the first step in achieving a more comprehensive understanding of the role particular resources play in the lives of victims.

Canada’s national Victim Services Survey defines victim services as “agencies that provide direct services to primary and secondary victims of crime that are funded in whole or in part by a ministry responsible for justice matters” (Brzozowski, 2008: 33). An initial question is: Are some important resources that are integral to victims excluded based on these criteria? In other words, does this definition capture the wealth of resources available to victims/survivors of violence with its focus on direct services, those funded by government, and so on? In the United Kingdom, the term violence against women ‘support services’ was used to guide the documentation of agencies and organizations that provided “a range of support options that enable women to create safety, seek justice, and undo the harms of violence” (Coy et al. 2007: 10). Recognizing that these resources are often found in what they refer to as the ‘voluntary/third sector,’ the authors included organizations in their study if they worked “primarily on violence and...provide significant direct support to female victims/survivors” (p. 16). In the United States, where researchers have focused more narrowly on documenting the impact of domestic violence resources, Dugan (2003) and her colleagues (1999, 2003) included in their definition of resources existing policies and laws or legislation that pertained to domestic violence as well as select organizations and initiatives that responded to domestic violence.⁴ For example, they examined the role of shelters, legal advocacy, hotline and counseling services as well as existing state- and local-level policies such as child custody legislation, judicial discretion surrounding protection order violations, warrantless arrest, mandatory arrest, prosecutorial no-drop policies, and firearm legislation. Efforts were also made to capture the level of criminal justice commitment to reducing domestic violence through the existence of specialized police units and training as well as the policies surrounding the prosecution of protection order violations and/or written policies that standardized the prosecution of cases.

Using the above approaches as a starting point, the first goal for workshop participants was to come up with a working definition for ‘victim/survivor resources’ that would be used to guide the documentation process. Sub-questions that guided this discussion were:

⁴ The organizations or initiatives included depended, in large part, on availability of consistent and reliable data as discussed by the researchers.

- How do we/should we categorize ‘victim/survivors of violence’?
- Do victims/survivors have common needs and/or requirements? Is there a core set of resources that are essential to all victims/survivors of violence?
- Are some needs/requirements specific to particular groups of victim/survivors of violence? If so, what are they?
- What resources are currently available to meet these needs/requirements?

The main themes and issues identified in this discussion are summarized below.

A. How do/should we categorize victims/survivors of violence?

To begin to answer this question, what is meant by ‘victims/survivors of violence’ (who are to be included in this group) as well as whether and how they should or can be categorized according to resources required needs to be addressed. Several key themes/issues were highlighted throughout this discussion.

Exclusive versus inclusive definitions: Most workshop participants recognized that victims/survivors of violence are currently defined or categorized according to whether they have engaged with the criminal justice system. Concerns were raised about the exclusive nature of adopting this dichotomous approach to categorizing victims because many individuals do not report their victimization and, as a result, this can impact their ability to access resources. It was felt that a more inclusive approach needed to be adopted that encompassed all types of victims suffering all types of harm. It was also argued that secondary victims should be included in the definition of ‘victims/survivors of violence’ because they are also impacted in similar ways to the primary victims (e.g. financially, emotionally, negative health outcomes). A secondary victim may be a witness to the violence, or children of those experiencing violence and so on. Some participants, however, argued that secondary victims should be excluded because the criminal justice system is already challenged in dealing with primary victims and secondary victims are not directly impacted by the violence either on an emotional or physical level. However, the definition of ‘victims/survivors of violence’ cannot be defined according to the potential of formal systems serving them and, further, it was argued that the criminal justice system is not the only, and often not the primary, resource accessed by many victim/survivors. Some excerpts from discussions illustrate further⁵:

One thing to note is that it’s an important distinction whether or not they’re involved in the justice system. Not everyone is. A lot of my work is evaluating the usefulness of combining data across sources. We’re trying to improve our estimates of victimization. (Government)

⁵ Excerpts are not verbatim quotations since discussions were recorded by note-takers and not by tape recorders. Therefore, the excerpts should be considered as paraphrased summaries of the speaker and not direct quotes. In the majority of cases, the sector that the speaker represented is indicated in parentheses after the excerpt. In those cases in which it was not recorded by the note-taker, it indicates that no sector was identified.

There are indirect victims, for example children who are exposed to violence and co-workers. But including direct and indirect victims is not necessarily the right orientation. It is really about proximity and relationships. Also, there may be victimization arising from non-violent crime to the same nature and degree as violent crime. (Sector not specified)

Take a machete attack in a mall. The primary victim would be the one who lost an arm. The secondary victims would be the 200 witnesses who are traumatized. The funding isn't there to compensate them all. We need very clear parameters. (Government)

There are better ways than simply being identified as a victim of crime; so, how do we identify those resources? It's challenging; the broader it gets, the more complicated it becomes. (Sector not specified)

'Victims' may not always be identified as such: Many participants felt that defining or categorizing victims/survivors of violence was difficult because some individuals are not identified as such for various reasons. This may arise if they do not identify themselves as victims, services do not identify them as victims because of the type of victimization, and/or because particular individuals never seek any kind of formal help for their victimization. Further, some may avoid the label of 'victim' as one way to avoid the problem or, alternatively, they may not wish to be labeled as a victim because of the negative stigma that is often attached to such a label. Victims may also see themselves as survivors rather than victims. One participant said, "Victims may not want services; they just want things to go away. We need to be careful with labeling them as victims."⁶ Another participant stated, "It's so unfortunate the stigma attached to being a victim. Nobody wants to say, I'm a victim, it's like there's something wrong with you." The overarching theme here is that, even if one achieves a consensus on how to define or categorize victims/survivors, it is likely that many individuals will still not be captured because of the above. This is a valid and important concern that needs to be addressed by researchers; however, it is a separate issue from the goal of the workshop which was to determine how one can begin to document resources available for victims/survivors of violence, regardless of whether they are identified as such.

The terminology of victims of violence is interesting. 'Survivor' suggests movement towards a more empowered position. In my experience with Aboriginal interviewees, they refuse to use word 'victim'. To them, no one is a victim because that automatically labels them in a certain way and takes the power away. An Aboriginal said it is a community problem not individual problem. They think we need to consider culture since there is different terminology and ways of thinking. (Academic)

Situational and demographics as defining characteristics: It was noted that victims of violence can be categorized in various ways. First, they can be defined based on the type of victimization that they have experienced; however, it was acknowledged that categorizing victims according to the type of crime/violence is not always appropriate because some of these

⁶ It should be noted that contributions from workshop participants are set off in single, rather than double, quotations to denote the fact that their comments were recorded as closely as possible by note takers, but they still should be considered as being paraphrased and not as direct quotations.

categories can overlap in some instances whereas in other situations they are distinct from one another (e.g. intimate partner violence can include sexual assault, but not always). Geography was another criterion discussed as having potential for categorization, but it was felt this would not allow for the possibility that victimization can be minimized in certain areas and, therefore, this potential tendency may mean some victims will be ignored or crimes will go unreported in particular jurisdictions. It was unclear how this may affect the documentation of victim/survivor resources, but it is clear that when examining the role of such resources in preventing particular types of victimization, this would become a problem as rates may not reflect reality. This issue is important, but was beyond the goals of the workshop. Some felt that race/ethnicity was an important characteristic to consider when defining victims/survivors, especially since it relates to identifying those groups who are or are not receiving services. However, it was noted that information on race/ethnicity of victims and/or perpetrators is often difficult to obtain because of privacy rights that restrict collecting this and other types of information in some instances. Finally, it was noted that victims can be categorized based on their age and, in fact, the age of victims was also argued to be important in determining who was and was not being served. Specifically, it was believed that victims should be separated into categories based on whether they are a child or an adult victim/survivor.

In response to this sub-question, then, among workshop participants there was a general concern that all victims have individual needs and some have more than one type of victimization; therefore, categorizing them might miss out on important elements of their victimization that may be crucial to responding effectively to their needs. One participant noted, 'I don't want to categorize or put a label on people, we should focus on individual needs.' In addition to the potential overlap in types of victimization, it was also noted that some victims/survivors of violence may also be labeled offenders and, as such, there is a need for this particular group to have resources available to them that address both roles which could get obscured in any categorization scheme. Despite these concerns, it was acknowledged that some type of definition was necessary, particularly with respect to research and funding needs.

Everything we ask victims for we have to be able to justify why we are asking for it. The policy side is difficult because we want more information but privacy says that it is none of our business. (Government)

It is good to have categorizes for statistical purposes and to know what kind of help they need because different victims have different needs. (Sector not specified)

Do victims/survivors have common or basic needs?

The possibility that victims/survivors of violence have a common set of needs or require a core set of resources that will aid in their recovery was a possibility discussed next that might move us forward in defining what are included in a definition of such resources. Several themes arose that identified some of these common needs or core resources, including: (1) Direct formal support; (2) Education, especially for victims who may not identify as such; (3) Specialized resources; (4) Provision of practical resources; (5) More informal networks; and, finally, (6) Information. Each of these is discussed in more detail below.

Direct formal support: It was agreed that all victims need formal support from services which can take the form of advocacy, public education and awareness, as well as information both general and specific to their case so that they can make more informed decisions. In particular, victims who engage with the criminal justice system need someone to walk them through this process.

Victims say that there needs to be more public education because their family and friends never told them about hotlines or shelters for battered women. An ordinary woman in the community who is a victim does not know about the resources available. We need to address this problem. (Community)

We need general information related to their survival and the criminal justice system. We need information regarding their case, and the longer term needs of the victim and counseling. (Government)

Victims need someone who can literally hold their hand through absolutely every step of the process of healing (Community)

Support can be a shoulder to cry on. Someone to say you're okay; someone to listen. They need to know they're not abnormal, that they'll be okay. They need non-judgmental support. (Government)

Education to help victims identify their experience: It was agreed that all victims need education, but education is especially important for those individuals who do not identify themselves as victims/survivors and, in turn, do not realize they may need resources to help them. Education for this group could help them move beyond the concern about the stigma that is attached to being labeled a 'victim' and may also help them recognize the signs of being a victim and the impact of their victimization that could be alleviated by accessing some of the resources that are available to them.

We need a baseline attitude. We need support and education. When you educate it removes the stigmatization because being educated removes stigma and then helps individuals recognize they are affected as well. (Academic)

They may not realize they've been abused. They may not understand the impact of controlling behavior. Many victims who come into the criminal justice system, especially those that others have reported their victimization, may not know. (Academic)

Victims need options from which to select a course of action. (Community)

Victims need to be able to decide what is best for them and their family. (Community)

Victims should be able to make informed choices. (Government)

Specialized services: It was largely agreed that many victim/survivors needed resources that were specialized based on their individual needs as well as their particular situational and demographic characteristics. Specifically, services need to be specialized depending on the type of victimization because the needs of victims differ, for example, when violence is relational compared to when it occurs between strangers. Some of the needs of those who suffer from crimes that are typically perpetrated in private (e.g. sexual assault, domestic violence) may be different from the needs of those who have been victimized in public (e.g. public and workplace violence). Furthermore, services need to be provided based on the age categories of victims because child victims have different needs than do adult victims. Services need to be specialized according to the gender of the victim and some argued this was important for male victims because their rate of victimization was lower and, as a result, there tends to be less support/services available for them. Finally, participants across the three sectors expressed the importance of specialized services for victims that take into account specific cultural and language needs, arguing that currently such considerations were not adequately being met.

Complications vary across every victim type so we need to specialize. There is a very low reporting rate and a huge stigma for victims who are sexually assaulted and victims of intimate partner violence. Immigrants even with English proficiency still need specialization because we cannot assume they are comfortable with English. Things still may not be communicated to the police. Aboriginal community, immigrants, and different cultures all have specialized needs. We need to think of these needs for these groups. (Community)

Different victims will have some needs that are different. Different needs based on whether a sexual assault victim or random act of violence. Individual needs depend on what they suffered. (Government)

Provision of practical resources: Victims/survivors need practical resources that go beyond addressing the specific violent occurrences to help them address other issues in their lives that prevent them from escaping the violence or recovering from experiences such as information on child protection, housing, pay equity and employment issues and so on.

Some women experience oppression by extreme violence, but resources also needs to include pay equity and other categorizations. We need to look at how violence is established and maintained. Some don't experience ongoing control over their lives. They may be traumatized, but it doesn't necessarily come from the same place. (Community)

They need practical support such as information from police, advocacy (child protection, health care, crown, housing supports). Sometimes victims don't seek help because they are afraid the services will report their victimization to the criminal justice system. Community based programs are best to respond to specialized crime types because victims need so much advocacy and therefore we need to push the system. (Community)

Informal networks: All participants agreed that victims/survivors often rely heavily on their informal networks for support rather than reporting the victimization to formal agencies. However, there has been little emphasis on documenting who comprises victims' informal networks which is a significant gap given that there is a need to collaborate with victims' informal networks to raise awareness in communities, especially for those victims who are not currently accessing resources. Specifically, one goal could be to help communities and informal networks become more coordinated and educated regarding the formal resources available to assist victims/survivors because they can then act as a gateway of sorts for victims who need to access these services for support. Informing and educating community and informal networks is also an important mechanism for exposing myths or stereotypes that continue to blame the victim for their role in their own victimization experiences. It was suggested that, while documenting formal resources is an important goal, taking a similar approach to the documentation of informal resources would only enhance such an initiative.

The reality is that victims first tell their friends or family and this social group has not been targeted by the government. (Academic)

Victims say that there needs to be more public education because their family and friends never told them about hotlines or shelters for battered women. An ordinary woman in the community who is a victim does not know about the resources available. We need to address this problem. (Community)

Information: It was touched on in some of the above themes, but given its prominence, it requires distinct mention. It is clear from the above and from the overall tone of both the roundtable and full plenary discussions that a core set of needs common to all victims/survivors is information. Victims/survivors must be provided with or have access to basic information that will help them make informed decisions. This information can come from formal support agencies, informal networks, communities, and so on. The source did not appear to be as important as the fact that it needs to come to victims/survivors from somewhere or someone.

Respect for dignity is the first step; then with information they can make informed decisions. (Academic)

Victims need options from which to select a course of action and they need information about their options. (Community)

We need general information related to their survival and the criminal justice system. We need information regarding their case, and the longer term needs of the victim and counseling. (Government)

In short, it was largely agreed that victims/survivors have basic common needs but, at the same time, each has individual needs that can stem from varying and often unique factors or situations. Key terms to describe the core needs, drawing from the roundtable and full plenary discussions were: immediacy/timely response, appropriateness, support, information, respect, emotional and physical safety, autonomy, empowerment, validation, and cultural/religious needs. Victims' differing needs were argued to stem from such factors as whether or not they were

primary or secondary victims, female or male, child or adult victims, victims from particular cultures, race/ethnicity or type of victimization.

Are there resources currently available to meet common needs?

After discussing the core set of needs and/or resources, participants discussed whether or not they felt that current resources were meeting these needs. Three key issues dominated this discussion: (1) The need for holistic, foundational responses; (2) Geographic equity of resources available; and (3) Continuing need for specialized services.

