

# **A formula for domestic abuse services in England – developing an ETHICAL response to domestic violence against women**

## **Paper 1: Type and Capacity of services in England**

### Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>An ETHICAL response</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The scope of this technical paper</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Developing a formula for the provision of domestic abuse services in England</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1	Notes on population and rates of help-seeking	4
4.2	Notes on data sources	5
<b>5</b>	<b>TYPE AND CAPACITY – developing a service infrastructure measure</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	Sample size and units	6
5.2	Length of service stay: Questions considered	7
5.3	Length of stay for use in Type and Capacity calculations	8
5.4	Caseload for use in Type and Capacity calculations	10
<b>6</b>	<b>Methodological steps</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1	Dimensions of domestic violence help-seeking to model – actual supply and expressed demand	11
6.2	Calculating Expressed Demand for services per annum	12
6.3	Calculating required accommodation family bedspaces per annum	13
6.4	Calculating required workers for non-accommodation support per annum	14
<b>7</b>	<b>Formula for service provision: Overall service type and capacity minimum requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1	Accommodation services	15
7.2	Non-accommodation services	16
<b>8</b>	<b>Further Reading</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1 Introduction

This technical paper provides further detail on the methodology towards developing a formula for provision of domestic abuse services in England.

It is a work in progress, so please contact me with any queries, clarifications, challenges, or other feedback, so that later versions can be improved – thanks very much. [info@womensjourneyscapes.net](mailto:info@womensjourneyscapes.net)

It is part of the research project “Women on the Move: the journeyscapes of domestic violence”, with further details and publications being available at: <https://www.womensjourneyscapes.net/>

## 2 An ETHICAL response

The project aims to underpin an ETHICAL response, highlighting seven key elements of an effective service provision: Eligibility, Type, Holistic, Independence, Capacity, Accessibility, Location.

### ➤ Eligibility

- rights and needs-based – a service infrastructure designed around women and children rather than forcing women and children to navigate a fragmented and ill-suited infrastructure.
- no location or risk-assessed criteria or rationing.
- not excluding women and children due to legal status – such as migration status, criminal convictions or debt – with any proceedings being put on hold until support and security have been provided.

### ➤ Type

- A range of types of services for a range of needs, including:
  - Women’s Refuge accommodation + support
  - Other accommodation-based support
  - Non-accommodation services – one-to-one support
- Specialisms – around cultural, health needs, higher support needs.
- **Note** that core service needs not addressed in this formula include: Peer support, children’s support, advocacy through complex and hostile systems.

### ➤ Holistic

- Services as only a part of wider co-ordinated and multi-agency responses so that women and children can journey through at their pace and need – involving and not involving the services and support they choose.
- Providing support on abuse issues in the context of other issues women and children may be experiencing over time.

- **Independence**
  - Recognising the pervasive nature of coercive control within abusive relationships, the interactions and relationships of services with women and children must not replicate coercion, control, or limitations on freedom or autonomy.
  - Service provision must operate with independence from statutory authorities (even if receiving funds from statutory authorities), including not sharing personal information inappropriately.
- **Capacity**
  - Sufficient for the level of expressed need – at the point of need.
  - Including an expected level of vacancy/voids/free capacity, so that service provision does not exploit or exhaust the workers or ration the availability of support.
  - Flexibility – able to respond when needed – recognising that women have to seek help when they can and may be unable to wait on a ‘waiting list’.
  - Evidence-based – not reducing, developing or changing services unless there is clear evidence of needs.
- **Accessibility**
  - Services must be constantly vigilant about barriers to accessibility – where women and children who deserve and would benefit from a service are unable to access it.
  - This may be due to issues of Eligibility, Capacity, or Location; but may additionally be about addressing aspects of specialist support, legal status, and the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of service providers.
- **Location**
  - Women experience domestic abuse everywhere, so the location of services must enable both staying put and journeys – including return journeys where appropriate.
  - All types of places – so that you can go as far as you need/ stay as near as you can.
  - The location of help-seeking should not necessarily cement the location of longer-term resettlement.
  - About fundamental eligibility as a survivor of abuse – violence against women as a human rights violation – to go and be wherever is best.

### **3 The scope of this technical paper**

The elements of service provision characterised as Eligibility, Holistic, Independence, Accessibility are based on principles, and are evidence-based from past learning, research literature, human rights law, and experience of decades of domestic abuse

service provision. In terms of this research, these are discussed in other publications available via <https://www.womensjourneyscapes.net/>.

The technical papers from this research are focused on the evidence base from quantitative data analysis for only three of these elements of service provision: Type, Capacity and Location.

