

**INTER AGENCY WORKSHOP**

# **TACKLING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

## **Evaluation of Level 1 Workshops**

**September 2003 – April 2004**

Part of

**Devon Domestic Violence Strategy**

| <b>INDEX</b>                             | <b>PAGE</b> |
|--|-------------|
| Context                                  | 3           |
| Aims and objectives of One day Programme | 4           |
| Cost evaluation                          | 5           |
| Evaluation process                       | 5           |
| Outcomes: attendance                     | 6           |
| - by district                            |             |
| - by agency                              |             |
| - by gender                              |             |
| - by district and agency                 | 7           |
| non attendees                            | 8           |
| - by agency                              |             |
| - by district                            |             |
| Feedback summary                         |             |
| - Overall by objectives                  | 9           |
| - by workshop                            | 10          |
| - by agency                              | 12          |
| - comments                               | 13 -14      |
| <br><b>Appendix</b>                      |             |
| Evaluation forms                         | 15 – 17     |
| Quality Assurance Process                | 18 - 24     |

## Context:

The Devon Domestic Violence Strategy clearly recommended service development in the following five key areas:

- Training and Awareness Raising
- Information Sharing and Data Management
- Services for Children and Survivors
- Work with Perpetrators
- Agency roles and policy

In order to ensure the development of Training and Awareness, the following objectives were clearly laid out in the 2003/4 Business Plan:

### **6.1.5 Training:**

*Raising the awareness of the scale and extent of domestic violence as well as the peculiar issues associated with this crime can only be achieved through comprehensive training across all agencies. Training needs will vary between agencies however all agencies would benefit from a quality, consistent programme (level 1). Such a **pilot has been developed** and is being rolled out to approximately **200 people (multi-agency) in March, April & May 2003**. On evaluation it is intended that this programme operate on a continuum, running **80 courses a year to approximately 1,000 staff**. In addition further specialist programmes will be developed and other mediums exploited to raise awareness across all agencies.*

*Training will contribute towards the overall aim of the strategy by raising awareness of domestic violence prevalence and those in contact with domestic violence victims, encouraging front-line staff to 'ask the question' and therefore increase the level of reportage.*

Based on the Evaluation Report of the Pilot workshops, several minor changes were made to the programme, however due to the **overwhelming success of the pilot**, the roll out was confirmed to target 1,000 people per year for the next four years.

Therefore 42 workshops were arranged to run from mid September to end of April 2004 across the eight districts, to target 600 delegates for the rest of the financial year.  
(see appendix1)

Once again a range of practitioners attended from Health, Police, Social Services, Housing, Education, Probation/Court Welfare and Voluntary agencies.

## **Aims of the one day workshop**

- To raise awareness of the impact of domestic violence upon children and families
- To increase understanding of how best to offer help and support
- To raise standards of practice both individually and collectively

## **Objectives**

By the conclusion of the course, participants will be able to:

- Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children and adults
- Provide strategies and practices to protect and safeguard those experiencing Domestic Violence
- Consider techniques for engaging with victims / survivors
- Practise using appropriate interventions

## **Style**

This course is practical and user-friendly. Participants will experience an enjoyable and productive workshop involving group discussion and participative exercises.

## **Duration**

1 day (9.00 to 4.30)

## **Group Size**

14

## Costs Evaluation

### Cost of Workshop Provision:

|   | <b>Budget*</b>                   | <b>Actual</b>         |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Consultancy                                     | £7,300                           | £6,963                |
| Admin support set up                            | £2,500                           | £2,964                |
| Admin support on going                          | £7,000                           | £8,979                |
| Resources – workbook, photocopying, letters etc | £3,300                           | £2,481                |
| Trainer training                                | Included in Consultancy          | £367                  |
| Evaluation                                      | £1,400                           | £1,625                |
| Venues and Catering                             | £7,040                           | £7,281                |
| Trainers  | £16,500                          | £16,107               |
|   | <b>Total: <u>£45,040</u></b>     | <b><u>£46,767</u></b> |
|   | <b>Cost per head: £76.60</b>     | <b>£75.30</b>         |
|   | <b>Number of delegates: 588*</b> | <b>621</b>            |

\* Based on 42 workshops at 14 delegates per workshop

## Evaluation Process

The evaluation process had three main strands:

- 1. Delegate feedback** – an evaluation form which very importantly was based on the objectives of the workshops. *(please see appendix 1)*
- 2. Managers feedback** – a face-to-face or phone conversation based on a number of structured questions which identified the added value of the workshop to the workplace. *(please see appendix 1)*
- 3. Review by trainers and training managers** – trainers reflected on their own and shared practice plus a series of meetings were set up by the Domestic Violence Prevention Officer Co-ordinator with training managers and those responsible for training in a variety of agencies.