Addressing holistic, foundational needs: Most were in agreement that current resources need to go beyond the narrow, short-term response and move towards a more holistic approach that strives to address the basic, long-term needs of victims and seeks to address the underlying root or structural causes of such violence, particularly against female victims in cases of intimate partner and sexual violence (e.g. gender inequalities). These resources would need to address some basic and more practical needs, some of which were noted above (e.g. housing, employment, childcare) with the emphasis being on harm rather than violence (and what is typically physical forms of violence). These long-term responses need to recognize the importance of social, economic, and political factors such as social housing and affordable legal advice that can help victims/survivors recover over the long-term. In short, the majority of participants agreed that it was time to move beyond the crisis model when responding to victims/survivors of violence because these individuals need long-term help as much as short-term interventions if they are to effectively deal with and recover from violence in their lives.

The crisis model is too short-term; it just gets them through criminal justice system. (Government)

I'm always confronting not knowing where to draw the boundaries. Are they broad or are they specific? It's easy to identify shelters, but how do you address social housing or availability of low-cost lawyers? They may be peripheral, but they are fundamental. (Academic)

If violence against women was domination against women as a whole, they would require social, economic, and political support. If we don't, all we will ever do is continue the domination. (Community)

We need to move away from the crisis model – “here are some resources and now you're better.” (Academic)

Geographic equity of resources: All sectors noted that the availability of resources to meet victim needs differed geographically. Specifically, resources were perceived to be limited for victims residing in rural areas. It was felt that this stemmed, in part, from the fact that many rural victims seeking resources did not want to be serviced within their area out of fear of being identified by a fellow community member. It was noted, though, that available rural services can often be thorough when providing information to the victims that they do serve.

Geographically, no, they are not there for a lot of Canadians. They don't have the services or the money to provide support. It's often decided by per capita basis; women in the North are not going to get the same level of service as women in larger urban areas, such as Toronto, but in Toronto, there would be different problems. Consider the diversity of the community, etc. We have a long way to go if we are going to include all victims. (Community)

Most victims in small communities want to talk to someone out of their community so they are comfortable. (Academic)

There are challenges in northern communities because they [the communities] want locals to work at the services but then the victims don't want to talk to someone they know, they want someone from outside. (Government)

The challenge of specialized services: Following up on the need mentioned above regarding specialized victim services, it was argued by some that there were not enough resources to meet the basic needs of victims more generally because of continuing attempts to specialize. In essence, it was argued by some that the more one attempts to understand a particular type of specialization, the more factors we uncover that we feel need to be addressed in a specialized manner.

We are always developing responses for specialized needs, the same-sex community, for example. There is always a differentiation; a never-ending thing. As we learn more, we recognize additional things, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome, for example. There is always another response. Resources always fall behind the expanding needs. Every time we do some research, we always find something new. (Government)

The common consensus appeared to be that there are resources out there to meet victim needs, but not enough services to meet the different and specialized individual needs of victims. As one participant highlighted above, resources are always falling behind the ever-expanding needs. However, it was also noted that while services/resources were available, more collaboration among organizations, service providers and across sectors would help ensure the more effective delivery of the resources that are available.

Summary

Drawing both the roundtable and full plenary discussions, several key issues were identified as requiring consideration when defining 'victim/survivor resources'. First, it was largely agreed that a broad definition of services and resources should be adopted that is client-centred or victim-centred, not just criminal justice centred. As part of this broad definition, a more holistic approach was felt to be necessary that would place the victim at the centre of discussions and that would adopt a human harm perspective of violence, rather than the criminal justice perspective. Adopting the human harm approach, responding agencies would be able to consider the role played by the social determinants of violence including the social, political and economic context within which the perpetuation of violence and harm occurs. This approach

would also comprise a human rights' perspective that recognizes violence and the provision of resources needs to be examined through an anti-discrimination and anti-oppression lens.

Using the above approach, then, a definition of 'victim/survivor resources' would reflect the full range of services available; the full range of victims, including primary and secondary victims, witnesses to violence, as well as those close to primary and secondary victims; and, finally, the full range of experiences, including a consideration of the intersectional nature of these experiences that acknowledges differences as well as commonalities in how violence is experienced. The definition would describe or encompass a coordinated, integrated system (or the desire for such) that includes policies, legislation, social and health services/resources, financial services, funding agencies, housing and employment services, and so on. In doing so, the definition would acknowledge the relationship between resources and the communities in which they exist by considering the role played by informal information and support systems, non-service support systems, services for perpetrators, and public education.

Adopting the above approach means that we are documenting a definition of resources that considers various elements and incorporates services/resources that are housed inside and outside the criminal justice context, provides direct and indirect resources to victims/survivors of violence, and includes resources that are invested in ending, not just responding, to violence.

II. WHAT ARE THE DATA GAPS AND NEEDS?

The most comprehensive data source in Canada that currently documents victim/survivor resources is gathered by Statistic Canada's Victim Services Survey (VSS). Findings from its third cycle (2007/2008) were released just prior to the workshop and were presented by Susan McDonald for the author (Sauvé 2009). The VSS is conducted to gather information about facilities that provide services to primary and secondary victims of crime. Each cycle of the survey covers the previous 12 months of operation for each agency and the characteristics of clients that received services on a specific snapshot day. Services included in the survey are those funded, at least in part, by the justice ministry. It is administered using a mailed questionnaire and the most recent cycle achieved an 87 percent response rate. The VSS collects information on the service providers, including expenditures and staff as well as a profile of the clients served and annual information in addition to the data collected on the snapshot day. The survey determined that four out of 10 victim service respondents were police-based. About 79 percent of the agencies were able to work with clients in a language other than English or French through informal interpreters; 95 percent were able to accommodate victims with mobility issues; 88 percent of the services could accommodate victims with mental disabilities; and, finally, 23 percent had programs specifically for Aboriginal peoples. The majority of services (43%) offered services to victims of specific types of crime with the most common service being the provision of general information and emotional support for victims. The total cost of providing services to victims of crime during the survey year examined was \$178.7 million dollars. Three quarters of the victim services had volunteers working for them; over 80 percent of services that responded expected employees to continue with training throughout their careers; and about 80 percent of the services provided future training for its employees in addition to providing training to about 70 percent of volunteers.

With respect to clients served, in 2007/2008, about 406,000 victims sought out services with women being three times more likely than men to receive services and the majority being victims of violent crime. About 5,300 victims were also registered with the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) to receive information about their offenders. CSC sent out approximately 15,000 notifications about offenders resulting in 244 victims making presentations at 139 National Parole Board hearings in 2007/2008. This represented an increase in the number of victim presentations which the National Parole Board attributes to new funding that can help pay travel costs for victims. The VSS will be revised and discussions will take place surrounding the identification of new information needs, accuracy of the actual content, and respondent burden when answering the questionnaire.

Beyond this national survey, there is currently no central database documenting resources for victims/survivors of violence that would provide a feasible starting point for this type of endeavour. Further, because information can vary both across and within provinces and territories, there is no consistency in the current documentation of resources at the provincial or local level. This is a significant gap in research because the majority of responses in the national survey were received from government-based agencies and, as such, non-government or community-based agencies may be underrepresented. In contrast, police-based agencies comprised the largest number of respondents (42%). DeLeon-Granados and Wells' (2003) argue that there is an overemphasis on criminal justice services, ignoring the wide diversity of community-based resources and non-profit organizations that offer direct and indirect assistance to individuals experiencing violence.

Because of concerns about particularly vulnerable groups and their ability to access resources, before turning to the roundtable discussions, Holly Johnson, University of Ottawa, presented on the *Intersections Among Vulnerabilities and Resources for Victims/Survivors of Partner Violence*. Particular vulnerabilities can overlap with risk factors for victims of intimate partner violence, but vulnerabilities can also be distinct from risk factors. Vulnerabilities are concerns that can increase the risk of repeat intimate partner violence and increase the impacts of intimate partner violence when it occurs. They can include mental health problems, income security, disability, discrimination, racism, housing vulnerabilities, and social exclusion. Many of these vulnerabilities are referred to as 'justiciable problems' which are defined as problems that exist at the intersection of law and everyday adversity where there is a potential for legal remedies but there are also other possible and maybe preferable courses of action (see Currie, 2007). Some examples of justiciable problems are those related to debt, income assistance, immigration, family law and personal injury. In 2006, Justice Canada conducted a telephone survey of 6,665 people and found that 45 percent of adults reported at least one justiciable problem. Legal problems can trigger both legal and non-legal problems. Single parents, people with disabilities, visible minorities, the unemployed, and those on social assistance are most likely to experience justiciable problems, suggesting a link between justiciable problems and social exclusion. Some of the justiciable problems form in clusters such as relationship breakdown; other family law problems; consumer debt and threat of legal action; personal injury, debt and unemployment and consumer, debt, and legal action.

There has not been much research examining the connection between homelessness as a justiciable problem and intimate partner violence, except for highlighting the high prevalence of

abuse among homeless women and the lack of alternative housing options for women fleeing violence. The relationship between homelessness and intimate partner violence is bi-lateral whereby intimate partner violence can lead to homelessness and homelessness can increase the chances of intimate partner violence. Women who experience intimate partner violence are four times more likely to experience housing instability, underscoring the fact that many housing problems are gendered. For example, women are more likely to be renters, affordability is a bigger problem for women, nearly half of single mothers are in core housing need, and there is a lack of affordable safe housing for women who want to leave violent relationships. Women who are abused also often experience discrimination when trying to find housing because of the abuse, especially Aboriginal women who experience further discrimination because of their race/ethnicity. Landlords are reluctant to rent to women coming from shelters and many people blame the victims for the violence they are experiencing. Landlords are also concerned about receiving rent and problems that could arise from violent partners. Stressors and vulnerabilities such as housing, mental health, poverty and social exclusion can intersect to cause substance abuse. Some of the stressors and vulnerabilities linked to substance abuse are specific to women, such as, violence, trauma, the role of women as mothers, stigma, lack of funding, lack of recognition of the need for women-centered responses, and lack of support for harm reduction approaches.

Immigrant women and women of different cultures experience intimate partner violence differently than other women. The batterer response to intervention, including if and how they accept responsibility, may be different for different cultures. Culture also shapes access to services for victims, children and perpetrators. The pre-migration and post-migration experience as well as immigration status may all have an effect on how women experience intimate partner violence. Therefore, it is crucial to know how services/resources can be better coordinated to reduce these vulnerabilities experienced by victims of intimate partner violence and an attempt to coordinate policies and agencies with the criminal justice system and other social service agencies should be made in order to alleviate the vulnerabilities experienced by victims of intimate partner violence and to prevent any triggering effects.

Drawing on the above presentations and building on the working definition of 'victim/survivor resources,' the next step in the roundtable discussions was to determine, first, if any existing data sources are reliable and valid, even if incomplete, that can be built upon, and, second, to identify the remaining gaps and needs. The second goal of the workshop addressed this issue by asking participants to identify what we currently know about victim/survivor resources and to discuss their knowledge of what is already being collected that could be built upon in future efforts. Sub-questions that guided the discussions included:

- How are we collecting victim/survivor resource information now? Is it an appropriate approach?
- What may be some of the (un)intended consequences of how we are collecting data?
- What data is currently available on victim resources? What do these data look like? Who is currently collecting these data and for what purposes?

- Are there existing data that provide foundational information that can be built upon?
- What are the data gaps that can be addressed by data collection in the future?
- From where or whom can data be collected?
- Are current data collection initiatives capturing what we want to capture?
- Are they accessible to those who need them (i.e. community, government, researchers)?
- What are the resource issues (e.g. time, personnel) that may pose a challenge to data collection and what are other potential obstacles (e.g. confidentiality issues, privacy issues, geographic or jurisdictional boundaries) that will need to be addressed?

Various data sources were identified as contributing or having the potential to contribute to more systematic and consistent collection of data on victim/survivor resources. For example, the following data sources were identified: 211 Ontario, Statistics Canada's General Social Survey on Victimization and the Transition Home Survey, surveys from sexual assault centres, and client satisfaction surveys. However, a number of important issues were identified in discussions about these current data systems, including that no current methodological approach is without its limitations in documenting the availability of victim/survivor resources and, further, that current data systems are largely inconsistent in their documentation of these resources. Therefore, regardless of what is currently available, concerns were raised about building on current data systems if they were already flawed in particular ways. To capture this discussion, we first discussed what was identified by participants as the primary needs and gaps based on what we know about data currently being collected. This is followed by a summary of the challenges of building on and/or collecting data on victim/survivor resources. With respect to primary needs/gaps, key themes discussed were: (1) Capturing victim/survivor perspectives; (2) Lack of data/research on rural service provision; (3) Longitudinal data not emphasized; and (4) Victims who access resources in unconventional or informal ways.

Capturing victim/survivor perspectives: A dominant theme of these discussions related to the intrinsic value in gathering information *from* victims and not just about victims yet, it was agreed, that this was an area of data collection or research that lacked any formal or systematic examination. While victim feedback is currently requested by many agencies through client exit or satisfaction surveys, for example, more focus needs to be placed on asking victims different and more beneficial questions about services such as what resources are meeting their needs and what is not available to them that would be helpful. Victim confidentiality was identified as one key barrier to capturing information from victims. Several representatives from each of the three sectors suggested that in order to counteract this problem, victims need to be approached and invited to participate. It was further argued that many women would be interested in participating if they felt that the results would be beneficial to them in some manner. One way this could be demonstrated is to make sure victims are informed as to whether and how their participation resulted in improvements to the existing state of victim resources. Most agreed that efforts to capture victim perspectives was important to documenting their personal experiences with

accessing services, their needs and wants from services, and how the policies/services have impacted their lives in both the short- and long-term. However, recognizing remaining cultural and language barriers that need to be overcome will be crucial to moving forward with such research. If these barriers are not overcome, particular victim populations will continue to be underrepresented in this research. One participant concisely summarized the situation by saying, 'We don't know what victims really want – do they want more services or do they want structural change.'

We don't know the impact of policies, perspectives, programs, and services from the victim's perspective. (Academic)

We need information about needs for services. What's the motivation for victims who do contact state services (e.g. not all women who call the police necessarily want the man to be arrested)? (Academic)

Lack of data/research on rural service provision: Several participants expressed concern about the lack of consideration for victims residing in rural communities or regions, arguing that these victims do not get the same level of service as other areas (i.e. urban centres). This occurs despite the fact that rural victims often face additional and unique issues related to their geographic location and lifestyle which are not taken into consideration. For example, women in rural communities may have to travel long distances to access resources and they often face further obstacles that prevent them from leaving violent relationships such as having the responsibility to maintain the family farm or lack of childcare options. For these and other reasons, some argued that data collection is also needed in rural areas to get a better picture of unreported victimization rates. Doing so is necessary in smaller communities because victims who reside in these areas may be less likely to report their victimization because they feel that no real action will be taken. If resource provision is inadequate, their perceptions may be valid. Finally, victims/survivors in rural or small communities are concerned about the anonymous nature of any data being collected given that they may often know those who are providing the services/resources which poses particular challenges for gathering information from victims/survivors.

