

**Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicester,  
Leicestershire and Rutland  
Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Fund –  
The Jenkins Centre FreeVa  
Evaluation**

Author	Charlotte Highcock – Commissioning Manager
--------	--

Contract Title	Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme FreeVa The Jenkins Centre
----------------	--

**Background**

The Jenkins Centre, run by Freeva, has been the preferred provider to deliver the Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme on behalf of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (OPCC) since 2015. The funding for this service has largely relied on successful applications to the Home Office by the OPCC, for £196,433 per annum, with additional funding granted for City service users, by Leicester City Council. As part of the requirements from the Home Office for monitoring the funding, an evaluation of the service must take place to ensure value for money, service efficiency, and efficacy.

**Purpose of Internal Review**

The purpose of this internal review is to evaluate the performance of the Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme against the aims and requirements of the contract, highlighting key performance outcomes, value for money, before concluding how successful the service has been. In order to complete this evaluation, the following were taken into consideration:

- The Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme contract between Freeva and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
- Monitoring data from Q1-Q3 for the financial year 22/23
- Case studies from both City and County Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programmes

**Aims of the Contract**

Schedule 1, The Specification sets out the aims of the contract to provide as follows:

1. An early intervention based out of court disposal (Conditional Cautions Against Relationship Abuse (CARA) which seeks to achieve a realisation within the perpetrator that their behaviour is not acceptable and that they have a problem which they need to deal with.
2. A perpetrator behaviour change programme with integrated partner support services, which seeks to enable perpetrators to understand the underlying drivers for their behaviour and enable them to behave in a different and more acceptable manner going forwards.
3. A Drive like perpetrator intervention to target and put pressure on high risk or prolific perpetrators through an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) approach.

In order to achieve the above, Freeva have the Jenkins Centre and deliver the following programmes:

- A 24-week group programme for men only, to change their violent and abusive behaviour.
- A 12-week Individual Interventions Programme for female perpetrators, Non-English speakers, perpetrators in same-sex relationships and for perpetrators unsuitable for the group programme.
- A 10-week Dads Parenting Programme focusing on restorative parenting (post-abuse) and accountability to children.
- Monthly maintenance group
- A parallel Partner Support Service, offering emotional, practical and safety planning support for partners/ex-partners of perpetrators engaged in interventions.
- Training and service briefings delivery to multiple agency professionals
- Early engagement with perpetrators providing awareness raising and motivational sessions to increase understanding and impact of their behaviour
- Specialist support for those that have mental health and/or substance misuse issues that includes 1-2-1 support alongside the group-work programme
- Culturally sensitive interventions/materials, including a BAME post to engage those whose first language is not English
- Community Awareness programme to raise awareness of services provided and to encourage perpetrators to seek support to change their behaviour.
- Provision for offenders where their index offence is not domestic violence.

Freeva have recently received re-accreditation in the Respect Accreditation standards. The service employs x1 Service Manager, x2.5 FTE Interventions Workers, x1 Senior Partner Support Worker, x1 Partner Support Worker and x1 Project Support Worker.

Freeva have been reporting on a quarterly basis in line with the contractual requirements. At the time of writing, Q1 – Q3 were used to support the content and conclusions in this report.

#### Highlight Report of Service to date

The service in the year 2021/2022 provided support to 86 perpetrators, 88 victims and 153 secondary/children victims. In Q1- Q3 of 2022/2023, the service provided support to 106 perpetrators, with ongoing support to over 100 victims and secondary/children victims.

Over the past three quarters of the financial year 2022/2023, we have seen 13 females, 93 males, of which there was 1 identifying as LGBTQ+, 73 who identify as White British, 25 Asian, 4 mixed race and 2 Black/Africa/Afro-Caribbean.

Quarter 1 highlights are as follows:

From the City, there were 22 referrals of which 16 were eligible. The 16 referrals had a completion rate of 100%.

From the County, 23 eligible referrals, of which 1 dropped out after the midway stage.