**Outcomes:****1. Summary of Attendance:**

**Total attendees**                      621                      **Target :**        600

**By District (NB based on location of stated workplace )**

|                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| <b>East Devon</b>                 | 45  |
| <b>Exeter</b>                     | 238 |
| <b>Mid Devon</b>                  | 38  |
| <b>Torrige and North Devon</b>    | 97  |
| <b>South Hams and Teignbridge</b> | 144 |
| <b>West Devon</b>                 | 29  |
| <b>External to Devon</b>          | 30  |

**By Agency****By Gender**  
**Male (%)      Female (%)**

|                        |            |                 |                 |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>CAFCAS</b>          | 8          | 3 (37.5)        | 5 (62.5)        |
| <b>CPS</b>             | 21         | 9 (43)          | 12 (57)         |
| <b>DCC other</b>       | 9          | 2 (22)          | 7 (78)          |
| <b>Education</b>       | 59         | 11 (19)         | 48 (81)         |
| <b>Health</b>          | 138        | 15 (11)         | 123 (89)        |
| <b>Housing</b>         | 39         | 5 (13)          | 48 (87)         |
| <b>Magistrates</b>     | 25         | 10 (40)         | 25 (60)         |
| <b>Police</b>          | 66         | 43 (65)         | 23 (35)         |
| <b>Prison</b>          | 9          | 6 (66)          | 3 (33)          |
| <b>Probation</b>       | 1          | 1 (100)         | 0 (0)           |
| <b>Social Services</b> | 123        | 16 (13)         | 107 (87)        |
| <b>SureStart</b>       | 9          | 0 (0)           | 9 (100)         |
| <b>Voluntary</b>       | 88         | 17 (19)         | 71 (81)         |
| <b>YOT</b>             | 14         | 1 (7)           | 13 (93)         |
| <b>Other</b>           | 12         | 2 (17)          | 10 (83)         |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>621</b> | <b>141 (23)</b> | <b>480 (77)</b> |

**District Attendance by Agency**

|                        | East Devon | Exeter     | Mid Devon | Torridge & North | S. Hams & Teignbridge | West Devon | External to Devon | Total      |
|------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| <b>CAFCAS</b>          | 0          | 8          | 0         | 0                | 0                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>8</b>   |
| <b>CPS</b>             | 0          | 21         | 0         | 0                | 0                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>21</b>  |
| <b>DCC Other</b>       | 0          | 8          | 0         | 0                | 1                     | 1          | 0                 | <b>10</b>  |
| <b>Education</b>       | 4          | 27         | 2         | 13               | 6                     | 6          | 1                 | <b>59</b>  |
| <b>Health</b>          | 20         | 48         | 10        | 22               | 32                    | 2          | 4                 | <b>138</b> |
| <b>Housing</b>         | 2          | 13         | 1         | 4                | 9                     | 0          | 10                | <b>39</b>  |
| <b>Magistrates</b>     | 2          | 7          | 6         | 6                | 4                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>Police</b>          | 2          | 19         | 4         | 3                | 25                    | 6          | 7                 | <b>66</b>  |
| <b>Prison</b>          | 0          | 9          | 0         | 0                | 0                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>9</b>   |
| <b>Probation</b>       | 0          | 1          | 0         | 0                | 0                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Social Services</b> | 11         | 48         | 12        | 17               | 28                    | 6          | 1                 | <b>123</b> |
| <b>SureStart</b>       | 0          | 3          | 0         | 4                | 1                     | 0          | 1                 | <b>9</b>   |
| <b>Voluntary</b>       | 3          | 23         | 3         | 19               | 26                    | 8          | 6                 | <b>88</b>  |
| <b>YOT</b>             | 0          | 0          | 0         | 8                | 6                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>14</b>  |
| <b>Other</b>           | 1          | 3          | 0         | 1                | 6                     | 0          | 0                 | <b>11</b>  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>45</b>  | <b>238</b> | <b>38</b> | <b>97</b>        | <b>144</b>            | <b>29</b>  | <b>30</b>         | <b>621</b> |

**Male** 10 (22%) 54 (23%) 9(24%) 23 (24%) 34 (24%) 4 (14%) 7 (23%) 141 (23%)

**Female** 35 184 29 74 110 25 23 480

There were many comments from delegates on the pilot regarding the lack of male attendees. We have tried to encourage agencies to engage with male delegates and there has been some success as the percentage during the pilot was only **7%**, whereas now it has more than **trebled to 23%**. As can be seen certain agencies and district need to help improve this balance.