We should get some data about people who live in rural areas and the extent of victimization which may never be reported because they feel nothing may be done about it. (Community)

Jurisdictional boundaries can cause problems for women who want more private services. (Academic)

Longitudinal data on victims not emphasized: It was argued that there is a need to collect longitudinal data on victims/survivors of violence so that it can be determined what sort of impact the violence and their use of resources available to them has on individuals over time. These data would allow an examination of whether victims are more likely to be re-victimized or become an offender in the future and the role that resources may play in determining such outcomes. Simply put, by carrying out longitudinal research, it would be possible to see if providing services to victims is beneficial to their well being over time.

What impact does services have on kids who are abused to stop them from becoming abusers and future victimization and do general victim services have an impact on children exposed to violence? (Community)

All these boys who are now men who were victimized by people in authority; there could be hundreds and then they go on to marry. We need to think about that and consequences as a whole, are they more likely to victimize their children and partners or susceptible to alcohol abuse? (Government)

We should also look at victims after the crisis and victims further into life because there is no information after the crisis. (No sector specified)

Victims who access help in unconventional or informal ways: Some victims do not identify themselves as victims, as discussed above, therefore when they seek help related to their experiences, they may perceive their needs to be unrelated to violence and stemming from other issues or situations (e.g. depression, substance use). As such, participants felt that it was important to find ways to collect data on victims who access resources related to their victimization through unconventional access points such as mental health or substance abuse programs. Similarly, while arguably more normal than unconventional for many victims/survivors, there is also little information on informal support systems available to or accessed by victims. Several participants noted that there is a need to capture information about informal support services that victims use most commonly, or in specific situations, that can provide a better understanding of how such supports may be filling in the gaps where formal services are absent or their needs in particular areas have been overlooked.

There's a huge chunk of victims who don't use services because they don't want to define themselves as victims; [they may] go to hospitals, discuss depression. Some victims enter system in different ways, and never get to that step of using the criminal justice system. We don't know about the victims that enter different ways like through the hospital. (Academic)

It would be good to get people like doctors or ministers who see victims that the criminal justice doesn't see to take in data on how they are helping victims. (Academic)

With respect to the second key focus of these discussions, key themes identified were: (1) Difficulties accessing/sharing data; (2) Existing data not used effectively; (3) Uncoordinated and/or inconsistent data collection; (4) Services collect data for own records; (5) Emphasis on quantitative over qualitative data; (6) Time commitment/constraints/resources; (7) Difficulties accessing data on victims who access system outside the justice system; and, (8) Difficulties standardizing data sources.

Difficulties accessing/sharing data: Various participants, primarily academics, expressed concerns about difficulties often faced when they try to access data or information about victims because those who hold this information may not want to share these data. The

reluctance to share may stem from a variety of reasons, according to participants, particularly from fears that this will result in others gaining access to victims' private information. As a result, agencies (e.g. government, police, or community services) are often cautious when providing information for research purposes because of concerns about privacy rights of victims and, further, that access to these data will result in negative findings and subsequent criticisms by the general public. This theme relates to an overarching theme that was present throughout the workshop: that more collaboration and cooperation is needed if efforts to document victim/survivor resources are to be successful.

We have more recently tried to find out what kind of information is gathered in what form. "We don't want to tell you because we don't want the police to know because then the police can subpoena." It is a conundrum for them. (Academic)

There is also the confidentiality wall. Even within the ministries there is a need for the protection and privacy of the individuals involved. That can create obstacles for data collection in many regards. (Academic)

Data should bridge between services, resources and information; not separate each piece of the response. (Government)

Regionally-specific; it's a fractured system. There isn't that sharing of information. Health boards do deal with violence, but we would never get that information. (Academic)

Existing data not being used effectively: Most participants agreed that there is a significant amount of data that have been collected through client feedback surveys, government surveys and through other efforts that has great potential for contributing to research and knowledge. However, it is not being analyzed because it is not being shared for the reasons just discussed or because researchers are not aware of it. Both community and government participants noted that victims of violence have provided consistently negative feedback about their experiences with the criminal justice system. In discussing the use of these data, though, community participants expressed frustrations with academics and other researchers (e.g. government) who have a tendency not to follow up with them regarding the results of these data that they collected related to the community services.

For us, a lot of times, people who want to research try to come in. They come in and ask questions and we don't know what happens to that data after. (Community)

Women talk about how criminal justice system failed them and this never gets taken up anywhere. (Community)

We track files by new cases. They could be working with those people for four or five years, but they're only counted once, as a new case. (Government)

To summarize: the way data is collected misrepresents where resources are needed. The lack of detail doesn't allow for what the actual needs are for the people they're serving. (Academic)

It is difficult to measure what is going on because data may not be collected for research purposes. (Academic)

Uncoordinated and inconsistent data collection: It was agreed that data collection documenting victims/survivor resources is highly fragmented among different jurisdictions, levels of actors, and within victim/survivor services. This results in 'missing pieces' or gaps in the descriptions of available victim/survivor resources. For example, there is little effort to document what agencies or resources victims/survivors of violence are being referred to and, further, if referred, whether they actually follow up on these referrals. One participant noted that 'we don't have data which is exhaustive; where are people coming from, etcetera. This has been bugging us. The research which is done is not exhaustive.' Another contributor again noted that the lack of collaboration and communication resulted in inconsistent data collection as well as to problematic interpretations of available data because data sources are not interconnected in any systematic way. Ultimately, participants indicated that they feel the fragmentation results in an ineffective use of financial resources overall. Furthermore, rather than sharing data as one way to link services together, individual pockets of data are instead being concealed from services, actors, jurisdictions and others who are all supposed to be working towards similar goals and addressing the needs of victims/survivors. One person noted that 'everyone is speaking different languages; data should act as a bridge between services, resources and information, not separate out each piece of the response.'

So we can say that there is a lot of consultation and discussion, but it has not been developed to a level that it is standardized. (Academic)

While discussing existing data collection efforts within jurisdictions, it was evident that the types of data collected were not consistent across jurisdictions and/or levels of government. For instance, one participant noted that one province funds data collection related to shelters whereas a second province does not fund this type of data collection. Furthermore, it was noted that there is no national government database containing information from all shelter services despite the existence of the Transition Home Survey. Community and academic participants also expressed concerns about governments who micro-manage data and, as a result, the information contained in various data sources tend not to result in any meaningful changes or improvements to resource provision. One participant suggested that 'we need to put in place a pilot study so one day we might have a common tool which we can use to collect data; otherwise data from diverse organizations might never be comparable.' Finally, all agreed and emphasized that collaboration and information sharing is necessary to bridge these gaps. As noted above, many individuals, groups, agencies are speaking different languages and the data should act as a link among these sectors, not a divider.

The government tries to get services to get client forms out by each service. Some don't do it, or forget or [a] new person comes in, so it doesn't always get done. (Government)

I'm puzzled. Comprehensive data set on accused. It is incredibly valuable, but I don't have any way to link to the victim services data. (Academic)

We need to have some mechanism of connecting victim services data and offender data. Need a wrap-around service for women who are living in crisis. (Academic)

Services collect data for own records: Community participants indicated that they collect data on their clients for their own purposes, not necessarily related to research goals. When discussing the possibility of sharing data with one another, some noted that this would be a difficult task for services to take on because they do not have the funding to carry out this level of research. This issue will be returned to below.

Our data is collected for our purposes, not for research, but research is important. We can do more. (Community)

Emphasis on quantitative over qualitative data: Participants from all three sectors noted concerns about the heavy reliance on quantitative research as the primary methodology used to document victim/survivor resources. They argued that there is a need for more qualitative data which can help capture many important contextual factors such as why some victims do not use resources or how clients perceive the quality of the services they have accessed for addressing their needs. One participant noted that we are missing a 'huge piece of data on why aren't people reporting? What about those who don't contact the criminal justice system?' Put another way, participants from all sectors argued that current data collection efforts tend to focus on ineffective research questions that produce information not beneficial to those served or to those who provide services and fails to capture the context of these responses. It was recognized that there is a tendency to rely on the use of surveys to collect information regarding resources for victims/survivors of violence and that government and individual client services conduct client satisfaction surveys for their own data collection purposes that are often quantitative in emphasis. These data are rarely or not effectively used or analyzed, in large part due to resources required to do so, an issue discussed next.

Not to put down quantitative data, but there's too much reliance on that. We have small numbers where we live so there are data challenges to begin with and without a good qualitative supplement, this is a problem. (Government)

The way data is collected misrepresents where resources are needed. The lack of [qualitative] detail doesn't allow for what the actual needs are for the people they're serving. (Academic)

We find the qualitative data most useful. (Community)

Time commitment/constraints/resources: Despite the recognition that consistent documentation of victim/survivor resources is an important endeavor, concerns were expressed about the level of time commitment often expected of service providers, in particular, who are asked to provide data on victims served. To counter the time commitment issue, one suggestion was a one-day snapshot from non-government organizations that deal directly with victims of

violence which could help illuminate how to strengthen the data collection process. It was noted that using surveys to collect and expand upon the data collection process was extremely time consuming and community participants, in particular, felt that when collecting data using surveys, consideration must be given to the amount of time it will take to prepare, train and implement the changes that may take place. In short, research needs to be ‘service provider friendly,’ including making it accessible to those who can benefit, ensuring that those being asked to provide information understand the research that is being conducted, making sure that training is provided for those asked to help conduct the research and, finally, that efforts are made by researchers to report back to them with their findings when complete. In summary, it was felt that when conducting research with the help of service providers, it should not burden them. One participant suggested that it might be a good idea to offer additional funding to those services who are asked to participate in research as part of a larger research agenda.

I think some accommodations need to be made by provincial funders in regards to reporting time frame. It would be good if there were not the same expectations around number of hours. (Community)

One problem in the communities is that shelters don’t want to sign on to five years of data collection because it’s too much of a time commitment in collecting data. (Academic)

The surveys just become another labour. (Government)

We fill out tons of reports all the time – I hate them – but we have to do them and nobody really cares. (Government)

Difficulties accessing data on victims outside the criminal justice system: It was noted that it is often difficult to collect data that captures both formal and informal entry points for victims accessing resources. It was suggested that one possibility to address this issue might be to request that other departments who do not deal directly with victims are included on the Victim Services Survey data collection, for example, to get a better picture of where victims may be accessing resources, if not through conventional channels. Several disagreed with this suggestion, however, arguing that data collection needs to be limited to only those resources or services that directly deal with victims of violence. Some consensus on what resources or services this would be is required.

We have good surveys, but they are only justice related and other areas that are not justice related need to be collected. Is it fair to ask the Department of Health to expand on it? We should use the VSS and shop it around to other departments (immigration, health, community services, public health agencies). (Government)

We can ask non-government organizations to try to get a snapshot [on] how can we make data collection better. However, we should not expand this snapshot to the point where we are surveying social services agencies who don’t really deal with victims of violence. If we are going to survey NGOs, we should keep it limited to a core group that directly deals with victims of violence. (Community)

Difficulties standardizing data sources: Linking existing data sources collected by different actors, services, levels of government and so on would be a monumental task given that the current state of data collection appears to be fragmented and not standardized across agencies and, in some cases, within sectors. In addition, determining the best method to collect data among all those concerned would be difficult especially when some groups may disagree with a chosen methodology. A possible solution to address the standardization of data is to have a central government service for agencies/services to contact when questions regarding data collection arise in order to ensure a consistent response.

We need to know how they count number of people served; for example, do they count just by one person or [do they count] by how many people are in the family. If every time you see the victim, do you take that as one point of service or if you see them five times is that five victim contacts. (Government)

There are turf wars about data quality of different systems and how to collect information. (Government)

In summary, when thinking about a starting point for data collection, building on current data systems was not viewed by some as an effective starting point for various reasons, including that many data sources adopt a narrow criminal justice focus; include primarily those resources that have government investments and not those with community and informal investments; place greater value on quantitative and specific methodological forms and tools (e.g. forced choice survey data); and for which the purpose of data collection and documentation is often for accountability rather than for research or larger goals. In contrast, others suggested that there is good research currently being conducted to measure the effectiveness of services funded by provincial, territorial, and federal governments as well as national and provincial surveys with some basic data that may offer a sound foundation upon which to build.

It was concluded, though, that there was a need to distinguish between ‘research’ and ‘data collection.’ The latter is often for specific accountability goals whereas the former provides an opportunity to focus on broader research questions that can benefit victims and communities. However, it was noted that there are also often political implications to both research and data collection; put simply, if we ask questions, we have to deal with the results of asking the questions.

Evening Keynote Address – *Map of Gaps*

The evening keynote address was provided by Dr. Liz Kelly, Professor and Director, Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University, who was one of three researchers involved in the groundbreaking Map of Gaps project (*see context paper, Appendix B*). Using GIS technology, the Map of Gaps project illustrates that, despite the fact that over three million women experience violence in the United Kingdom each year, a large portion of these women are unable to access basic support services to deal with their violent experiences. Instead, their ability to access adequate services is contingent upon the postcode they reside in, since victim resources are not equitably distributed across regions. The study focused on only

those agencies or organizations primarily focused on violence and who provide direct support to female victims of violence. The data were obtained through questionnaires distributed to the sample of service providers, from published listings of services and resources, as well as interviews with umbrella organizations. An internet search was also conducted in an effort to include as many services as possible that met the requirements of the study.

The results from the first phase of Map of Gaps (2007) demonstrated for the first time that the “postcode lottery” of services available to women who experienced violence; specifically, results showed that one third of the jurisdictions in the United Kingdom were lacking specialized services relating to violence against women. The study found that the presence of rape crisis centres were minimal since most women were unable to access these services from where they were residing. Less than one quarter of the jurisdictions had services to support victims of sexual violence and about one third lacked services specific to domestic violence. Furthermore, Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) women were found to often face additional obstacles when accessing supports and, as a result, may be at further risk of experiencing specific types of violence. Specifically, BME women were at an additional disadvantage when seeking out the support of specialized services since less than one in 10 jurisdictions reported having services that were suitable to address specific forms of violence such as forced marriage, female genital mutilation, threats against immigration status, and crimes made in the name of honour. Finally, less than one in 10 jurisdictions had services available to address the needs of women involved in prostitution. These findings were particularly problematic for those involved in the violence against women sector since many of these agencies were already strained in terms of resources or had been forced to close their doors due to the commissioning process. Overall, the authors concluded that only a limited number of jurisdictions were equipped with adequate service provisions to address the needs of women who had experienced violence and, further, that a number of areas were not equipped to meet the needs of this population.

The impact from the first phase of this project resulted in a number of responses from different actors/sectors who had a stake in the findings’ implications. The violence against women sector was able to advance the position that these services were often under resourced, while also facilitating discussions relating to the unintended consequences of local commissioning. Reactions from politicians were mixed, with some questioning the validity of the findings and others becoming enlightened to the situation, which motivated them to address the problem within their constituency. In 2009, a follow up study was conducted to determine whether there were any notable changes in service provision, particularly in areas that were originally identified as underserved. While some jurisdictions did show some overall improvement, more than one quarter of the jurisdictions still lacked any sort of specialized violence against women support services. BME women continued to be underserved with only one in 10 jurisdictions having services that were appropriate to dealing with the unique challenges they often faced. The circumstances regarding the lack of services available to women involved in prostitution remained unchanged with less than one in 10 jurisdictions having sufficient service provision to address this population. The findings of the 2009 study also demonstrated the consequences of commissioning which centred upon granting based on need, resulting in smaller scale VAW services being unable to compete for large-scale contracts. Many smaller scale services were pressured to merge and, consequently, their unique provision

and expertise were lost. Standardized models were implemented, but without any specialized expertise, the authors concluded that these services were no longer able to provide the depth of support needed to adequately meet the needs of certain female victims of violence. Finally, while there were new violence against women services created in 2008, 60 percent of these services were within the statutory (i.e. criminal justice) sector thereby responding primarily to cases that were reported to the criminal justice system, overlooking the majority of incidences where female victims chose not to report the violence to the police. In contrast, the provision levels within the voluntary/third sector remained static and, in some areas, had declined due to lack of funding. This is particularly problematic given that this sector provides a wider range of services that often address the needs that remain unmet by the statutory sector.