For Quarter 1 there was a total completion rate of 91% which was broken down into the following statistics:

- All clients completed the 12-week programme, by getting to the midway stage (partial completers completing SRP)
- 1 client completed the full 24-week programme (full completers completing SRP and RRP) – 1 client dropped out of the programme after the midway stage.
- All remaining clients completed 121 intervention

Support plans were provided at the initiation, midway and completion stages and were all completed by all clients where relevant.

93% of perpetrators in this programme saw a reduction in perpetrated abusive behaviour; 1 client reported a further incident.

Quarter 2 highlights:

From the County there were 18 eligible referrals in quarter 2 and 15 from the city. The completion rate for the programmes was 67%.

At the end of Q2:

5 referrals had been received and were being processed but were awaiting more information from referring professionals;

3 clients had been allocated and first contact made and were awaiting their assessment;

1 client was actively being assessed;

11 clients were closed due to the outcome of assessment

1 client was awaiting the next intake for intervention

10 clients were in intervention

Support plans were provided at the initiation, midway and completion stages and were all completed by all clients where relevant.

Unfortunately, of the 4 completers in the County cohort, (1 Charnwood, 1 O&W, 1 H&B, 1 Harborough), only 1 of the partners (Harborough) continued to engage with PSS. Therefore, this is the only case we can consider in the numbers which showed there were no incidents recorded and the partner describes that things are going well.

Quarter 3 highlights:

The data for this quarter is affected by the exit strategy that was put in place from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022, in the event that funding is not secured beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023.

There were 33 total referrals for this quarter, 15 of which were from the county. The completion rate of the programme was 71% for this quarter.

At the end of Q3:

3 clients had been allocated and first contact made and were awaiting their assessment;

1 client was actively being assessed;

8 clients were closed due to the outcome of assessment

5 clients were awaiting the next intake for intervention

9 clients were in intervention

During Q3 one client (Blaby) has experienced ongoing emotional abuse and harassment from her ex-partner. PSS have supported this client through attainment of a non-molestation order and through her contact with Police.

Another client disclosed on intervention that he has strangled his partner. This case had come into service as a mutual violence case and we were unable to support his partner due to her having recently completed a different intervention. However, on following this disclosure, we contacted her in the capacity of PSS to do a check in and see what support she required. She declined to complete a DASH and stated she did not want any support.

Quarter 4 highlights:

14 eligible referrals were received from the county and 20 from the City.

For the Adult Perpetrator Service, as of 31/03/23:

At the end of Q4:

3 clients had not yet been successfully contacted – staff had made attempts and were continuing to do so;

4 clients had been allocated and first contact made and were awaiting their assessment (3 had assessments booked and 1 was trying to arrange the assessment date);

1 client was actively being assessed;

2 clients were closed due to the outcome of assessment

2 clients were awaiting the next intake for intervention

8 clients were in intervention

During quarter 4, one city client completed Foundations. Two more have started and had completed 4 of 6 sessions at the point of monitoring. Feedback received about Foundations from clients, was that it was helpful and “100% on point”. A client suggested that they learnt how to deal with their emotions, as well as how to understand other people better.

Case Studies

County

Chris, a White-British 21-year old, was referred to The Jenkins Centre on the 12th December 2022, by Children’s Social Care. He had been referred to the service twice before, but had not engaged during the assessment process, to see if he would be suitable in this intervention. At these times, interventions workers offered multiple opportunities to complete the assessment, and had liaised with Chris’s children’s social worker to encourage him to attend the assessment. When Chris did answer calls to complete the suitability assessment, they had been in unsuitable or non-confidential environments like the gym. After his third referral, Chris agreed to a telephone assessment that was arranged for the 17th December 2022. However, on the call a child was heard with Chris and it was later understood he was at his son’s birthday party. While Chris was willing to continue the assessment, he was advised a new appointment would be arranged. It was explained to Chris this would need to be in-person due to concerns around him not being in a safe and confidential space.