## Non-attendees

In order to ensure value for money for both the Domestic Violence Strategy and the agencies, the level of attendance is critical.

In total 51 people were unable to attend the workshop to which they were assigned. Of those, almost half did not send apologies so we could not utilise our waiting list, which often holds more than 100 people.

### Non attendees by agency:

|                 |    |   |
|-----------------|----|---|
| CPS             | 4  |   |
| Education       | 4  |   |
| Health          | 3  |   |
| Police          | 7  |   |
| Probation       | 1  |   |
| Social Services | 9  |   |
| Housing         | 4  |   |
| Voluntary       | 12 |   |
| Others/unknown  | 7  | - |

There are obviously many factors involved, however we will continue to monitor this as we see it as an indication to quality (people wanting to go on the workshop), and support from organisations for this important initiative. Compared with other large training initiatives this is a very good ratio (8% of total), which is probably helped by the policy of charging for non attendance.

*\*For example: average non-attendance was 14% in 2003/4 across forty-nine Social Services and Education training courses with comparable aims.*

## Delegate Feedback

To date we have received a total of 601 feedback forms out of a possible 621. These responses give the following results of how each of the workshop objectives have been met:

### Q 1. To demonstrate an understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children and adults

| Met completely |     |    |   |   | Not at all | Average: 1.43 |
|----------------|-----|----|---|---|------------|---------------|
| 1              | 2   | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6          |               |
| 368            | 211 | 16 | 5 | 1 | -          |               |

### Q 2. To provide personal strategies and practices to protect and safeguard those experiencing Domestic Violence

| Met completely |     |     |    |   | Not at all | Average: 2.06 |
|----------------|-----|-----|----|---|------------|---------------|
| 1              | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5 | 6          |               |
| 144            | 304 | 129 | 18 | 6 | -          |               |

### Q 3. To consider techniques for engaging with victims / survivors

| Met completely |     |     |    |   | Not at all | Average: 2.09 |
|----------------|-----|-----|----|---|------------|---------------|
| 1              | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5 | 6          |               |
| 136            | 302 | 139 | 16 | 8 | -          |               |

### Q 4. To practice using appropriate interventions

| Met completely |     |     |    |   | Not at all | Average: 2.15 |
|----------------|-----|-----|----|---|------------|---------------|
| 1              | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5 | 6          |               |
| 147            | 272 | 145 | 24 | 9 | 4          |               |

### Q 5. The trainers' approach was

| Excellent |    |   |   |   | Very Poor | Average: 1.17 |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|-----------|---------------|
| 1         | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6         |               |
| 511       | 78 | 8 | 4 | - | -         |               |

This gives a total of 3,005 scores broken down as follows:

| <b>Met completely/ Excellent</b> |              |            |           | <b>Not at all/ Very Poor</b> |             |
|----------------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>1</b>                         | <b>2</b>     | <b>3</b>   | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>                     | <b>6</b>    |
| <b>1,306</b>                     | <b>1,167</b> | <b>437</b> | <b>67</b> | <b>24</b>                    | <b>4</b>    |
| <b>44%</b>                       | <b>39%</b>   | <b>14%</b> | <b>2%</b> | <b>0.8%</b>                  | <b>0.1%</b> |

Giving an overall average of **1.78**

These represent a very high standard of feedback, however to achieve the overall consistency and maintain standards, the feedback has been broken down further to each individual workshop.