The UK research received extensive media coverage and their findings have promoted other research in the area of violence against women using GIS mapping such as efforts to chart the distance that women travel in order to access shelter services, for example. The authors concluded that it is vital that national and local governments take immediate action in order to ensure that all women who have experienced violence are able to access specialized services when and where they need it. They recommend that national governments create a national funding strategy that would ensure adequate funding for specialized services that focus on violence against women. Furthermore, they urge local governments to secure funding for independent services as well as those services that specialize in addressing the needs of females who have been subjected to violence.

III. DEFINING AND COLLECTING DATA ON INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE RESOURCES

Building on the first day's discussions that focused on the documentation of victims of violence resources more generally, the second day narrowed the focus specifically to intimate partner violence to determine what benefits and/or challenges stemmed from focusing on one type of violence or one type of victim when documenting resources. To set the context for this discussion, Myrna Dawson, University of Guelph, discussed the challenges and benefits to using intimate partner violence as a case study for documenting resources for victims/survivors of violence. One key reason for using this type of violence as a case study for documenting resources stems from the fact that intimate partner violence has been a key focus of legislative, policy and program initiatives in Canada and many other countries in recent decades, but there has been no parallel effort to document what these resources and initiatives are which represents a gap in our knowledge. It is also important to look at intimate partner violence because the VSS found that women represented approximately three quarters of the victims served and 46 percent had been victimized by their current or former intimate partner. It is important to study this now because there is still little research on which services help victims, and are effective at reducing victimization rates. This cannot be done until we have more consistent and systematic knowledge of what is out there for such victims.

Research conducted in the United States has shown that the increase in victim/survivor resources in recent decades has coincided with decreases in certain types of violence. For example, as victim resources have increased, the homicide rates have declined for intimate partner homicides; however, decreases were larger for male victims, African Americans, and

married victims (Dugan et al. 2003). Overall communities with more resources experience less violence, but the results are varied by the victim and abuser characteristics. The resources that were measured as victim services/resources were existence of warrantless arrest laws, existence of mandatory arrest laws, consequences for violation of protection orders, existence of police domestic violence units, existence of in-service training for police, prosecutor willingness to prosecute protection order violations, existence of a domestic violence unit in prosecutor's office, the number of agencies with funding for legal advocacy, availability of hotlines, presence of counseling, bed capacity for those offering shelter concerns, protection orders for cohabitating victims, temporary custody of children to victims with protection orders, and firearms confiscation when protection orders are in place.

There are challenges to measuring victim/survivor services and resources because it is hard to capture all social, health, legal, community and other resources that may directly or indirectly help survivors of intimate partner violence. It is also hard to measure resources and to examine distributions of these resources because of the complex relationship between federal, provincial and local policies, a topic discussed below. Furthermore, as demonstrated in the above discussion, it can also be a challenge to reach a consensus on what is considered victim services/resources, how to collect data about such resources, who should collect these data, and how data are accessed. If only the availability of services was measured then it would be missing part of the story. It is also important to recognize that because there has previously been such an emphasis on resources in the criminal justice system, many other resources in the community have been forgotten. It is important to ensure all victim resources are included in any documentation initiative.

With respect to the relationship among available resources and federal, provincial and local policies, Michelle Lawrence and Margaret Jackson, Simon Fraser University, discussed the impact of criminal justice policy on the growth of intimate partner violence resources by describing the Canadian Observatory (CO) on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence Policy Scan project. According to the policy cycle, the intended purpose of a policy is to guide governments by establishing a balance between the tensions that exist between the values of individuals versus the values of society. Consequently, the policy intent that is produced demonstrates the action that is to be taken to ensure the stated value is balanced. However, a disjuncture may occur between the intent and the practice if the policy does not produce the anticipated effect and instead produces unintended outcomes because of unforeseen circumstances. In addition, a relationship exists between the policy and the direction and development of services. At the policy analysis stage, the goal is to determine whether the services/resources originally developed to achieve the intent are effective in doing so. If they are not effective in accomplishing the overall intent of the policy then the resources/services are considered ineffective.

The project seeks to combine and standardize, for comparative purposes, the policies in place in each Canadian province and territory relating to intimate partner violence. The forms of policies under investigation include legislation, Crown prosecution policy, and police policy. Each policy is to be assessed using evaluation criteria that evolved from recommendations from the 2003 Federal/Provincial/Territorial Working Group as well as other related policy items. In addition, comparisons will be undertaken to determine the degree of horizontal and vertical

consistency both within each jurisdiction and across jurisdictions. Moreover, the extent to which the policies address ethno-cultural communities will be examined. Ultimately, it is hoped that this undertaking will help to determine the degree in which operational policies reflect underlying social policies and to identify areas in need of further action.

The final presentation to lay the foundation for this roundtable discussion described the results of the most recent findings of the Transition Home Survey, 2007/2008 by Andrea Taylor-Butts, Statistics Canada. The Transition Home Survey (THS) is a census of all facilities known to be in operation in Canada, providing residential services to abused women and children. Its purpose is to collect information regarding the characteristics of these residential facilities and the services they provided during the previous 12 months and to provide a snapshot of the characteristics of those women and children who have used these facilities on the specified day of that year. The THS is administered every two years by mail to residential services for abused women across Canada. Participation is voluntary with a response rate of approximately 90 percent. The results indicate that the number of shelters available to abused women in Canada has grown from 18 shelters in 1975 to 569 shelters with almost half of the facilities providing transitional housing followed by emergency-type facilities for women. Although transition facilities have been the main point of entry between 2000 until 2008, this trend has been on the decline while the demand for admissions through emergency type facilities has been increasing. The rates of shelter admittance have remained relatively stable over the past 10 years with approximately 101,000 women and children using shelter services in a 12-month period.

The profile of the residents indicate that on a given day, 7,600 women and children were residing in shelters and about 80 percent of these shelter residents were attempting to flee an abusive situation. The majority of these women were fleeing from psychological and physical abuse by a common-law partner or spouse. Most women who were mothers had brought their children with them so children accounted for approximately half of the shelter residents and over two-thirds were under the age of 10 years old. Women with children often sought facilities that assisted in longer-term stays whereas women without children were more likely to turn to emergency facilities for shelter. While the majority (90%) of women leaving shelters reported that they did not intend to return to their abusive partners, the rates of re-entry suggest that about one quarter of women were caught in the cycle of abuse, typically returning to the facility within the year.

The profile of the facilities indicate that shelters typically provided services relating to the transportation, accompaniment and advocacy for its residents with many shelters expanding its services to former and non-residents. Some of these extended resources include providing telephone crisis support, safety and protection planning, short-term counseling and advocacy, and more than 62,000 inquiries were made monthly to shelters across Canada related to these services. On the snapshot day, one in five facilities had to refer women and children elsewhere resulting in 300 women and 150 children being turned away most often because the shelter had reached its capacity. While the THS produces results that have large coverage and a high response rate, it is not without its limitations. Its data is administrative and in aggregate form, it does not account for any seasonal discrepancies relating to capacity and does not report on outreach services used by former residents and non-residents.

These and many other challenges and benefits were highlighted during the roundtable discussions that focused on using intimate partner violence as a case study for understanding the feasibility of documenting resources as discussed below. It is obvious that participants perceived more challenges than benefits, but most agreed some type of narrowing of the focus would need to occur in order to more effectively examine the feasibility of documenting resources initially.

Benefits

All agreed that it was beneficial to narrow the focus to a particular type of victim or a specific type of violence because doing so may lead to a more specialized knowledge base that could provide more informed responses to victims/survivors and, in turn, may more effectively address the needs of those groups of victims. Put another way, to focus on the consistent needs of a particular type of victim could produce more focused and cost-effective solutions when responding to victims/survivors of violence. Capturing this view, one participant noted that the ‘more narrowly you define victims of crime, the better focused you will be’ and a second participant noted that ‘a benefit to narrowing is to better address the specific needs of the survivor, all of their needs are not the same.’

It was also noted that it would be beneficial to address other types of victims such as child victims/survivors of violence. Collecting longitudinal data on child witnesses and child victims of violence could provide a better understanding of what are the consequences of these early experiences on later adult outcomes as well as identify those resources that can encourage the development of healthy families, minimizing to some degree the likelihood that such children will offend in the future. Specifically, regarding child witnesses of domestic violence, by following them into adulthood, one can determine if there is an effect from witnessing violence against their mothers, for example, such as whether or not they are more likely to be in violent relationships in the future.

It might be good to be family-oriented instead of problem-oriented. You can help children from becoming abusers and women to get a healthy, safe life and help fathers to see that violence is not a part of healthy relationship. (Academic)

We may want to look at violence and abuse across the lifespan, there is a huge proportion of adults who are witnesses or are abused as children. (Community)

Challenges

All participants discussed the ongoing challenge of addressing intersecting needs. Many felt conflicted over whether it was best to specialize or broaden services because both alternatives would not satisfy the needs of every victim. The inclusion of intersecting needs was perceived as important, especially when working with intimate partner violence victims because they often have multiple and complex issues that help to perpetuate the violence. Thus, all the needs would have to be addressed if society is to respond effectively to their situations. Several possible solutions to addressing specific, intersecting as well as common needs of victims were identified. For example, it was suggested that those trained to do so (i.e. specialists of some sort) could make the initial decision as to whether the victim/survivor needed specialized attention or

resources. A second suggestion was that a meta-analysis could be conducted to determine what types of intersecting needs appeared to be most prevalent among which types of victims/survivors.

The challenge goes back to the intersection of needs; you can end up with very precise services that benefit no one. (Government)

If we have a broad definition, then it encompasses intersectionality whereas if it is too small and specific, then we don't have the capacity to address everything. (Community)

Various participants from each of the three sectors also felt that one of the challenges of narrowing the focus to a particular type of victim or violence was that it could result in a backlash of sorts because certain categories of victims would then be excluded in such an approach or receive less attention. Put another way, narrowing the focus to a particular type of victim may turn the focus of resource provision to dominant categories of victims while more specialized or less dominant types of victims are not emphasized, resulting in the elimination or loss of funding for these victims/survivors. Therefore, rather than working together for the common goal of supporting victims/survivors of violence, narrowing the focus may result in competition among services for funding and support.

Superficial analysis can result. These are present problems for social movements; for example, male-violence vs. female-violence. It creates oppositions within community and impairs meaningful dialogue. (Academic)

Resources may fall out of policy that may be too narrow. We don't want to forget stuff because attention can go to a certain kind of victim of crime, and other services that have been developed may have the funding pulled away. So they will defund. It is a competition for funding. (Community)

This concern was also noted in the full plenary discussion and, in particular, it was noted that narrowing the focus may lead to only those types of crimes that fall under criminal justice definitions being included. Victims who did not meet the formal *Criminal Code of Canada* definitional criteria may lose out on resources as a result. To address this problem, it was suggested that data should include those crimes/victimizations that do not meet the requirements for serious charges, but that lead to other issues such as health and social problems that exacerbated the victimization experience. There was also concern noted over those areas of victimization that often, but not always, cross over (for example, sexual assault and intimate partner violence) and, therefore, narrowing the focus may result in combining responses and/or funding even though they should be kept distinct in some cases. For example, if the focus was narrowed to domestic violence victims, those who experience sexual assault may lose out on present services and vice versa.

It's important to understand differences and similarities between sexual assault and intimate partner violence. Everything shouldn't be blended into one category. Sexual assault is more serious in terms of criminal sanctions. There are many cross issues

between sexual assault and intimate partner violence. Sexual assault survivors are left behind because of a focus on domestic violence. (Community)

A final challenge that exists when narrowing the focus to a particular type of victim or crime is that it may result in gender-neutral responses in which research and government responses to violence no longer focus or acknowledge the realities of particular victims, such as women, but instead have a backlash effect on them. One community participant expressed concern stating, 'If you narrow the focus of crime, you will get resistance from the criminal justice system. If you say you have to charge these guys, what we find is that they charge women.'

IV. WHAT ARE APPROPRIATE MEASURES OF RESOURCES?

Once victim/survivor resources are defined and current data sources identified, the challenge is to identify appropriate measures for levels of resource provision which may or may not be currently available, but will be important to documenting resources. While an important first step in the documentation process, *resource availability* is only one dimension of provision, representing a basic and somewhat crude measure of whether resources are distributed evenly among all victims/survivors and can be captured in various ways. However, more detailed measures of resource accessibility, utility, quality and other important characteristics of an organization or policy need to be identified as well. For example, *resource accessibility* measures might include average distance travelled by victims to access resources (particularly relevant for victims living in rural and/or remote areas) or whether a victim accesses services immediately or is put on a waiting list. *Resource utility* can be measured by the characteristics of those victims who are served which, in turn, can be compared to the characteristics of victims in the population. For example, an area might have a high concentration of Aboriginal victims/survivors, but a particular resource is found to serve only a minority of such victims. Such patterns can identify areas for further examination that can lead to more equitable access and use of resources for and by all victims/survivors. Once potential measures are identified, the first task will be to determine if it is feasible or even possible to collect such data.

As argued by Coy et al. (2009), documenting where services are and who they serve will provide only part of the story. Measures that capture the characteristics of the resources being examined will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the level of resources that are provided across jurisdictions. For example, documenting the existence of a shelter does not tell us the number of beds available, the services it offers in-house or in the community through outreach programs (all potential measures of resource quality). Documenting the availability of a specialized domestic violence police unit does not provide information as to the size of the unit (e.g. is it comprised of one full- or part-time police officer or 10 police officers with additional civilian support staff). Further, sexual violence services may exist in a jurisdiction, but they vary in availability from 24 hours a day, seven days a week to only a few days per week. Thus, the documentation process must move beyond availability, accessibility and utility to the *quality* of available resources in terms of size, breadth of services, and level of commitment relative to the population of victims/survivors they serve. Efforts by U.S. researchers to document the level of police or prosecutorial commitment is an example of this, recognizing that existing policies are

often implemented at the local level by various actors and, therefore, policy and/or resource implementation will vary across jurisdictions.

As such, the final goal of the workshop was to begin to identify some common available measures of resources that can build upon current information, focusing on intimate partner violence as a case study. Four sets of sub-questions that guided the discussions included:

(1) How should ‘resource availability’ be measured?

- Would a yes/no response be sufficient to identify whether resources exist in a particular region or community? How do we capture quantity of such resources?
- Do we want to know what the level of commitment is in terms of funding and staff available? Hours open? Or is this about resource accessibility or resource quality discussed next?