The suitability assessment was completed on the 19th January 2023. Chris engaged well during the assessment, he opened up quickly and shared a lot about harmful and abusive behaviour during the



relationship, and what he struggles with when it comes to managing his behaviour. It was observed by the intervention's worker assessing Chris that sometimes he would talk about behaviour that 'we' used, as in both he and his ex-partner Emma. This is something that the facilitators of sessions can challenge during our intervention to encourage him to think about his behaviour separately from his partners. When discussing goals and considering how he would like to change through completing our Second-Step Programme, Chris spoke about wanting to manage arguments better and be better at talking to his partner. In parts of the assessment, Chris spoke about worrying that if he got back with his partner she would cheat, these were raised with Chris, and he was asked if he thought he should set any goals around managing these worries or trusting Emma more. Chris wasn't really sure what he needed to change, and presented as ambivalent as to whether this would be a problem or not, and spoke about the fact that Emma did cheat. Therefore, it was suggested that Chris think about risks around not trusting your partner in a relationship, and think about whether he relates to jealousy when it is talked about in sessions.

Chris started the Second-Step Programme on 16th February 2023. Chris was quiet in the session, he shared he was feeling nervous and the group felt 'a bit weird'. Chris did make positive contributions to group discussions in the session. Chris's keyworker introduced themselves to the family's social worker and updated them that he had begun the intervention. The keyworker was invited to the next Core Group on the 2nd March. Updates from other professionals were positive, and Chris and Emma had by this point recently reconciled the relationship, no incidents or recent concerns were identified, the only concern was with one of their children undergoing an autism diagnosis and parents struggling with some of his more challenging behaviours, however they were also praised for co-parenting well.

As sessions progressed Chris grew in confidence in the groups, and was able to relate to content in the sessions and was supported by facilitators to reflect on his own behaviour. For example, when exploring the concept of 'wearing masks' as defence mechanisms, Chris identified with being the 'funny guy' and wearing a humorous mask. When this was explored further Chris reflected that some of the humour he uses are actually jokes at his partner's expense.

Chris also engaged well in conversations with toxic masculinity, talking about his own childhood/teenage experiences of being encouraged to be a "player" and have sex with lots of people, and how this relates to his behaviour in relationships. Facilitators challenged some of his views on masculinity as well, and the impact this could have on his relationship, as well as views expressed towards people in the public eye.

Chris has only missed one session so far and this was recently, and a catchup on this has been arranged to be completed. Chris is finishing a security qualification and will then be looking for work. His keyworker will encourage him to prioritise his commitment to the intervention alongside this, in order to continue to make important changes and maintain a healthier relationship.

Risk has been reviewed on a monthly basis through internal risk management meetings, and whilst Chris's keyworker is happy with the progress that he is making, the risk has remained high due to concerns of historic violence and that Emma has declined support from our partner support service, therefore we are unable to accurately capture the survivor's voice.

City

As part of assessment of suitability for interventions, assessors also assess risk by completing a Perpetrator DASH with the client. DASHs are also completed with the survivor within their initial contact (if possible and they consent to do so). This provides a good indicator of risk within a case,



as we get the view from both sides. If concerns are identified within the DASHs, a referral to MARAC will be made.

Each week, the interventions team and the partner support service meet for risk management. We review cases and discuss any concerns around risk. Actions are set to support any needs identified. Case notes and the risk tracker on oasis are used to follow any changes in risk throughout the journey of a case.

The Partner Support Service offers safety planning to all clients and this is reviewed throughout their engagement with the service.

In Q3 there was a case where the Partner Support Service identified concerns of the mother's mental health and her ability to care for her child and reported this to the social worker overseeing the case. Following this, in Q4, the social worker did not keep in contact with our service. More concerns arose, as The Jenkins Centre were looking to suspend the father due to lack of attendance, which could possibly increase risk. The father had also been reporting mental health issues and attempts at taking his own life and also informed that he and his ex-partner were having contact again. Therefore, there were a number of areas in which risk was increasing. It was only through The Jenkins Centre contacting the social worker, that we were informed that the case was no longer under Leicester City and had now moved to county. The interventions worker then had to contact county to establish who the new social worker was for the case. In making this contact, it became clear that the social worker was not aware of any of these current risk factors and that case conferences had been cancelled due to a number of factors. By this time, interventions had suspended the client and the partner support service were no longer able to have successful contact with their client (she was not answering calls or messages). The interventions worker continued to persevere and chase until she was finally invited to a case conference and could share all the up to date information and concerns that we had. This was taken into consideration when the case safety plan was reviewed.