By each workshop average score for each question

| <b>2003</b>                 | <b>Q1</b> | <b>Q2</b> | <b>Q3</b> | <b>Q4</b> | <b>Q5</b> | <b>Average</b> |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| <b>17<sup>th</sup> Sept</b> | 1.6       | 1.9       | 2.0       | 2.0       | 1.0       | 1.69           |
| <b>18<sup>th</sup> Sept</b> | 1.25      | 2.2       | 2.5       | 2.3       | 1.25      | 1.90           |
| <b>25<sup>th</sup> Sept</b> | 1.5       | 2.0       | 1.5       | 2.1       | 1.3       | 1.69           |
| <b>26<sup>th</sup> Sept</b> | 1.6       | 2.1       | 2.2       | 2.1       | 1.1       | 1.84           |
| <b>7<sup>th</sup> Oct</b>   | 1.5       | 2.1       | 2.2       | 2.1       | 1.1       | 1.80           |
| <b>10<sup>th</sup> Oct</b>  | 1.5       | 2.1       | 2.1       | 2.0       | 1.0       | 1.74           |
| <b>14<sup>th</sup> Oct</b>  | 1.2       | 2.1       | 1.9       | 2.0       | 1.1       | 1.66           |
| <b>23<sup>rd</sup> Oct</b>  | 1.4       | 2.1       | 1.9       | 2.1       | 1.4       | 1.78           |
| <b>7<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>   | 1.4       | 2.0       | 2.2       | 2.4       | 1.0       | 1.80           |
| <b>12<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>  | 1.4       | 2.0       | 1.7       | 1.8       | 1.1       | 1.60           |
| <b>13<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>  | 1.4       | 1.8       | 2.0       | 1.9       | 1.3       | 1.68           |
| <b>18<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>  | 1.5       | 2.3       | 2.0       | 1.8       | 1.1       | 1.74           |
| <b>20<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>  | 1.2       | 2.1       | 2.0       | 2.4       | 1.1       | 1.76           |
| <b>26<sup>th</sup> Nov</b>  | 1.4       | 2.3       | 2.4       | 2.5       | 1.2       | 1.96           |
| <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Dec</b>   | 1.6       | 2.4       | 2.1       | 2.4       | 1.2       | 1.94           |
| <b>10<sup>th</sup> Dec</b>  | 1.3       | 2.0       | 1.7       | 2.0       | 1.0       | 1.60           |
| <b>11<sup>th</sup> Dec</b>  | 1.4       | 1.8       | 2.0       | 1.9       | 1.0       | 1.62           |
| <b>11<sup>th</sup> Dec</b>  | 1.4       | 2.3       | 2.3       | 2.3       | 1.2       | 1.90           |

| <b>2004</b>                  | <b>Q1</b>   | <b>Q2</b>   | <b>Q3</b>   | <b>Q4</b>   | <b>Q5</b>   | <b>Average</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>13<sup>th</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.7         | 2.1         | 1.9         | 2.2         | 1.2         | 1.82           |
| <b>14<sup>th</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.4         | 2.1         | 2.2         | 2.0         | 1.3         | 1.80           |
| <b>21<sup>st</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.2         | 2.2         | 2.4         | 2.4         | 1.3         | 1.90           |
| <b>22<sup>nd</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.4         | 2.1         | 2.0         | 1.7         | 1.0         | 1.64           |
| <b>28<sup>th</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.8         | 2.4         | 2.4         | 2.3         | 1.1         | 2.00           |
| <b>29<sup>th</sup> Jan</b>   | 1.4         | 1.8         | 2.0         | 2.0         | 1.2         | 1.68           |
| <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Feb</b>    | 1.7         | 2.2         | 2.4         | 2.6         | 1.2         | 2.02           |
| <b>10<sup>th</sup> Feb</b>   | 1.7         | 2.0         | 2.1         | 2.1         | 1.4         | 1.86           |
| <b>11<sup>th</sup> Feb</b>   | 1.3         | 1.7         | 1.8         | 2.5         | 1.0         | 1.66           |
| <b>18<sup>th</sup> Feb</b>   | 1.4         | 1.9         | 2.1         | 2.3         | 1.3         | 1.80           |
| <b>19<sup>th</sup> Feb</b>   | 1.5         | 2.2         | 2.4         | 2.4         | 1.1         | 1.92           |
| <b>26<sup>th</sup> Feb</b>   | 1.4         | 2.1         | 2.2         | 2.4         | 1.1         | 1.84           |
| <b>4<sup>th</sup> March</b>  | 1.5         | 2.5         | 2.2         | 2.4         | 1.0         | 1.92           |
| <b>10<sup>th</sup> March</b> | 1.0         | 1.8         | 1.9         | 1.9         | 1.0         | 1.52           |
| <b>11<sup>th</sup> March</b> | 1.6         | 1.7         | 1.6         | 2.1         | 1.1         | 1.62           |
| <b>16<sup>th</sup> March</b> | 1.5         | 1.9         | 1.6         | 1.9         | 1.1         | 1.60           |
| <b>17<sup>th</sup> March</b> | 1.1         | 1.7         | 1.7         | 1.9         | 1.1         | 1.50           |
| <b>23<sup>rd</sup> March</b> | 1.3         | 1.8         | 1.8         | 1.6         | 1.3         | 1.56           |
| <b>2<sup>nd</sup> April</b>  | 2.1         | 3.0         | 3.1         | 2.7         | 1.8         | 2.54           |
| <b>5<sup>th</sup> April</b>  | 1.5         | 1.93        | 2.1         | 2.0         | 1.2         | 1.75           |
| <b>6<sup>th</sup> April</b>  | 1.1         | 1.4         | 1.8         | 1.7         | 1.4         | 1.48           |
| <b>23<sup>rd</sup> April</b> | 1.4         | 2.5         | 2.3         | 2.3         | 1.3         | 1.96           |
| <b>Average</b>               | <b>1.43</b> | <b>2.06</b> | <b>2.09</b> | <b>2.15</b> | <b>1.17</b> | <b>1.78</b>    |
| <b>Pilot:</b>                |             |             |             |             |             |                |
| <b>Average</b>               | <b>1.43</b> | <b>2.12</b> | <b>2.10</b> | <b>2.17</b> | <b>1.26</b> | <b>1.83</b>    |

It is useful to compare these score with the Pilot workshops as it is often found that Pilots receive the best feedback for a number of reasons. However it can be seen that due to the focus of the Training Team plus a rigorous Quality Assurance\* process standards have actually improved across the board.