(2) How should ‘resource accessibility’ be measured?

- Should we ask about average distance traveled by victims/survivors to access resources?
- Do we measure whether victims/survivors are able to access services immediately or are put on waiting list?
- Are victims/survivors able to access their language of service, accommodation for any disabilities (e.g. hearing, sight, wheelchair access, etc.) and so on?

(3) How should ‘resource utility’ be measured?

- Do we measure utility in absolute numbers of victims/survivors served?
- Do we measure utility by numbers of victims/survivors served based on characteristics such as race/ethnicity, age, disability and so on compared to representation in the population?
- How well do resources respond to needs of victims/survivors and the needs of communities?

(4) What other resource characteristics can be measured?

- Should we consider existing policies and laws pertaining to violent victimization as ‘resources’ to be measured along with more concrete measures that often stem from these policies and laws?
- With respect to shelters, for example, is knowing availability enough or do we measure absolute number of beds available? Number of beds available compared to need measured by women on waiting list? Should we consider the number of women turned

away is an indicator of capacity to meet demand? Types of services offered? Do they offer outreach and internal services?

A theme that crosscuts the discussions with respect to each of the four sets of questions was the need to get information from the victims. One participant said, ‘we need to know, what do women actually use’ whereas another commented that we need to be ‘asking people what they actually do to seek help and from whom – then we have a map of the possible disconnect that may exist between what we offer and what they want.’ The value in such information is clear both in terms of research and policy and systematically documenting what resources is a crucial first step in such efforts. Below are some of the potential measures that were highlighted.

Measures of resource availability

Various measures of resource availability were identified including an inventory with a qualitative description of each service, a mapping system, the amount of available resources in general or dedicated to particular areas, wait times, and a bed/room count for shelters. Many agreed that availability of services in a community should be measured based on the geographic location of the community, paying particular attention to rural regions or communities. In particular, the distance required to travel to access services for those who live in rural neighborhoods was considered to be an important measure of availability and, some argued, accessibility. Related to this, it was noted that some measures of availability are similar to what might also be used to measure accessibility (discussed next), but that in the rural context, both measures were important because resources may be deemed as available to rural populations; however, they are not accessible because of the distance and other barriers often unique to rural populations. Specific mention was made about the geographic location of women who live in rural areas in relation to how these victims are limited in terms of availability of services since these areas tend to have limited hours of operation. In fact, one participant noted that the only 24-hour service available to rural victims was the police in some jurisdictions and another noted that, in their jurisdiction, the RCMP only operated during certain hours. Some other geographic concerns were voiced about rural communities and the quality of specialized services they receive and the reluctance of some rural women to seek out resources when available in their rural communities out of fear of being identified and, because of this, some fearing their partner will become aware that they have/are seeking services for their victimization.

Talk to women in rural communities about the specific issues they experience (cold weather, transport). The only thing available 24/7 is the police. So, in most Canadian communities that's the response. (Government)

We can measure availability, but accessibility is another issue. It can be distance, culturally-specific/relevant. So we need to consider for example, if a victim is disabled. Distance is only one element (Government)

Using a yes/no response [of availability] is not measurement, it's an inventory. (Government)

It was also agreed that an appropriate measure of availability of resources in a community was related to the length of wait times, including those that never receive service as a result, or who are turned away. However, this measure could also pose challenges because there could be reasons why clients are turned away from particular resources other than reaching capacity which is discussed in more detail next.

*You may be open from nine to midnight, but if you're full then it does not help!
(Community)*

Measures of resource accessibility

Many participants agreed that measuring the resource accessibility based on length of wait times and turn-away rates was important because these two factors may ultimately result in victims accessing or not accessing resources that they need or desire. While services being full, or at their capacity, is often the reason for not getting access to resources, it was also highlighted that victim age and, particularly, that victims may be underage can prevent them from accessing particular services. Furthermore, some victims may also be turned away because they have male children who are considered too old to be accepted into shelters. Finally, it was mentioned that some victims may be turned away because of concerns about their potential behaviour, possibly related to mental health or substance abuse issues that a particular service may not be equipped to deal with. Given the above, data collection efforts would need to be cautious if using such accessibility measures.

Shelters won't take boys over certain age. So if a women shows up with a child who is over 14 or so, they can't stay. This re victimizes them. (Academic)

Women who behave violently may be put on a no admittance list. Maybe she is using drugs or stole from the shelter and they may not admit her. How does she ever get off that list? What about HER safety? (Community)

Second, it was agreed that it was necessary to measure accessibility of resources within a community by looking at the hours of operation because this would impact whether victims receive the service they need. For example, not all women can access services during standard office hours because their partners may be present during these hours or women may have work obligations during those periods.

This is a huge issue. Women may not be able to get to a counselor in the evening or weekend, when the services are closed. We don't know how to deal with it, the services get really defensive. Some women are working shifts, etc. and they can't get there. (Academic)

Their partner works shifts so that is when they want to access the services. (Government)

Third, resource accessibility also depends on whether the victim is able to receive services in their language of choice or first language so this could be another potential measure. However, some felt that language as a primary focus is not necessary and may result in other victim/survivor issues being ignored. They felt there were existing language services that were

being used infrequently. It would need to be determined if there were sufficient language resources for victims/survivors to support this belief, however; the documentation of such a measure would identify potential gaps.

Similar to the discussion about resource availability, representatives from all sectors raised concerns about accessibility of victim/survivor resources in rural areas. In particular, it was noted that female victims in rural areas face particular obstacles when choosing to use resources because they often fear being identified by someone they know. This may ultimately result in the female having to go outside the community or simply choosing not to use services at all. Further, it was noted that swiftness of police service response in rural areas may not be adequate because of limited policing resources thereby placing this group at further risk as a result.

Also in small communities everyone knows everyone and where you are going and you don't believe it will be confidential which deters some victims from seeking help. (Academic)

We could track people who don't have a way to get to the services. Outside urban areas, there are not enough police services. This increases dangerousness because they can't to calls on time. (Government)

It's not accessible if you treat her like dirt. A lot of women will leave. Or they won't come back. They have a sense that the shelter is annoyed with them. They sense a level of suspicion with their story. They may make the decision, "Holy cow. I'm not going there." The first time you talk to them, it may be the last time you talk to them. They may select themselves out. You can't convey the message to her that she is the problem. (No sector specified)

Measures of resource utility

The general consensus in responding to this question once again emphasizes the crosscutting theme that victims need to have a voice if researchers, policy makers, and service providers are to find out how useful resources provided have been to those served. It was acknowledged by many that, if services are not delivered effectively or in the manner they were meant to be delivered, victims can be harmed; for example, victims often end up feeling re-victimized when they seek help from the criminal justice process. In addition, even when resources are provided in the manner legislated or intended, victims/survivors can still be harmed; for example, it was noted that women can end up losing their children to child protective services when the agencies they go to for help report the victimization as mandated by law. One participant commented that 'it [resource utility] needs to be measured from the perspective of the user' while another said, 'we need to ask clients if there are any unmet needs.'

The question of how well services responded to victim/community needs was discussed and it was agreed that there was a need to measure the usefulness of services to victims/survivors, but how usefulness can be captured may vary considerably. Many felt that the utility of services should be measured based on whether the needs were met from the perspective of the client or the community. For example, victims/survivors could be asked how helpful the

service was to them, how they felt the services could be improved, and how they would like to receive services in the future. However, some disagreed with using the victim/survivor perspective to measure how well the services responded to their needs, arguing that having victims determine the usefulness of services is unfair because often the mandate of these services is to simply provide information and referrals. It would be expected, however, that the mandate of the resources would be clearly articulated so they are not assessed unfairly.

Second, it was also agreed that capturing resource utility could be done by assessing whether the policy as intended and the practice(s) that result are correlated with one another when providing victim/survivor resources. This could be done by looking at whether the practices influenced the implementation of policies or vice versa because there needs to be both a coordinated process of problem identification and response. In short, policy intent should match the practice implemented. Several felt that quantifying the coordination of policy and practice would be difficult but not impossible and, doing so, would help to illustrate the different degrees of policy implementation.

It's about measuring what policies each of the regions have in place including what extent things are coordinated since there may be relationships. We want to measure existence of policies. Is there a coordinated process and a coordinated response? Is there policy and practice? Is the policy being implemented? There are some great policies but they are not being implemented or adhered to. (Community)

Third, underscoring the potential measures of each resource characteristic, many participants also felt that the utility/usefulness of resources could be measured according to service shortfalls such as wait times and turn-away rates. This would help to capture if there was adequate funding to maintain the costs of operating the resource being documented.

We could measure the funding provided and the shortfall, for example waiting lists and turn away rates; funding versus operating expenses. (Community)

We could measure how many beds are available, and we should consider women turned away. (Government)

Previously we have focused on characteristics of the service rather than the user, but we need to interview the service user. (No sector specified)

In summary, four themes were reiterated in the full plenary discussion.

First, the need to make sure that measures capture how well resources targeting intimate partner violence are responding to the needs of victims/survivors and communities was emphasized. To capture the quality of resources in terms of availability, accessibility, and utility, the perspectives of those who use them are crucial and will help providers, researchers and policymakers more comprehensively and practically understand what the needs are of victim/survivors. Furthermore, when gaining such perspectives, both positive and negative aspects are important to document.

Second, measuring resources based on wait times and turn-away rates was cautioned against several times during the full plenary. In particular, groups were concerned that such measures would not reflect reality. For example, some women seeking resources may place themselves on wait lists, but in the event that they no longer require the service, they may never be taken off the waiting list. Furthermore, some women may be turned away for reasons unrelated to the service reaching capacity as discussed above.

Waiting lists can be misleading, if they find another service, they might remain on the waiting list. (No sector specified)

There are other kinds of indicators such as wait times and turn away rates, but we need to know what those mean in reality. (No sector specified)

Third, measuring whether policies and practices are reflective of each other was emphasized again. Some felt that we should measure this at the more macro-level so that we can achieve a better understanding of what the resource needs are for victims/survivors as well as how complex these needs may be. One participant said, ‘By looking at policies, we can see where we stand and at the collaboration involved. We can then look at services and ask whether they are being implemented in furtherance of the policy intent and with measurable effect.’ Finally, it was argued that, when determining best measures of the various resource characteristics, it will be important to recognize that various issues or factors will affect the level of these resources which also often overlap. Some of these factors could be police officer availability, victim/survivor literacy, confidentiality/privacy issues, cell phone coverage, same-sex couples, mental health or substance issues, culturally-appropriate needs, older women, and women with adolescent sons who are not allowed in shelters, the existence of a highway between the victim and the resource, long distance crisis lines, lack of childcare, 16- and 17-year-old girls not allowed in shelters alone, children, disability and so on. Some of these have been touched on in more detail in the above discussion.

At a macro level, we want to look at the policy and practices that are implemented. We want to show how complex service needs are for victims. We should learn (No sector specified)

V. CONCLUSION

The above workshop brought together those who provide victim/survivor resources in the community, researchers, policymakers, and other stakeholders to identify the strengths and limitations of current national, provincial and other data systems that document available resources, to reach a consensus on what is meant by ‘victim/survivor resources,’ to determine the types of resources that may be important to document and why, and to identify the most appropriate measures to capture the existence and type of resources and services, including those that relate to resource availability, accessibility, utility and quality. Further, participants explored methods for collecting standardized data on these measures at the local, provincial, and national level and began to discuss the possibility of a multi-level research initiative that could examine the feasibility of more systematically and consistently documenting victim resources.

Some themes throughout the workshop were very specific to the above objectives and the questions asked; however, some themes were common throughout the workshop discussions. For example, the theme that many individuals do not identify as victims or are not identified as such by others was discussed repeatedly. One result of this is that because some individuals do not label themselves as victims, they may not access resources and, therefore, they are not officially identified by resource providers as victims. It was noted many times that victims often go to friends or family members for help rather than to formal services and this would possibly affect some measures and their documentation. Further, the perceived harm that can sometimes result from labeling individuals as victims was evident across all three sectors represented at the workshop. Second, the need for more qualitative data that can capture perspectives of victims/survivors and the greater complexity of their experiences was also consistently noted throughout the two days. That is, discussions often highlighted, regardless of the question being focused upon, that researchers and policymakers need to be asking the victims/survivors about their perspectives when conducting research because, after all, they are the ones who will know what is useful and accessible to them. Related to this, throughout the discussions, participants continuously expressed concerns relating to the need to conduct more research pertaining to victims in rural communities and the difficulties these groups may face regarding accessibility and availability of services and resources made available to them since they often face unique challenges compared to other victims of violence.

Finally, the importance of collaboration was dominant in all discussions across all sectors. The comments related to this theme mainly expressed that those involved in responding to victims/survivors of violence through resource or service provision needed to work together and share information to more effectively provide better resources to those who need them. After reading through the roundtable discussion material it was also evident that all participant types, government, community service providers, and academic researchers were eager and willing to work collaboratively on initiatives that would work to better document resources for victims/survivors of violence.