In Q4, one of the partner support clients was residing in a safehouse in Birmingham. Throughout this quarter, concerns developed around her contact with her husband. She firstly shared that she was having a trip back to Leicester and was going to stay in the marital home whilst he was away on a work trip. At another time, she stated she was returning to Leicester to drop off supplies for her pets that a friend was looking after for her. She then later shared that she had been meeting up with her husband in Birmingham. At each disclosure, the partner support worker spoke with the client about concerns and the possible impacts of her actions and that she may be putting herself at risk. Safety planning was always reviewed. The Partner Support worker encouraged the client to speak with her keyworker at the safe house but it was evident that the client did not feel supported by her keyworker. Therefore, the partner support worker also contacted staff at the safehouse on a number of occasions to clarify factors, for example, whether the client could lose her place in the safe house if she left for a number of days. The Partner Support worker also informed the safehouse that the client was meeting her husband in Birmingham and that we therefore did not know if the location of the safe house was being kept from him, etc. Partner Support continue to support this client through her journey.



### Value for Money

In financial year 21/22 86 perpetrators and 88 victims received a service, making the cost per client £1034. If this included the 153 children/ secondary victims in this the cost reduces to £550 per client.

Without the additional consideration of the secondary victims/children, the cost per client would be considered very expensive, especially given that the service is completed by fewer than 100 people per financial year, at a cost of over £1k per person. In addition, the completion rates have varied per quarter and no new referrals were accepted for the County from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022 due to no further confirmation of funding beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023.

### Risks and Issues

At the time of writing, there is no comparable service available in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, making this service unique in the area for perpetrators of domestic abuse.

The Jenkins Centre provides an integrated domestic abuse service, that supports perpetrators in changing their thinking and behaviour, whilst also providing emotional and practical support to survivors, as well as providing support for children by making referrals to relevant agencies.

A large proportion of referrals come from statutory services and without this provision in place it will put services that are already overwhelmed under further pressure.

Leicestershire implements conditional cautioning for domestic violence in conjunction with the CARA Project, which is delivered by the Respect accredited Hampton Trust service. CARA is a short term awareness raising intervention that does not include survivor support. In December 2022, Rise Mutual started implementing a similar awareness raising course in the County. Neither of these provisions are perpetrator behaviour change programmes and on their own, will not provide sufficient perpetrator provision for the area.

It is a pre-condition for forces to ensure that there is no evidence of coercive control when referring offenders to CARA, which is a form of abuse that The Jenkins Centre addresses with the majority of perpetrators supported through the programme. Awareness raising courses such as CARA and the Rise Mutual project should sit alongside and create a pathway to behaviour change courses like The Second Step with The Jenkins Centre.

The main issue when considering the above risks, is the value for money of this programme. The aim of the perpetrator service is to identify, engage and motivate change amongst men and women using abusive behaviour in intimate partner relationships in order to reduce that behaviour and improve the safety, health and well-being of partners, ex-partners, children and themselves.

In addition, programme completion and ongoing support are two outcomes that are mixed in results. On average 76% of clients completed the programme in Q1-Q3, at a cost of £131,648.93 to date. It is a concern that only 38 made it through the programme in full and continued to engage with the service after, out of 105 perpetrators seen this year to date. This is something that will require close monitoring in a new contract.



## Conclusions

It is evident that a service for behaviour change is relevant to the area and that it would complement the other services in the area, such as CARA, RISE and the Victim Services commissioned across LLR. However, value for money is something that must be addressed if the service is to continue. Freeva have been requested to provide details of the minimum service requirements needed to keep the service going.