*(Please see Appendix 2 for details of Quality Assurance Process)*

The feedback has also been broken down by sector as training managers felt this would be a useful indicator.

However as can be seen from the figures below there is a degree of consistency with only a couple of disparities.

|                    | <b>Q1</b>   | <b>Q2</b>   | <b>Q3</b>   | <b>Q4</b>   | <b>Q5</b>   | <b>Average</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| <b>CAFCAS</b>      | 1.4         | 1.6         | 2.0         | 2.1         | 1.0         | <b>1.60</b>    |
| <b>CPS</b>         | 1.5         | 2.5         | 2.4         | 2.7         | 1.2         | <b>2.06</b>    |
| <b>DCC Other</b>   | 1.5         | 2.0         | 2.1         | 2.25        | 1.5         | <b>1.88</b>    |
| <b>Education</b>   | 1.5         | 2.3         | 2.4         | 2.1         | 1.2         | <b>1.90</b>    |
| <b>Health</b>      | 1.5         | 2.1         | 2.1         | 2.2         | 1.2         | <b>1.83</b>    |
| <b>Housing</b>     | 1.2         | 1.8         | 2.1         | 1.8         | 1.1         | <b>1.59</b>    |
| <b>Magistrates</b> | 1.4         | 1.9         | 1.9         | 2.0         | 1.1         | <b>1.66</b>    |
| <b>Police</b>      | 1.5         | 2.1         | 1.9         | 2.2         | 1.2         | <b>1.78</b>    |
| <b>Prison</b>      | 1.4         | 2.3         | 1.9         | 1.9         | 1.1         | <b>1.70</b>    |
| <b>Probation</b>   | 1.0         | 2.0         | 3.0         | 2.0         | 1.0         | <b>1.80</b>    |
| <b>Social Serv</b> | 1.5         | 2.1         | 2.2         | 2.0         | 1.2         | <b>1.79</b>    |
| <b>SureStart</b>   | 1.2         | 1.9         | 2.3         | 2.0         | 1.0         | <b>1.69</b>    |
| <b>Voluntary</b>   | 1.3         | 1.9         | 2.0         | 2.0         | 1.2         | <b>1.68</b>    |
| <b>YOT</b>         | 1.2         | 2.1         | 2.3         | 2.2         | 1.1         | <b>1.80</b>    |
| <b>Other</b>       | 1.4         | 1.7         | 2.0         | 2.1         | 1.0         | <b>1.64</b>    |
| <b>Average</b>     | 1.43        | 2.07        | 2.09        | 2.15        | 1.17        | <b>1.83</b>    |
| <b>Male</b>        | <b>1.51</b> | <b>2.07</b> | <b>2.03</b> | <b>2.25</b> | <b>1.16</b> | <b>1.81</b>    |
| <b>Female</b>      | <b>1.42</b> | <b>2.06</b> | <b>2.11</b> | <b>2.05</b> | <b>1.18</b> | <b>1.76</b>    |

It is very encouraging to find that the feedback across the genders is very similar. There were possible concerns that due to the gender split of the delegates and trainers (eight out of nine trainers female) plus the nature of the programme, that at times men may be alienated. This is something we will continue to monitor.

## Comments:

The following are a mixture of comments from the evaluation forms and the discussions with managers. This list has tried to capture the whole variance of comments, however it must be remembered that in reality, *by far* the majority of comments were positive.