APPENDIX A

Workshop participant list

Arnott, Pamela

Director and Senior Counsel
Policy Centre for Victims Issues
284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8
Tel: 613-952-1105
Fax: 613-952-1110
Email: Pam.Arnott@justice.gc.ca

Arsenault, Rina

Associate Director
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research
University of New Brunswick
PO. Box 4400, Fredericton, NB E3B 5A3
Telephone: (506) 458-7137
Fax: (506) 453-4788
Email: rinaa@unb.ca

Blaney, Elizabeth

Research Associate, PhD
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research
University of New Brunswick
678 Windsor Street
P.O. Box 4400, Fredericton, N.B. E3B 5A3
Tel: 506-458-7378
blaney@unb.ca

Carberry, Lesley

Director, Community Justice and Victim Services
Department of Justice
Government of Yukon
Box 2703, Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 2C6
(2nd floor, 301 Jarvis Street Y1A 2H3)
Phone: (867) 667-5962
Fax: (867) 393-6326
Email: lesley.carberry@gov.yk.ca

Caron, Robert

Sociologue, Directeur
Bureau d'aide aux victimes d'actes criminels
Ministère de la Justice du Québec
1200, route de l'Église, 7e étage
Québec (Québec) G1V 4M1
Phone: (418) 646-6548 poste 20858
Fax: (418) 646-5995
E-mail: rcaron@justice.gouv.qc.ca

Castaldi, Sly

Executive Director
Guelph-Wellington Women in Crisis
P.O. Box 1451
Guelph, ON N1H 6N9
Tel: 519 836 1110, x. 226
Fax: 519 836 1979
E-mail: sly@gwwomenin crisis.org
Website: www.gwwomenin crisis.org

Coderre, Nicole

Agente de relations humaine
CSSS Jeanne Mance (service Côté cour)
Cour municipale de Montréal
775 rue Gosford #R710
Montreal, QC H2Y 3B9
Tel: (514) 861-0141
Email: nicole.coderre.jmance@ssss.gouv.qc.ca

Crocker, Diane

Associate Professor
Department of Sociology & Criminology
St. Mary's University
923 Robie Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 3C3
Email: diane.crocker@stmarys.ca

Dahlin, Susanne

Executive Director, Victim Services Division
Policing and Community Safety Branch
302 – 815 Hornby Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6Z 2E6
Phone: (604) 660-5272
Fax: (604) 660-5340
E-mail: Susanne.Dahlin@gov.bc.ca

Davis-Ermuth, Shannon

B.A. LL.B. LL.M., Legal Counsel
Children's Law and Family Violence Policy Unit
Family, Children & Youth Section
Department of Justice Canada
Email: SDavis@justice.gc.ca

Dawson, Myrna

Associate Professor & Canada Research Chair in Public Policy in Criminal Justice
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1
Tel: (519) 824-4120, x56028
Fax: (519) 837-9561
Email: mdawson@uoguelph.ca

Fraehlich, Cheryl

Postdoctoral Fellow
RESOLVE Manitoba
108 Isbister Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg Manitoba R2N 2A7
Email: fraehlic@cc.umanitoba.ca

George, Deb

Coordinator, Domestic Violence Unit
Family Service Regina
2020 Halifax Street
Regina, SK S4P 1T7
Telephone: (306)757-6675 ext. 235
Fax: (306) 757-0133
Email: d.v.programs.fsr@sasktel.net

Gill, Carmen

Director
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research (MMFC)
University of New Brunswick
678 Windsor Street
PO Box 4400 Fredericton , NB E3B 5A3
Tel: 506-452-6367
Fax: 506-453-4788
Email: cgill@unb.ca

Hampton, Mary

Director
RESOLVE Saskatchewan
c/o Luther College, LC 210
University of Regina
Regina, SK, S4S 0A2
Tel: 306-337-2511
Fax: 306-585-5267
Email: mary.hampton@uregina.ca

Heinze, Beth

Senior Policy Analyst
Policy Centre for Victim Issues
Department of Justice
Room 6036, 284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8
Tel: (613) 954-1392
Fax: (613) 952-1110
Email: beth.heinze@justice.gc.ca

Holder, Robyn

Victims of Crime Coordinator
Australian Capital Territory
GPO Box 158
Canberra City ACT 2601 Australia
Tel: (02) 6205 2066
Fax: (02) 6205 0177
Email: robyn.holder@act.gov.au

Hornick, Joe

Executive Director
Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family
One Executive Place
#510, 1816 Crowchild Trail, NW
Calgary, AB T3M 3Y7
Tel: (403) 216-0340
Fax: (403) 289-4887
Web: www.ucalgary.ca/~crilf
Email: hornick@ucalgary.ca

Hotton Mahony, Tina

Analyst, Microdata Access Division
Statistics Canada McMaster Research Data Centre
Room 217 Mills Memorial Library
McMaster University
1280 Main St. West
Hamilton, ON, L8S 4L6
(905) 525-9140 ext. 27968
Email: hottont@mcmaster.ca

Hubbert, Mary Jane

Fourth-year undergraduate
Criminal Justice and Public Policy Program
University of Guelph
Email: mhubbart@uoguelph.ca

Jacklin, Aaron

Master's candidate
Criminology and Criminal Justice Policy
University of Guelph
Email: ajacklin@uoguelph.ca

Jackson, Margaret

Professor, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University,
Co-Director, Simon Fraser University Institute for Studies in Criminal Justice Policy
Director, FREDA
The FREDA Centre
Simon Fraser University
515 West Hastings Street
Vancouver BC V6B 5K3
Tel: 778-782-5197 & 778 782-4040
Fax: 778-782-5189
E-mail: margarej@sfu.ca

Johnson, Holly

Associate Professor
Department of Criminology
Institute for the Prevention of Crime
Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5
Phone: 613-562-5800 (ext. 1805)
Fax: 613-562-5188
Email: hjohnson@uottawa.ca

Kane, Barb

Manager
Policy & Program Development
Ministry of Attorney General of Ontario
Tel: 416-326-3130
Email: barbara.kane@ontario.ca

Kelly, Liz

Professor & Director of the Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit
London Metropolitan University
Ladbroke House
62-66 Highbury Grove
London N5 2AD
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7133 5014
Fax: +44 (0)20 7133 5075
E-mail: cwasu@londonmet.ac.uk
Website: <http://www.cwasu.org/>

Lawrence, Michelle

LLM, PhD candidate
School of Criminology
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Tel: (778) 229-4125
Email: msl17@sfu.ca

Marissink, Steve

Director, Victims Programs
Victims Services and Crime Prevention
Solicitor General and Public Security
10th fl John E Brownlee Building
10365 - 97 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 3W7
Phone: (780) 427-3460
Fax: (780) 422-4213
E-mail: steve.marissink@gov.ab.ca

Mason, Sharon

Executive Director
First Nation Healing Centre Inc.
Fisher River Cree Nation
Box 365
Koostatak, MB R0C 1S0
Tel: 204-645-2750
Fax: 204-645-2546
Email: Sharon.fnhc@mts.net

Maynard, Alison

Fourth-year undergraduate
Political Science
University of Guelph
amaynard@uoguelph.ca

Maynard, Susan

Provincial Manager
Victim Services
P.O. Box 2000
51 Water Street
Charlottetown, PEI C1N 7N8
Telephone: (902) 368-4584
Fax: (902) 368-4514
E-mail: smaynard@gov.pe.ca

McDonald, Susan

LLB, PhD, Principal Researcher
Research and Statistics Division
Department of Justice Canada
284 Wellington Street, 6th floor
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0H8
Tel./tél: [\(613\) 957-9315](tel:6139579315)
Fax./ téléc: [\(613\) 941-1845](tel:6139411845)
smcdonal@justice.gc.ca

McInnes, Dawn

Manager
Community Justice Division, Victim Services
GNWT Department of Justice
P.O. Box 1320, 4903 – 49th Street
Yellowknife, NWT X1A 2L9
Phone: (867) 920-6911
Fax: (867) 873-0199
Email: Dawn_McInnes@gov.nt.ca

McQuarrie, Barb

Community Director

Centre for Research & Education on Violence Against Women and Children

1137 Western Road, Room 1118

Faculty of Education Building

The University of Western Ontario

London, Ontario, CANADA N6G 1G7

Tel: 519-661-4040

Fax: 519-850-2464

Email: bmacquar@uwo.ca

Michalyshyn, Gayle

Manager, Domestic Violence Support Services

Criminal Justice Division

Manitoba Justice

1410-405 Broadway

Winnipeg, MB R3C 3L6

Tel: (204) 945-4589

Email: Gayle.Michalyshyn@gov.mb.ca

Morrow, Eileen

Coordinator

Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses

Tel: 416-977-6619

Email: e.morrow@rogers.com

Poon, Julie

Master's candidate

Criminology and Criminal Justice Policy

University of Guelph

Email: julie.poon@gmail.com

Porteous, Tracy

Executive Director

Ending Violence Association of BC

728-602 West Hastings Street

Vancouver, BC V6B 1P2

Phone: 604-633-2506, x.11

Fax: 604-633-2507

Email: porteous@endingviolence.org

www.endingviolence.org

Pottie Bunge, Valerie

Director
Policy Planning and Research
Nova Scotia Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7
5151 Terminal Road, 2nd Flr.
Halifax, NS B3J 2L6
Tel: (902) 424-7984
Fax: (902) 424-6403
POTTIEVA@gov.ns.ca

Riggs, Joan

Facilitator
Catalyst Research & Communications
78 Delaware Avenue
Ottawa ON K2P OZ3
Tel: 613-565-4081
Fax: (613) 565-9229
Email: catalyst@bellnet.ca

Ruff, Lanette

Project Coordinator
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research
University of New Brunswick
678 Windsor Street
P.O. Box 4400
Fredericton, NB E3B 5A3
Telephone: (506) 447-3480
Fax: (506) 453-4788
Email: lruff@unb.ca

Singer, Verona

Coordinator
Halifax Regional Police Victim Services
1975 Gottingen Street
Halifax, NS B3J 2H1
Tel: (902) 490-5300
Fax: (902) 490-6596
Email: singerv@halifax.ca

Taylor-Butts, Andrea

Analyst
Integration, Analysis and Research Program
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada
R.H. Coats Building, 19A
100 Tunney's Pasture Driveway,
Ottawa ON K1A 0T6
Telephone 613-951-2065
Fax 613-951-6615
Email: Andrea.Taylor-Butts@statcan.gc.ca

Thiele, Patrick

Director, Victim Services
610, 1874 Scarth Street
Regina, Saskatchewan S4P 4B3
Phone: (306) 787-6707
Fax: (306) 787-0081
E-Mail: pthiele@justice.gov.sk.ca

Thomas, Brenda

Program Support Manager
Victim Services
Community and Correctional Services Division
3rd Floor, Argyle Place, 364 Argyle Street
Fredericton, NB E3B 1T9
Phone: (506) 444-4674
Fax: (506) 453-2307
E-Mail: Brenda.Thomas@gnb.ca

Tutty, Leslie

Professor
Faculty of Social Work
University of Calgary
Tel: (403) 220-5040
Email: tutty@ucalgary.ca

Verhoek-Oftedahl, Wendy

PhD, Family Violence Prevention
& Community Development Coordinator
Child and Family Services
Social Services and Seniors
161 St. Peters Road, PO Box 2000
Charlottetown, PE C1A 7N8
Tel.: 902-368-6712
Fax: 902-368-6169
Email: wverhoekoftedahl@gov.pe.ca

Wells, Elizabeth

Postdoctoral Fellow

Canadian Observatory on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence

Social and Legal Responses to Violence in Canada Research Unit, University of Guelph

Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1

Tel: (519) 824-4120, x53523

E-mail: ewells@uoguelph.ca

White, Linda

Executive Director

Alliance to End Violence

306, 301- 14 Street NW

Calgary, Alberta T2N 2A1

Phone: 403-283-3013 ext. 222

Fax: 403-283-3780

E-mail: lwhite@endviolence.ca

Website: www.endviolence.ca

Ursel, Jane

Director, RESOLVE Manitoba

Associate Professor, Department of Sociology

108 Isbister Bldg

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2

Tel: (204) 474-8965

Fax: (204) 474-7686

E-mail: jursel@umanitoba.ca

APPENDIX B

Documenting the Growth of Resources for Victims/Survivors of Violence

**By Myrna Dawson, Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair in Public Policy in
Criminal Justice, University of Guelph**

Introduction

Over the course of the past few decades, crime victims have become more aware of their rights and of the resources available to them largely due to the victims' rights and the violence against women movements. During the same period, there has been significant growth in the number and types of available resources for victims/survivors of crime. With increasing numbers of victims/survivors of crime seeking help and limited funding, it is becoming more of a challenge to allocate available resources to effectively meet growing demands. Adding to this challenge is the fact that, despite growing resources in most industrialized countries, there has been little effort to document what these resources are, where they are, and who they serve.

This knowledge gap is significant because access to resources is not equal for all victims/survivors of crime. Identifying and documenting which groups are underserved, and where requires consistent and detailed information about what services are available, where, and to whom. Such information would contribute to more informed public policy decisions about the distribution and allocation of victim resources, and an enhanced ability to examine their impact on victims/survivors of crime, and on levels of crime and violence in communities.

In Canada, the first national victim services survey was conducted in 2003, repeated in 2005/2006 and again in 2008. Focusing on one 'snapshot' day of the year, findings from the first two survey cycles⁷ showed that victims/survivors of violence and women represent the majority of those served (72% and 68%, respectively, in the most recent cycle; Brzozowski 2008, 36). Among female victims of violence seeking help, close to one half had been victimized by current or former intimate partners and one-quarter by family members. This national survey represents an important first step in addressing the dearth of information on available resources in this country and arguably moves Canada beyond other countries in documenting victim resources.

Its finding that female victims of intimate partner and domestic violence represent a large proportion of those served by victim services also highlights why much of the research to date, largely conducted in other countries, has focused on documenting domestic violence or violence against women resources and examining their impact on levels of violence. These patterns may also be due, in part, to the fact that violence against women, particularly by male partners, has been a key focus of legislative, policy and program initiatives in many countries that now recognize these victims/survivors have not historically had equal access to resources or justice overall (Fineman and Mykitiuk 1994).

⁷ Findings from the 2008 survey were not yet available at the time of writing.

Given this emphasis, results from two bodies of research are briefly described below, followed by a discussion of the challenges of systematically documenting this information even when focusing on one type of crime or group of victims/survivors. Without this research service providers, policy makers, and researchers lack the information necessary to determine if resources are distributed equally to all victims, and to understand the role played by these resources in keeping victims safe and preventing future violence.

Domestic violence resources and intimate partner homicide

One indicator of safety for victims that has received significant research attention is the level of lethal violence or homicide in society. In particular, recent documented declines in intimate partner homicide in several countries have led to concentrated efforts to identify factors that may be contributing to these declines using an exposure reduction framework (Dawson et al. 2009; Dugan et al. 1999, 2003). Premised upon the consistent finding that chronic relationship violence often precedes intimate partner killings regardless of whether the victim is female or male, this perspective argues that factors which help abused partners safely leave violent relationships or avoid such relationships in the first place should reduce levels of intimate partner violence and homicide (Dugan et al. 1999). The increasing availability of domestic violence resources is one of three societal trends that have paralleled declines in intimate partner homicide, which has arguably also contributed to reduced exposure to intimate partner homicide.⁸

Researchers in the United States examined whether increased resources lead to lower rates of violence and uncovered an unexpected pattern. They focused on the existence of state statutes related to domestic violence, local police and prosecution policies, existence of crisis hotlines, shelters and on. Study results showed that, as domestic violence resources increased over the past few decades, the risk of female intimate partner homicide remained stable or declined only slightly, whereas the risk of intimate partner homicide of males significantly declined (Browne and Williams 1989, 1993; Dugan et al., 1999). Similar patterns were documented in England and Wales and Canada (Aldridge and Browne 2003; Dawson et al. 2009; Ogrodnik 2008). On the one hand, these findings can be viewed as positive; one interpretation is that increased resources are providing women with alternatives to lethal violence against their abusers to escape victimization. US researchers also found, however, that some resources may actually increase the risk for some women, possibly due to retaliatory violence by male partners coupled with inadequate attention to ensuring women's safety as part of the intervention efforts (Dugan 2003; Dugan et al. 2003). Resources were also shown to have different impacts for various types of victims depending, for example, on their race/ethnicity or the type of intimate relationship they shared with their abusers (e.g., married or unmarried). Despite these variations, Dugan et al. (2003) concluded that, more often than not, communities with more victim resources had lower levels of violence. While this research documents more of a correlation rather than a causal connection between resources and levels of violence, the findings have implications for victims/survivors of crime who do not have equal access to resources, a situation examined and documented by a second body of research conducted in the United Kingdom.

⁸ The other two trends are increasing gender equality and changing relationship structures (for review, see Dawson et al. 2009).