This technical paper is on Type and Capacity of services in England. A separate technical paper is on the Location of services in England.

The administrative data used to analyse help-seeking are from the Supporting People Programme of service provision (ODPM 2002). These data only record help-seeking to the extent that women successfully accessed these types of services due to domestic violence. They are therefore an under-count of overall help-seeking (which may be to other types of services and/or not involve services), as well as not reflecting the underlying need for help and support – including the other types of need highlighted earlier. The data are also increasingly historical. For further details of the data, analysis and limitations see the published article (Bowstead 2019a).

## **4 Developing a formula for the provision of domestic abuse services in England**

### **4.1 Notes on population and rates of help-seeking**

It is important to note that numbers of women and children accessing services from each Local Authority are overwhelmingly associated with the population of that area. On that basis, the most straightforward and evidence-based formula for service provision would be per population. This has long been recognised with the target for minimum levels of women's refuge provision as 1 family bedspace per 10,000 population, which has existed – but never been reached – since the 1975 Home Affairs Select Committee (HMSO 1975, 2:xiii) and is enshrined in the Council of Europe approach on refuge/shelter accommodation (Council of Europe 2011b, 25). Any approach involving more complex formula calculations and/or needs assessments should consider whether it can be justified in terms of adding sufficient additional knowledge, or whether the cost would be better directed to actual provision rather than assessing the need for provision.

Given the overwhelming association of population with help-seeking, much that follows in terms of analysis (particularly considering Location) therefore uses rates of help-seeking to consider factors over and above population. In addition, given that the data used reflect successful service access, rates of help-seeking are also strongly associated with levels of service provision. To provide some counterbalance to this

effect, the rates of help-seeking used are those *from* the Local Authority in question (rather than *to*), but, for the overall majority of women's help-seeking this is the same Local Authority.

Rates of help-seeking are key to this attempt both to *account for* and to *provide infrastructure for* women's domestic violence help-seeking<sup>1</sup>. The total help-seeking numbers include different strategies of relocation or not – Stay Put/Remain Local/Go Elsewhere (Bowstead 2021) – that may be a mixture of both choices and being forced upon women and children.

Analysis is based on the local authority women come from when they access services – so this is same local authority as the service when women Stay Put or Remain Local, but a different local authority from the service location when they Go Elsewhere. It therefore goes back at least one stage from the location where women happen to fetch up due to the (un)availability of services.

The process of formula development aims both to generate understanding of the processes and patterns of help-seeking; and to use that understanding as an evidence base for the provision that would begin to address more effectively the help sought.

## 4.2 Notes on data sources

There are four broad categories of data sources used in the analysis:

- Women's help-seeking strategies – the Supporting People Programme data of service access and exit due to domestic violence (DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) and University of St Andrews, Centre for Housing Research 2012); providing annual count data and the ability to generate rates
- Service location and capacity – from the Supporting People data (see above), from additional Supporting People records (DCLG 2011), and from Women's Aid Federation of England annual surveys (Women's Aid 2022)
- Characteristics of places – data on a range of topics which could be associated with rates of help-seeking, service access and service exit (see later in this technical report, and the Location technical report).
- Characteristics of people (within the Supporting People Programme data) – demographic and circumstances data which could be associated with strategies (rather than rates).

---

<sup>1</sup> N.B. The Supporting People Programme data do include male help-seeking due to the risk of domestic violence and include help-seeking where domestic violence is a secondary factor, but this formula focuses only on women's help-seeking where domestic violence is the primary reason. See the briefing paper for details of male help-seeking due to domestic violence (Bowstead 2018).

This technical paper focuses on the evidence base and analysis to calculate a minimum for service Type and Capacity. The Location of such services is the focus of a second technical paper, to be brought together for a national formula for domestic violence service provision – a minimum capacity to meet expressed demand.

## **5 TYPE AND CAPACITY – developing a service infrastructure measure**

### **5.1 Sample size and units**

From the Supporting People Programme data, the number of women accessing these types of services (due to domestic violence) from each local authority area was calculated. The total over 8 years was n=177,893. This was only where risk of domestic violence was the primary need at the point of accessing the service (many more individuals have domestic violence as a secondary need) – so all the resultant classification and formula are for a minimum provision. In addition, these were only the types of services that were classed as housing-related support under the Supporting People Programme (ODPM 2002), and therefore did not include significant types of services within the non-statutory sector, such as children’s services, counselling, and risk-based advocacy; nor any statutory sector services.