### Q1. To demonstrate an understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children and adults

Excellent day. Most useful to meet and discuss with other agencies

Thought I knew a lot about it already but ...wow! Role play was incredible experience couldn't believe how I /we felt

Excellent presentations covered all aspects                      A good day - objectives met

Very powerful and revealing - gave a better insight to people suffering domestic violence

Very informative day. Made a very heavy subject easy to talk about. Lots of participation and open forum encouraged

Excellent course    Didn't realise how many people were affected by DV

Demonstrated vividly - enjoyed all the exercises

I wish there was a course like this one when I first worked within a family where DV was a daily occurrence  
(Social worker)

Perhaps some anonymous case studies would have re-enforced some aspects

Subject perhaps too large to cover in one session

Perhaps more information on the effects (long term)

### Q2. To provide personal strategies and practices to protect and safeguard those experiencing Domestic Violence

I have a much better understanding of how to communicate with victims in my victim support role

My practice will change and improve as a result of this course. (Health)

Will approach domestic violence incidents from a different perspective in future (Police)

I will re evaluate my personal working practices (CPS)

Talking with colleagues from other agencies gave me a better insight into the roles/services they provide  
(Police)

Still will find it hard area to tackle and work towards appropriate goals

Would like to have expanded on this

As a healthcare worker more emphasis on this would have been helpful

Have no policies within working environment (Ambulance Service)

**Q3. To consider techniques for engaging with victims / survivors**

Role play exercise is extremely effective but painful

Valuable insight into this.

Need more practical type help with question

How this might work in Prisons I'm not sure. Particularly when offenders particularly those with DV issues talk about not complying with licence conditions i.e. who to contact etc.

The room exercise was very powerful however I would have liked to look/expand on this further for my role.  
(Social worker)

Met completely in relation to adults would have liked more in relation to assisting children

Difficult area - need institutional policy (Health)

Personally don't like role play but they are effective. Perhaps some more structured scenarios might be beneficial

**Q4. To practice using appropriate interventions**

Very helpful to observe strategies used by other delegates

Will try more often (Health)

Uncomfortable but valuable (Education)

Forget black and white, this subject isn't ever grey - it's something else altogether!

It was good to be told that we won't always get it right

I will not be so 'afraid' to ask the question (Health)

I have a better idea of how to approach the subject and how to deal with it (Youth Enquiry Service)

Feel more confident about signposting to other helpful agencies. Used enough practice for the role I take (YOT)

**Q5. The trainers' approach was.....**

Both trainers were excellent. Approachable and friendly as well as knowledgeable

Very enthusiastic but realistic.

The day went quickly which is a good sign

Good variety of training methods used, good pace and interactive style

On a few occasions I felt I was ever so slightly put down for giving a 'wrong' answer or expressing a 'wrong' opinion. This inhibited contribution

I felt very at home despite being the only male!

Both were fantastic - inspirational

Very committed to the DV. Good balance of humour/ pleasantness whilst dealing with an emotive subject

**General Comments**

I will recommend this to other team members - very useful

Great course, awful sausage rolls.

A thoroughly enjoyable and thought provoking day. Brilliant!

I feel I've become more aware of DV problems and what a hidden issue it is in our society (Housing)

**Appendix 1a:**

**TACKLING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – MULT-AGENCY TRAINING WORKSHOP**

Feedback sheet: Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Date: \_\_\_\_\_

We would be grateful if you would fill in this form so that the provision of this training can be monitored, evaluated and improved. Please be honest.

Please tick the number that best describes how you feel and add comments if you wish. Comments would be particularly helpful, please.

**Objectives**

1. To demonstrate an understanding of the impact of domestic violence on children and adults

**Met completely**

**Not at all**

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                 | <b>6</b>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments

-----

-----

-----

2. To provide personal strategies and practices to protect and safeguard those experiencing Domestic Violence

**Met completely**

**Not at all**

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                 | <b>6</b>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments

-----

-----

-----

**PTO for further questions**

**3. To consider techniques for engaging with victims / survivors**

**Met completely**

**Not at all**

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                 | <b>6</b>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments

---



---



---

**4. To practice using appropriate interventions**

**Met completely**

**Not at all**

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                 | <b>6</b>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments

---



---



---

**5. The trainers' approach was**

**Excellent**

**Very Poor**

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                 | <b>6</b>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments

---



---



---

**6. Would you like any further training in domestic violence? If so, what?**

---



---

**7. Any additional comments**

---



---

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME**

**Appendix 1b:**

**Evaluation of learning by delegate(s) manager**

**Name:**

**Learning experience:**     Domestic Violence Level 1

Candidates/dates.....

1. What did you expect delegates to learn?
  
2. Do you think they achieved your/their expectations?
  
3. How do you/they plan to put this learning into practice?
  
4. What learning needs do they still have in this area? (level 2 accredited?)
  
5. Are you aware what was helpful about this learning experience?
  
6. Was there anything unhelpful about it?
  
7. Would you recommend this to colleagues/managers? Why?

## **Appendix 2**

### **Guide for Quality Assurance**

#### **Level 1: Domestic Violence Awareness Raising**

#### **A guide for trainers and QA mentors**

##### **What is Quality Assurance?**

This is a system to maintain standards across all courses delivered under the auspices of the Devon Domestic Violence Partnership.