The geographic distribution of violence against women support services

There has been a renewed interest in the geography of crime, or environmental criminology, which draws attention to the fact that crime is not evenly distributed, but is rather concentrated in particular areas (e.g., Brantingham and Brantingham 1981). For example, Statistics Canada has released several recent publications using Geographic Information System (GIS) to examine neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime (e.g., Fitzgerald et al. 2004; Savoie 2008). What has received less attention both historically and today is the way in which the availability of resources for crime victims/survivors may also be concentrated in particular areas or geographic regions which, in turn, may also have implications for the distribution and level of crime and violence in those areas. The dearth of research in this area is due, in part, to the paucity of available data with which to examine these questions. Studies from the UK have moved research in a positive direction with respect to understanding how resources are distributed across jurisdictions, using GIS to map the existence (or lack thereof) of victim resources, visually displaying those areas that are clearly underserved (Coy et al. 2007; Coy et al. 2009).

Focusing on specialized violence against women support services, this study showed that “access to support is a postcode lottery” for female victims/survivors of violence (Coy et al. 2007, 6). Simply put, depending on where they live, some victims/survivors have access to adequate services, whereas others have little or no access to any services at all. While this may seem obvious to many who work in this field and are aware of the often uneven distribution of resources, the ability to document and provide evidence of this has been a challenge. Graphically, this study was able to clearly show that one-third of the jurisdictions in the UK had no specialized support services for women experiencing violence. Further, they found that most women had no access to rape crisis centres, less than one quarter had access to any services specializing in sexual violence, and there was only minimal coverage offered by sexual assault referral centres. Less than one in 10 jurisdictions had specialized services for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) women, almost one-third had no domestic violence services at all and few jurisdictions had services for women involved in prostitution. The authors concluded that few areas could actually claim to have ‘sufficient’ service provision and several areas were particularly underserved. In a follow up in 2008, some improvements had been noted; however, one in four jurisdictions still had no specialized support services, BME women were still underserved, most of the new services were statutory (i.e. primarily related to the criminal justice system), while provision levels in the voluntary/third sector remained static or had declined (Coy et al. 2009, 7).

Challenges in documenting victim/survivor resources

The above research suggests that it is possible to document victim/survivor resources and to examine their impact on reducing levels of violence for particular types of victims/survivors. These studies also highlight some of the challenges in such documentation. For example, it has been argued that the US study which found that initiatives intended to make women safer actually provided more protection for men may be the result of research which relied upon inadequate or limited data to capture the existence of domestic violence resources (DeLeon-

Granados and Wells 2003). Indeed, Dugan and her colleagues (1999, 2003) acknowledged the scarcity of information available. A similar argument can be made about the availability of data documenting victim/survivor resources more generally, which is largely the case in most countries that have experienced the rapid growth in resources since the mid-1970s. While the collection of such information is a large and complex task given the number of changes that have taken place, variations across jurisdictions, as well as the fragmented and unreliable nature of existing data, for example, this information is crucial for understanding the relative impact of these and other social trends on the victimization experiences of women and men. To begin to address this gap, three initial steps are required: defining what is meant by ‘victim resources’; identifying appropriate measures of resource provision; and determining appropriate data sources and needs.

Defining victim/survivor resources

Today there is a multitude of new initiatives that co-exist with long-standing resources for various types of victims/survivors. In the area of violence against women, rape/sexual assault centres and shelters that grew out of the violence against women movement in the 1970s are easily identifiable resources. The more recent implementation of specialized domestic violence courts and police units in some jurisdictions can also be easily used as examples of victim/survivor resources. Focusing only on the more obvious albeit important initiatives does not recognize the wealth of social, health, community, and other resources that are directly or indirectly related to helping victims of violence (e.g. Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners, coordinated community protocols). Therefore, defining what is meant by ‘victim resources’ – the ‘what are they’ question – is the first step towards achieving an understanding of the role particular resources play in the lives of victims. Canada’s national victim services survey defines victim services as “agencies that provide direct services to primary and secondary victims of crime and that are funded in whole or in part by a ministry responsible for justice matters” (Brzozowski 2008, 33). An initial question is whether some important resources integral to victims/survivors are excluded based on these criteria.

In the UK, the term violence against women ‘support services’ was used to encompass agencies and organizations that provided “a range of support options that enable women to create safety, seek justice, and undo the harms of violence” (Coy et al. 2007, 10). Recognizing that these resources are often found in what they refer to as the ‘voluntary/third sector,’ the authors included organizations in their study if they worked “primarily on violence and...provide significant direct support to female victims/survivors” (2007, 16). Based on these criteria, the following resources were included: refuges (i.e., shelters), community domestic violence projects, rape crisis centres, and sexual violence support services; specialized services within the statutory sector that provide significant support services, including sexual assault referral centres, and specialist domestic violence courts; perpetrator programs belonging to a network that ensures minimum guidelines and standards are followed; prostitution, trafficking and sexual exploitation services; and, finally, health-sector female genital mutilation services.

In the US where researchers have focused more narrowly on documenting the impact of domestic violence resources, Dugan (2003) and her colleagues (1999, 2003) included in their definition of resources existing policies and laws pertaining to domestic violence as well as

organizations and initiatives that responded to domestic violence. Specifically, they examined the role of shelters, legal advocacy, hotline and counseling services as well as existing state- and local-level policies such as child custody legislation, judicial discretion surrounding protection order violations, warrantless arrest, mandatory arrest, prosecutorial no-drop policies, and firearms legislation. Efforts were also made to capture the level of criminal justice commitment to domestic violence through the existence of specialized police units and training, as well as the prosecution of protection order violations, and/or written policies that standardized the prosecution of cases.

Two definition issues are highlighted by these studies. First, the UK study demonstrates that, before resources are defined, the particular groups of victim/survivors or crimes/violence being examined will need to be clearly identified because of the broad range of resources available, the varying types of victims, and the particular needs that may be acute in different countries. For example, in Canada, prostitution, trafficking and sexual exploitation services as well as health-sector female genital mutilation services may not have automatically been included in a definition of 'violence against women support services' even though this might well be warranted. Second, research in the US highlights the need to move beyond the narrow conceptualization of victim/survivor resources as only those responding organizations and agencies to encompass existing policy and legislative initiatives that often lead to varying levels of resources in communities or countries.

Measuring victim/survivor resources

Once victim/survivor resources are identified, the challenge is to identify appropriate measures for levels of resource provision. While an important first step, resource availability is only one dimension of provision, representing a basic and somewhat crude measure of whether resources are distributed evenly among all victims/survivors. More detailed measures of resource accessibility, utility, and other important characteristics of an organization or policy will need to be identified. Accessibility measures might include average distance travelled by victims/survivors to access resources (particularly relevant for victims/survivors living in rural or remote areas), languages in which services are available, or whether a victim/survivor accesses services immediately or has their name put on a waiting list. Resource utility can be measured by the characteristics of those victims/survivors who are served, which, in turn, can be compared to the characteristics of victims/survivors in the population. An area might have a high concentration of Aboriginals who have been victims/survivors of crime, but a particular resource is found to serve only a small proportion of such victims/survivors. Such patterns can be used to identify areas for further examination that can lead to more equitable access and use of resources.

Finally, as argued by Coy et al. (2009), documenting where services are, and who they serve, still provides only part of the story. Measures that capture the characteristics of those resources being examined will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the level of resources that are provided across jurisdictions. For example, documenting the existence of a shelter does not tell us the number of beds available, the services it offers in-house or in the community through outreach programs. Documenting the availability of a specialized domestic violence police unit does not provide information as to the size of the unit (e.g., whether it is comprised of one full- or part-time police officer, or 10 police officers with support staff, number of civilian

employees). Further, sexual violence services available in a jurisdiction may be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, or only for a few days per week. Thus, the documentation process must move beyond availability, accessibility, and utility towards the quality of available resources in terms of size, breadth of services, and level of commitment relative to the population of victims/survivors served. Efforts by US researchers to document the level of police or prosecutorial commitment is an example of this, recognizing that existing policies are often implemented at the local level by various actors and, therefore, policy and/or resource implementation will vary across jurisdictions.

Determining appropriate data sources and needs

Beyond the national victim services survey, there is currently no central database on legal and/or community-based resources for victims/survivors which would provide a starting point for this type of endeavour, and because information can vary both across and within provinces and territories, there is no consistency in the current documentation of resources at the provincial or local level. Even Canada's Victim Services Survey has limitations because the majority of responses were received from government-based agencies and, therefore, non-government/community-based agencies are likely underrepresented. In fact, police-based agencies comprised the largest number of respondents (42%), a finding which is consistent with DeLeon-Granados & Wells' (2003) argument that there is an overemphasis on criminal justice services, ignoring the wide diversity of community-based resources, and non-profit organizations that also offer assistance to women experiencing violence. Therefore, once victim/survivor resources are defined, and measures identified, the final task is to determine whether any existing data are reliable and valid that can be built upon. If not, data needs and methods for collecting these data will need to be identified.

Why is it important to document victim/survivor resources?

The transformations that have occurred over the course of the past several decades in society's response to crime victims/survivors has led to a pressing need to begin to identify reliable and valid standardized measures that can be used to understand the role of this growth in resources in the lives of victims/survivors and in the communities in which they live. An examination of the distribution of these initiatives is vital to the development of public policy over time but, as argued by DeLeon-Granados and Wells (2003), any efforts to document and ultimately examine the effect of resources requires "a dialogue among key stakeholders, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers on an important and growing research area; a discussion of the ways to improve data systems and to improve the manner in which data are used for social science; and an enhanced awareness of methods to track efficacy of state and federal policy over time (2003, 150)." Such a dialogue will begin to respond to the call that policymakers and researchers begin to identify what programs, policies and/or legislative reforms have provided protection to victims/survivors of crime overall and, in particular, to victims/survivors of violent crime (Campbell et al. 2007).

APPENDIX C

Documenting Resources for Victims/Survivors of Violence in Canada **Delta Guelph, November 5-6, 2009**

[All events in John McCrae Room unless otherwise noted]

Please join us at a Pre-Workshop Hospitality Suite

Wednesday, November 4, 2009

8 p.m. – 10 p.m.

Heritage Suite

[Room 534, 5th Floor]

Day 1:

Thursday, November 5, 2009

8:00

Breakfast

[Location: Gryphon Room]

9:00

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chair: Myrna Dawson, University of Guelph

Facilitator: Joan Riggs, Catalyst Research and Communications

9:15

Summary of Federal Activities and Research on Victims of Crime in Canada

Presenters: Pam Arnott, Beth Heinze, Shannon Davis-Ermuth, and Susan McDonald, Department of Justice Canada

10:15

Refreshment Break

10:30

Defining victim/survivor resources

[*Roundtable discussions*]

11:15

Defining victim/survivor resources

[*Full plenary: Report back – Julie to record*]

- Creating a working definition

12:15

Lunch

[Location: Gryphon Room]

1:30

What do we know about victim/survivor resources in Canada? Findings from 2007/2008 Victim Services Survey

Presenter: Susan McDonald, Department of Justice Canada

2:00

Intersections among vulnerabilities and resources for victims/survivors of violence

Presenter: Holly Johnson, University of Ottawa

Day 1

Thursday, November 5, 2009 [continued]

- 2:30** What don't we know about victim/survivor resources in Canada?
Assessing data needs and research gaps from a community, a government
and an academic perspective
[Short panel presentations/discussion]
- 3:00** Refreshment Break
- 3:15** Collecting data on victim/survivor resources
[*Roundtable discussions*]
- What do we have? What do we need? How do we collect it?
- 3:45** Collecting data on victim/survivor resources
[*Full plenary: Report back – Aaron to record*]
- Building on current knowledge: Where do we begin?
- 4:30** Close of Day 1 Session
- 5:30** Reception & Dinner
[Location: Flanders Room]
- 7:00** Introduction of keynote speaker:
[Sly Castaldi, Executive Director, Guelph-Wellington Women in Crisis]
- Keynote Presentation: “Map of Gaps: The Postcode Lottery of Violence
Against Women Services.”
Presenter: Dr. Liz Kelly, Metropolitan London University, UK
- 8:30** Hospitality Suite
[Location: Heritage Suite]

Documenting resources for victims/survivors of violence in Canada
Delta Guelph, November 5-6, 2009

[All events in John McCrae Room unless otherwise noted]

- Day 2:** **Friday, November 6, 2009**
- 8:00** Breakfast
[Location: Gryphon Room]
- 8:45** Welcome to Day 2: ‘Where Are We’ Recap of Day 1
Facilitator: Joan Riggs
- 9:00** Using intimate partner violence as a case study for examining feasibility of documenting victim/survivor resources in Canada?
Presenter: Myrna Dawson, University of Guelph
- 9:30** The impact of criminal justice policy on the growth of intimate partner violence resources
Presenters: Michelle Lawrence and Margaret Jackson, Simon Fraser University
- 10:00** What do we know about intimate partner violence resources? Findings from 2007/2008 Transition Homes in Canada Fact Sheet
Presenter: Andrea Taylor-Butts, Canadian Centre of Justice Statistics
- 10:30** Refreshment Break
- 10:45** Defining and collecting data on intimate partner violence resources: Beginning a case study [*Roundtable discussions*]
- 11:15** Are there challenges/benefits to narrowing our focus to a particular type of victim/survivor or a particular type of crime?
[*Full plenary: Report back – MJ to record*]
- 12:15** Lunch
[Location: Gryphon Room]
- 1:30** Measuring intimate partner violence resources: Resource availability, accessibility, utility and other characteristics?
[*Roundtable discussions*]

Day 2:

Friday, November 6, 2009

2:30

Measuring intimate partner violence resources: What are the common measures available that can begin the process?
[*Full plenary: Report back – Liz to record*]

3:30

Refreshment Break

3:45

What now? Where do we go from here?
Myrna Dawson, University of Guelph

4:15

Reflections and Closing Comments
Barb McQuarrie, Centre for Research and Education on Violence Against Women and Children

Members of Workshop Organizing Committee:

Elizabeth Blaney
Myrna Dawson
Carmen Gill
Holly Johnson
Barb McQuarrie
Elizabeth Wells

Special thanks to:

Cheryl Fraehlich
Mary Jane Hubbert
Aaron Jacklin
Michelle Lawrence
Alison Maynard
Julie Poon
Lanette Ruff
Elizabeth Wells

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

[Please note: The first day of the workshop will focus more broadly on victims/survivors of violence and the first two questions. The second day will focus in more detail on intimate partner violence as a case study, building on the previous day's discussion with respect to the first two questions, but focusing in more detail on the third question. The sub-questions are provided as examples of potential issues to be covered, but should not be considered exhaustive. Please see attached agenda.]

➤ **QUESTION #1: HOW DO WE DEFINE VICTIM/SURVIVOR RESOURCES?**

Sub-questions:

How do we/should we categorize victim/survivors of crimes/violence?

Do the victim/survivor categories have anything in common with respect to their needs and/or requirements?

Is there a core set of resources that all victims/survivors of violence need?

Are some needs/requirements specific to particular groups of victim/survivors or crimes/violence? If so, what are they?

What resources are available to meet these needs/requirements?

Discussion Goal: To create a working definition for victim/survivor resources.

Some current definitions:

Canada's national victim services survey defines *victim services* as "agencies that provide direct services to primary and secondary victims of crime and that are funded in whole or in part by a ministry responsible for justice matters" (Brzozowski 2008, 33).

Map the Gaps define *violence against women support services* as "a range of support options that enable women to create safety, seek justice, and undo the harms of violence" (Coy et al. 2007, 10).