#### Units used – Type:

- the range of services were grouped into three alternative service categories: Women’s Refuge / Other accommodation / Non-accommodation housing related support.

#### Units used – Capacity:

- the capacity of accommodation services requires a measure of both spaces – typically measured as family spaces i.e. One adult with or without dependent children – and length of service stay. For example, a women’s refuge with a capacity of six spaces – six bedrooms/units – would have an annual capacity of 12 families if they stay on average for six months, but an annual capacity of only 8 families if they stay on average for nine months.
- the capacity of non-accommodation services requires a measure of both caseload per full-time worker (fte) – which is affected by hours per week of direct contact for support, but also all the associated non-contact work – and length of service stay. Providing higher levels of support contact to individual women, and/or support over a longer period of time, is dependent on workers having lower levels of caseload.

Calculation of capacity therefore crucially requires a measure of length of stay. For this, the Supporting People Programme data included, for only part of the period,

data on women leaving different types of services from each local authority area and therefore the length of service stay. The total over 3.7 years was n=63,360.

## **5.2 Length of service stay: Questions considered**

### **1. Does average length of service stay vary significantly over time?**

The detailed data on length of stay were only available for under 4 years and variation over time was tested for statistical significance. The majority of accommodation services were women's refuges, so, for this analysis only, the calculation was for the two categories of accommodation and non-accommodation services. However, it is important to note that, in terms of services provided, and role in women's and children's domestic violence help-seeking, it is recognised that women's refuges are distinctive from other types of accommodation (Bowstead 2015; Bowstead 2019b).

There was no significant trend over time in the length of stay for accommodation services (including women's refuges), but there was a significant trend of increased length of stay in non-accommodation services. The overall length of stay increase from a mean of 136 days (median of 83 days) to a mean of 151 days (median of 104 days) is therefore accounted for by the increase in non-accommodation services. Therefore, capacity is calculated using different average length of stay for accommodation and non-accommodation service types, and the most recent non-accommodation service length of stay.

### **2. Does average length of service stay vary significantly across England?**

Length of service stay was analysed for the nine regions of England and was found to be similar for most regions but statistically significantly different for the region of London. London has significantly longer service stays on average than the rest of England, especially for accommodation services. Therefore, capacity is calculated using different average length of stay for London and Rest of England services.

### **3. What measure of average most effectively captures the distribution of lengths of stay?**

Mean is more commonly used as an average measure and therefore more readily understood; it also has the advantage of including all the data in its calculation. Many women have very short service stays, for a range of reasons, and the median is therefore smaller than the mean. Using the median would risk an under-estimation

of service need as it would not reflect all the women who need longer service-stays, including those who are able to complete their service use with an appropriate move-on. The mean length of stay is therefore used because the measure of service provision capacity needs to provide for women to complete their service use.

#### 4. How do the demographic characteristics of individuals affect length of service stay?

Analysis of the association of length of service stay with individual demographic categories in the data provided some statistically significant associations, but a lack of clear generalisations; emphasising the more individual factors which affect help-seeking strategies including patterns of service access (Bowstead 2021).

Demographic characteristics and circumstances are significant for individuals' help-seeking journeys, but do not aggregate into generalisable trends. For example, whether women have children with them (or not) is a major factor in the services accessed and support needed – and therefore in the capacity and types of services which should be provided. However, the difference in length of service stays of women with and without children was within the 5% confidence limits, so not functionally significant in these calculations.

**Therefore, four average length of stay figures were used in the capacity and service type calculations:**

#### 5.3 Length of stay for use in Type and Capacity calculations

	<b>Accommodation services</b>	<b>Non-accommodation services</b>
<b>London</b>	Mean length of stay 167 days ( <b>5.6 months</b> )  i.e. <b>1.97 women p.a. per room</b> (assume 10% voids)	Mean length of stay 232 days ( <b>7.7 months</b> )
<b>Rest of England</b>	Mean length of stay 92 days ( <b>3.1 months</b> )  i.e. <b>3.57 women p.a. per room</b> (assume 10% voids)	Mean length of stay 185 days ( <b>6.2 months</b> )

**Note** that the trend in the final year of England-wide Supporting People Programme data (2010-11) showed a general increase in length of stay. If this trend continued



then increased service capacity would be needed just for the same number of women accessing services, so the measures here are a conservative estimate of a minimum required capacity. In addition, the type of non-accommodation service support under the Supporting People Programme was much more needs-led and available over a longer period of time than the current focus on risk-rationed services with strict time limits on service support.