It is a process to check that the Programme is running according to agreed specifications (outlined in a trainer's individual development programme).

##### **What is the Quality Assurance Process?**

- Each trainer will be assigned a QA mentor.
- Each trainer will have a one to one meeting with their QA mentor to reflect on his/her practice, undertake a personal assessment (on pro-forma) and develop a personal development plan.
- Each trainer will be supported by their QA mentor at least twice within the first six months of delivering the Programme.
- Feedback on the trainer's delivery will be written and provided by the QA mentor to the trainer on the day of the training
- Feedback will focus on three areas: content; group facilitation and delivery
- If/when a QA mentor co-trains with someone who is not their nominated trainer, that mentor will debrief the relevant QA colleague
- The role of the QA mentor is to be supportive
- Co-supervision exists to give the trainer the opportunity to seek support/advice of another QA mentor in times of need
- Trainers and QA mentors will respect confidentiality but also recognise the need for openness about own's own practice & feel able to share reflections about this with the QA mentor and colleagues

##### **Why have Quality Assurance?**

This is a key aspect of the delivery of the Devon Domestic Violence Partnership training. Without quality assurance it would be difficult to ensure a high quality, consistent programme across all districts in Devon.

##### **Moderation**

Should trainers or QA mentors have concerns that they cannot resolve amongst themselves these should be raised with either the Domestic Violence Prevention Co-Ordinator and/or Devon County Council's Policy Officer with responsibility for the Devon DV Partnership.

The 'moderator' will undertake to resolve any issues whilst working within the parameters of providing a high quality training programme to the public.

## Content:

### Please reflect on:

Knowledge of specific content  
Impact intended – was it accomplished?  
Confidence dealing with the topic  
Timing

### Rating 1- 4:

(a) The framework has a scoring system. Please score the specific part of content according to how you see yourself typically performing, using this scale:

- 1 = *Not confident about content, rarely/never effective*  
i.e. effective one time or less in every five occasions
- 2 = *Quite confident about content, sometimes effective*  
i.e. effective up to three times in every five occasions
- 3 = *Confident about content, often effective*  
i.e. effective up to four times in every five occasions
- 4 = *Very confident about content, always or nearly always effective*  
i.e. effective five times in every five occasions

(b) As you score, **provide comments and examples that validate the score you have chosen.** This is particularly important as this will provide specific examples relevant to your own delivery.

| CONTENT   | Rating<br>(1-4) | Comments |
|---|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Welcome, objectives, introductions</b>   |                 |          |
| <b>Quiz</b><br>Pictures and 3 words “perpetrator;<br>victims; survivor”<br>Use of Prevalence statistics |                 |          |
| <b>Definition of domestic violence</b><br>What it is<br>What it isn’t<br>Impact of domestic violence    |                 |          |

| <b>CONTENT</b>  | <b>Rating<br/>(1-4)</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Cycle of domestic violence<br>Bidman (victims)<br>How confident were you with the content of Bidman and the links between each square?<br>Bidman (perpetrators)   |                         |                 |
| <b>Domestic Violence in Society</b><br>Police music   |                         |                 |
| <b>Perpetrator's Perspective</b><br><b>Children's Perspective</b><br>The Room x 2   |                         |                 |
| <b>Why Women Stay</b><br>How did you bring about a change of pace or not?<br>How did you link this back to the Bidman?<br>Flip charts and contrasting list (benefits of staying/leaving)                          |                         |                 |
| <b>Barriers to asking the question</b><br>Broaching the subject, opening the door<br>Exercise (Real life scenarios in 3's)  |                         |                 |
| <b>Joint support – String Exercise</b><br>Did you convey how it feels to be a victim amongst all these agencies?<br>Did participants make links between their role & those of other agencies?<br>Interagency list |                         |                 |
| <b>Safety and Awareness</b><br>Did you convey the specific issues related to domestic violence?<br>Did you use anecdotes from within your own or others' practice?  |                         |                 |
| <b>Questions, Evaluation and Next Steps</b><br>Strategy Tool<br>Reflection on own practice<br>Anchoring learning  |                         |                 |

## Delivery and Group Dynamics

### Rating 1- 4:

The framework has a scoring system. Please score the specific part of content according to how you see yourself typically performing, using this scale:

- 1 = *rarely/never effective*  
i.e. effective one time or less in every five occasions
- 2 = *sometimes effective*  
i.e. effective up to three times in every five occasions
- 3 = *often effective*  
i.e. effective up to four times in every five occasions
- 4 = *always or nearly always effective*  
i.e. effective five times in every five occasions