Research in the United States did not specifically define *domestic violence resources*, but did include in their definition of existing policies and laws pertaining to domestic violence as well as organizations and initiatives that responded to domestic violence (Dugan et al., 1999, 2003).

➤ **QUESTION #2: WHAT ARE OUR DATA GAPS AND NEEDS?**

Sub-questions:

How are we collecting victim/survivor resource information now? Is it an appropriate approach?

What may be some of the (un)intended consequences of how we are collecting data?

What data is currently available on victim resources? What do these data look like?

Who is currently collecting these data and for what purposes?

Are there existing data that provide foundational information that can be built upon?

What are the data gaps that can be addressed by data collection in the future?

From where or whom can data be collected?

Are current data collection initiatives capturing what we want to capture? Are they accessible to those who need them (i.e. community, government, researchers)?

What are the resource issues (e.g. time, personnel) that may pose a challenge to data collection and what are other potential obstacles (e.g. confidentiality issues, privacy issues, geographic or jurisdictional boundaries) that will need to be addressed?

Goal: To begin to build on current knowledge by identifying where to begin and potential priorities

➤ **QUESTION #3: WHAT ARE APPROPRIATE MEASURES?**

Sub-questions:

How should 'resource availability' be measured?

(A simple yes/no as to whether they exist in a particular region or community? What level of commitment in terms of funding and staff available? Hours open?)

How should 'resource accessibility' be measured?

(Average distance traveled by victims? Do victims access services immediately or after being placed on a waiting list? Are victims able to access their language of service, accommodations for those with disability (e.g. hearing, sight, wheelchair access, etc.)?

How should 'resource utility' be measured?

(Absolute numbers of victims served? Numbers of victims served based on characteristics such as race/ethnicity, age, disability compared to representation in the population? What are

services offered and what are used? How well do resources respond to needs of client and needs of community?

What other important resource characteristics should we be measuring?

Should we consider existing policies and laws pertaining to violent victimization as 'resources' to be measured along with more concrete measures such as the more concrete initiatives that often stem from these policies and laws?

(E.g. With respect to shelters, we know they are available, but we should measure absolute number of beds available? Number of beds available compared to need measured by women who are on waiting list? Should we consider the number of women turned away is an indicator of capacity to meet demand? Types of services it offers? Do they offer outreach and internal services?)

(E.g. With respect to police, a community as a specialized police unit, but what does this mean in terms of size of unit relative to the area they cover, number of officers who work fulltime within the unit? How many civilian employees and volunteers?)

Goal: To identify some common available measures

APPENDIX E

Methodology

The data analyzed for this paper was obtained at a two-day workshop in Guelph, Ontario. The method used to collect the data consisted of semi-structured questions seeking qualitative responses from workshop participants. The workshop brought together approximately 50 participants including academic, government and community actors. The majority of participants were from the provinces and territories with one academic from the United Kingdom and one government actor from Australia. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss current knowledge about victim/survivor resources, including criminal justice and community-based resources and services available to those who are or have experienced violence. Determining what resources and services are currently available to victims/survivors will provide the necessary foundation to build upon the current methods of collecting these types of data.

Each participant was assigned to a roundtable comprised of approximately five participants with at least one representative from each sector. Prior to commencing the discussions, participants were informed of the anonymity of their responses to ensure that they could be confident that they would not be identified and, therefore, they could be as open as possible when responding to particular questions. Each roundtable was presented with a series of semi-structured questions related broadly to victim/survivors of violence as well as more specific questions related to intimate partner violence which served as a later case study. In addition to the main workshop facilitator, each roundtable was assigned their own facilitator/note-taker to moderate the discussion, to ensure that all actors were given the opportunity to present their perspectives, and to ensure that the discussions were recorded as accurately as possible, highlighting the key points and concerns as they arose. Following the breakout sessions, the roundtables reconvened for full plenary discussions to share the ideas and concerns expressed within their groups and to identify similarities or differences in the issues identified.

Following the data collection, all recorder notes were organized by question into one summary document containing the raw data. Each of the authors conducted an initial read through, making general notes, to familiarize themselves with the summary document. A second read through involved more detailed analyses that included making initial descriptive codes to describe themes, concerns and issues raised in the discussions, along with making detailed notes of any important similarities, differences or contradictions that were highlighted within these themes. Two documents were created from this qualitative analysis. The first document identified codes and themes from excerpts that were specific to particular research questions. Themes were organized so that they appeared directly below each research question with the participant's sector noted. Organizing the document in this manner provided the opportunity to view similar excerpts collectively, to identify whether themes could be collapsed or merged together, and to determine whether any similarities or differences of opinions existed across the three sectors. Additionally, themes that appeared to be infrequent yet considered important were documented as a free code. The second document contained a summary of the overall analysis derived from the first document. It concisely identified the themes within each research question, this time counting the number of times a theme was raised within each sector. This allowed us to determine whether any differences, similarities, concerns or contradictions were identified more commonly within a specific sector.

Following the completion of the separate analyses, the two documents were circulated amongst the authors to compare analyses and to identify whether any of the themes overlapped to ensure the reliability and validity of the analysis and to ensure greater legitimacy in findings. Once the draft of the analysis was completed and written up into summary form, it was distributed to workshop participants to review to ensure that the opinions and concerns expressed in the draft were reflective of what was communicated during the workshop.

APPENDIX F

Workshop Evaluation Summary

At the end of the workshop, participants were given an evaluation survey consisting of 20 questions to gain feedback regarding the workshop. The goal was to gauge their assessment of how effective the workshop was at reaching its goals and to gather any insight they had gained over the course of the workshop. The summary below is based on those respondents who completed the survey (N=41). Where possible, we include comments from respondents that illustrate more fully their reflections on the workshop.

- Approximately 60 percent of the participants said the workshop exceeded their expectations, 35 percent said the workshop somewhat exceeded their expectations, and five percent indicated that the workshop met expectations.
- About 64 percent of participants felt the presentations given on the first day met the goals of the workshop very well, 31 percent felt the goals were met well and five percent felt the presentations had been satisfactory in meeting the workshop goals. Regarding the second-day presentations, 53 percent of participants indicated they met the goals very well, 40 percent felt the goals were met well with these presentations and eight percent felt it was satisfactory.
- Participants were also asked to rate the short panel presentations as to how well they set the context for the roundtable discussions. About 56 percent of participants felt the presentations set the context for discussion very well, 41 percent felt they set the context well, and almost three percent felt that the context was satisfactorily set for the discussions.
- Participants were also asked if they felt the small roundtable discussions were an effective way to facilitate discussions and if they were appropriate for the workshop. About 70 percent of participants strongly agreed that they were effective, 28 percent agreed, and three percent somewhat agreed.
- Full plenary discussions were held following the roundtable discussions and participants were asked if they felt that the full plenary discussions effectively brought together ideas from the roundtable discussions. About 64 percent of the participants strongly agreed that the full plenary was an effective method for doing so, 31 percent agreed, and five percent somewhat agreed.
- One of the workshop goals was to identify strengths and limitations of current national and provincial data systems documenting the availability of victim/survivor services and resources. About 44 percent of the participants felt this objective was met very well, 44 percent felt it was met well, and about 13 percent felt this objective was met in a satisfactory manner.

One participant wrote that it is a challenge to share data across different groups but it is worthwhile to share knowledge. Another wrote that it is 'hard to document resources for victims/survivors especially without a well thought through policy framework, it is easy to

collect lots of data but not to analyze or provide information on it. It is a complex issue, responding to violence does not equal ending violence.’

Another limitation noted in the evaluation was that governments largely drive data collection and there are difficulties in documenting resources because there are a wide variety of services across the country and, therefore, some services/resources are not mentioned in data collection.

- Participants were asked if they felt that they had achieved a consensus on what is meant by ‘services/resources.’ About 27 percent felt that this goal was met very well, 51 percent felt the goal was met well, and another 17 percent felt the goal was met in a satisfactory manner. Five percent felt this goal was not met well.
- Participants were asked if they felt that the types of services/resources that were important to measure and why were adequately identified at the workshop. About 44 percent felt they had been identified very well, 39 percent indicated that they thought they were identified well, 15 percent felt it had been done satisfactorily and about two percent felt it was not done well.

One participant wrote that one of her top priorities when beginning to document victim/survivor resources would be to ‘speak with women who do not access specialized services.’ More than one participant noted that they would ensure sexual assault services were included when documenting victim/survivor resources. Another participant said they would ‘ensure non-justice resources are included in the victim services survey, (and) promote consistency within Ontario.’

Overall, it was indicated by some participants that the workshop had lead them to the conclusion that it is important to document a broad range of services.

- Identifying the most appropriate measures and samples to capture the existence and type of resource/service was another workshop goal. In rating the ability of the workshop to meet this goal, 15 percent of the participants felt this was done very well, 65 percent said it was done well, and 20 percent indicated this goal had been met in a satisfactory manner.
- The workshop also explored appropriate methods for collecting standardized data on various resource measures at the local, provincial, and national level. About 21 percent felt these methods were explored very well, 45 percent felt they were explored well, 32 percent felt they were explored at a satisfactory level and three percent felt the methods had not been explored well.

One participant wrote that a promising method for data collection was ‘the networking of community, government, and academics.’ The keynote speaker, Liz Kelly, and her presentation about the mapping of services in the UK also stood out as an effective measurement tool to participants and this was mentioned many times on evaluations as a promising practice.

One participant also raised the point that it is important to look beyond the criminal justice system when collecting data at all levels.

- Another workshop goal was to lay out a research agenda for multi-level initiatives that will examine the feasibility of documenting the availability, accessibility, and utility of resources/services. About 26 percent of the participants felt this goal was met very well, 39 percent felt it was met well, 33 percent felt it was met in a satisfactory manner and, finally, three percent of participants felt this goal was not met well.
- The next two questions focused on the multi-disciplinary focus of the workshop that brought together representatives from the government, communities, and academia. Participants were asked to rate how effective the workshop was at bringing together community partners, researchers, and policy makers. About 71 percent of the participants felt this was done very well, 20 percent felt this was done well, seven percent said it was done in a satisfactory manner, and three percent said it was not done well. Participants were asked if the workshop demonstrated the value of interdisciplinary and multi-sectoral collaborations among community members, researchers, and policy makers to address the issues brought forward by the workshop and 80 percent indicated that this was done very well, 13 percent said this was done well, and eight percent said it was done to a satisfactory extent.

Participants were given the opportunity to submit written responses and comments to the questions asked as well. Some of these comments have already been discussed above. We asked participants what they learned about documenting resources for victims/survivors of violence in Canada. Some additional comments were that:

“There are differences across counties, and we need to find out where are the informal resources.”

“The community, academics and government must work together.”

“There is a need for a broad range of information, policies, and laws. There is a need for standardized methods and definitions.”

“We can be more effective if we share perspectives and tools, it is important to include victims/survivors in the process (of data collection).”

Participants were also asked what were the three things that they felt they could do to support the move toward better documentation of victim/survivor resources. Some noted the following:

“I would talk more to service providers and place an emphasis on qualitative research methods.”

“(I would) do victim centered research, include women in the (research) process, (and) collaborate with others.”

Many participants also noted that they would include talking to women (victims) when documenting resources as well as collaborating among the different disciplines, including government, communities, and academics and using more qualitative research methods. One participant said “*[I would] communicate with members of communities [where] I interact, [as well as] take part in initial research steps in my community, for example arranging and conducting focus groups with service providers/users etcetera.*”

Finally, participants were asked what they felt the barriers or challenges are to documenting victim/survivor resources. Many participants noted privacy and confidentiality as a barrier to data collection. Limited human resources and funding was another repeated concern among participants brought up many times. Low response rate was an additional concern to documenting victim/survivor resources. Participants were asked at the end if they would be interested in participating in a collaborative initiative to document victim and survivor resources in Canada and 93 percent of them said yes and provided their contact information.

References

- Aldridge, M.L. and K.D. Browne. 2003. Perpetrators of spousal homicide: A review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 4(3):265.
- Brantingham, P. J. and P.L. Brantingham. 1981. *Environmental criminology*. California: Sage.
- Browne, A. and K.R. Williams. 1989. Exploring the effect of resource availability and the likelihood of female-perpetrated homicides. *Law and Society Review* 23(1): 75-94.
- Brzozowski, J. 2008. Serving Canada's crime victims: Results from the 2005/2006 Victim Services Survey. *Victims of Crime Research Digest* (p. 33-37). Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Campbell, J.C., Glass, N., Sharps, P.W., Laughon, K. and T. Bloom. 2007. Intimate partner homicide: Review and implications of research and policy. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 8(3): 246-269.
- Coy, M., Kelly, L., and J. Foord. 2009. *Map of Gaps 2: The Postcode Lottery of Violence Against Women Support Services*. London: End Violence Against Women.
- Coy, M., Kelly, L., and J. Foord. 2007. *Map of Gaps: The Postcode Lottery of Violence Against Women Support Services*. London: End Violence Against Women.
- Currie, A. 2007. *The Legal Problems of Everyday Life: The Nature, Extent and Consequences of Justiciable Problems Experienced by Canadians*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Dawson, M. 2010. Documenting the growth of resources for victims/survivors of violence. *Victims of Crime: Research Digest*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada. [In press]
- Dawson, M., V. Pottie Bunge and T. Balde. 2009. National trends in intimate partner homicides: Explaining the decline, Canada, 1976-2001. *Violence Against Women* 15(3): 276-306.
- Dawson, M. 2001. *An Examination of Declines in Intimate Partner Homicide Rates*. Final Report, 80 pages. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- DeLeon-Granados, W. and W. Wells. 2003. The reliability and validity of measures of domestic violence resources as used in intimate partner homicide research. *Violence Against Women* 9(2): 148-162.
- Dugan, L. 2003. Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of domestic violence police involvement, and arrest. *Criminology and Public Policy* 2(2): 283-312.
- Dugan, L., D.S. Nagin, and R. Rosenfeld. 2003. Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate partner homicide? *Law & Society Review* 37(1): 169-198.

- Dugan, L., D.S. Nagin, and R. Rosenfeld. 1999. Explaining the Decline in Intimate Partner Homicide: The Effects of Changing Domesticity, Women's Status, and Domestic Violence Resources. *Homicide Studies* 3: 187-214.
- Fineman, M.A. and R. Mykitiuk. 1994. *The Public Nature of Private Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Fitzgerald, R., Wisener, M., and J. Savoie. 2004. *Neighbourhood Characteristics and the Distribution of Crime in Winnipeg*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (Catalogue no. 85-561-MIE2004004)
- Johnson, Holly. 2008. *Workshop on the Intersections Between Vulnerabilities and Criminal Justice Processing of Intimate Partner Violence: Record of Proceedings*. UNB: Canadian Observatory on the Justice System Response to Intimate Partner Violence.
- Ogrodnik, L. 2008. *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2008*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (Catalogue No. 85-224-XIE)
- Sauvé, Julie. 2009. Victim Services in Canada, 2007/2008. *Juristat* 29(4).
- Savoie, J. 2008. *Neighbourhood Characteristics and the Distribution of Crime: Edmonton, Halifax, and Thunder Bay*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (Catalogue no. 85-561-M-No. 010)