As you score, **provide comments and examples that validate the score you have chosen.** This is particularly important as this will provide specific examples relevant to your own delivery.

| <b>DELIVERY</b>  | <b>Rating<br/>(1-4)</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. understands his/her role as a member of the training delivery team, and knows how and when to collaborate with project co-ordinator, Quality Assurance and Administration to ensure that training is effective as possible                            |                         |                 |
| 2. recognises the impact of the physical training environment in facilitating or impeding learning; arranges the training room to promote comfort, interaction, and group development including making delegates feel welcomed.                          |                         |                 |
| 3. knows the importance of speaking clearly at an appropriate volume; can vary volume, pace, tone, and inflection to maintain trainee's attention; and can avoid unnecessary and distracting vocalizations ("uh," "ummm," "you know," "like," "I mean.") |                         |                 |
| 4. understands the potential impact of having been mandated to attend training, and can use supportive engagement strategies to help trainees identify personal learning objectives and develop an investment in the training.                           |                         |                 |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>5.</b> uses reflective listening and feedback to encourage group involvement, to clarify and expand upon delegates' contributions, to guide the direction of the discussion, and enhancing delegates' understanding of the content and concepts.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>6.</b> uses summarisation, bridging, and segue to help preserve continuity when moving between segments of the training.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>7.</b> stimulates and facilitates discussion of emotionally charged topics and issues during the training, and can monitor and manage the emotional of the group to maintain a safe, objective, and comfortable training environment.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>8</b> facilitates experiential activities by clearly and concisely explaining instructions; providing ongoing direction and feedback to delegates helping process and draw conclusions about the exercise; and engaging in problem solving when the activity is not progressing or accomplishing learning objectives.</p> |  |  |
| <p><b>9</b> clearly and accurately communicates the goals and objectives of the training; helps delegates identify unrealistic expectations for the training; adheres to pre-set time frames for the training .</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>10</b> recognises non-verbal cues from delegates; can use active listening and reflection to determine their meaning; and can elicit feedback to clarify points and to determine the level of understanding or agreement.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>11</b> provides timely, sensitive and relevant feedback to the group, and challenges ideas in a manner that stimulates creative thinking and promotes growth, while maintaining delegates' self-esteem.</p>   |  |  |

## Team Training

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>1.</b> understands the most appropriate uses of team training, and knows the benefits and limitations of team training, both for trainers and the training group.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>2.</b> knows how to work with a training partner to achieve the best mix of content expertise, previous experience, trainer style, and personal strengths and weaknesses, to best achieve the training objectives.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>3.</b> understands the importance of developing clear roles and responsibilities for each member of the training team; and the importance of developing mutual expectations for the partnership.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>4.</b> constructively manages the challenges of team training, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>managing verbal and nonverbal communication between trainers;</li> <li>sharing responsibility and authority;</li> <li>responding to cues from the group when the partner is leading;</li> <li>respecting the partner's lead, while concurrently providing needed support and validation;</li> <li>dealing constructively with differences in opinion between trainers;</li> <li>assuming full responsibility for the training when needed.</li> </ul> |  |  |
| <p><b>5.</b> assesses, negotiates, and resolves conflicts in the team training relationship.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>6.</b> when evaluating own practice is able to evaluate their own practice against set goals and criteria, accept feedback in a positive manner and assess it for validity and importance, set clear and realistic goals and targets for their own development in order of priority and to reflect on these aspects.</p>   |  |  |

## Quality Assessor and Mentor

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>1.</b> The QA can engage another trainer into a productive mentoring relationship, and jointly set the goals, objectives, and norms for the QA process.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>2.</b> can engage a trainer in assessing his/her own developmental needs in the areas of;<br/> training preparation;<br/> training delivery;<br/> managing group dynamics;<br/> team training;<br/> establishing a learner centered environment;</p> <p>and in jointly developing a plan to develop the trainer's skills in needed areas.</p> |  |  |
| <p><b>3.</b> understands the developmental nature of the QA process, and knows how to select mentoring and coaching strategies that are most appropriate for the individual's level of development.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>4.</b> conceptualises and explains the rationale for specific training interventions, including; the design and sequencing of the programme; adjusting the programme for groups at different developmental levels; individual and group management strategies; strategies to manage time.</p>   |  |  |
| <p><b>5.</b> understands the potential impact of cultural differences on his/her relationship with the specified trainer, and can establish a relationship that encourages dialogue around cultural/organisational differences and issues.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>6.</b> assesses the accuracy of the trainer's content; the quality and appropriateness of training strategies; and their effectiveness in managing group dynamics; and can provide a sensitive and accurate critique of the trainer's performance to the trainer and QA team.</p>   |  |  |