### **How does this compare to any other analysis of service length of stay in accommodation services?**

Women's Aid Federation of England has calculated length of stay in the services which use their On Track data system (Women's Aid 2018). Their calculations used just over 4 months of data (n=1,370). They calculated similar average lengths of service stay to the above figures, and similarly found a significant difference between London (mean stay 5.5 months) and Rest of England (mean stay 3.7 months). They did not include an allowance for voids in accommodation services, and therefore calculated 2.18 women p.a. per bedspace for London and 3.24 for rest of England.

The figures used in the analysis in this project, based on a much larger dataset (but more historic data), therefore are confirmed as appropriate as best estimates.

### **How does this compare to any other analysis of service length of stay in non-accommodation services?**

**Note** that, as discussed above, non-accommodation service support varies enormously in terms of many of the other factors of an ETHICAL approach, especially in terms of accessibility and eligibility – whether or not services are risk-rationed and time-limited. In addition, services addressing domestic abuse may have different purposes and differently-skilled workers. The non-accommodation support services considered in this type and capacity calculation tend towards the accessible and needs-based support, which was more common at the time of the Supporting People Programme, and was in fact increasing in terms of provision when the Programme ceased nationally. Service length of stay is now more likely to be strictly time-limited and risk-rationed.

### **Length of stay and worker caseload estimates are available for a range of domestic abuse non-accommodation services:**

- Safe Lives Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) are planned as providing a maximum of 3 months' support; which means 60-80 women p.a. per full-time equivalent (fte) worker (SafeLives 2016). This would mean a worker supporting 15-20 women at a time (60-80/4 – because 3 months per woman so 4 women per space p.a.). However, Safe Lives acknowledges that workers often have a higher caseload (average 110 women p.a.).

- Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) states that Refuge advocates currently work with 30-40 cases at a time (Atkinson, Vagi, and DAHA 2020).
- Hospital-based IDVAs were recently assumed to have 100 referrals p.a. and a caseload of “75 engaged survivors” (Webb et al. 2020, 214).
- DAHA proposes a model of Mobile Advocacy support which includes 5-7 hours a week support for 12 weeks and therefore a caseload of 8-15 at a time per worker (Atkinson, Vagi, and DAHA 2020) with planned endings to the support provided, rather than strict time limits.
- Earlier ideas of the role of IDVAs estimated a caseload of 35 per IDVA per annum, and saw 15-25 at a time as manageable (Coy and Kelly 2011, 35).

These examples are therefore generally shorter lengths of service stay than the estimates used here of 7.7 months for London and 6.2 months for the rest of England. The examples also often present considerably higher caseloads per worker than they actually regard as manageable, let alone ideal.

#### 5.4 Caseload for use in Type and Capacity calculations

Overall, the IDVA model of advocacy seems to regard 15 at a time as manageable – which would be 60 p.a. for time-limited 3 months’ support; but – using the average service stays here – 23 p.a. per fte worker for London and 29 p.a. for the rest of England.

For more holistic needs-led advocacy and support, a caseload of 12 at a time would be a maximum, with a caseload of 8 at a time for supporting women with additional needs. These are therefore the caseloads used here.

	<b>Non-accommodation services</b>	<b>Needs-led support caseload: 12 per fte worker</b>	<b>Holistic support including additional needs: 8 per fte worker</b>
<b>London</b>	Mean length of stay 232 days ( <b>7.7 months</b> )	$365/232 = 1.57$  $1.57 \times 12 = \mathbf{18.9}$ <b>caseload p.a.</b>	$365/232 = 1.57$  $1.57 \times 8 = \mathbf{12.6}$ <b>caseload p.a.</b>
<b>Rest of England</b>	Mean length of stay 185 days ( <b>6.2 months</b> )	$365/185 = 1.97$  $1.97 \times 12 = \mathbf{23.6}$ <b>caseload p.a.</b>	$365/185 = 1.97$  $1.97 \times 8 = \mathbf{15.8}$ <b>caseload p.a.</b>

**Note** that, unlike for accommodation services, no allowance is made for 'voids'/vacancies in non-accommodation services. This presumes effective referral systems, but does not intend to under-estimate the logistics of managing needs and demands in a timely way (for example, services may currently operate a 'waiting list' which raises concerns about the accessibility and timeliness of service support).

The calculations here therefore use the timescales and caseloads to provide a minimum manageable support service to address women's needs. As a very conservative estimate, the proportions 90%/10% were used for the standard caseload (18.9 pa per fte worker for London and 23.6 p.a. per fte worker for the rest of England) and the higher support caseload (12.6 pa per fte worker for London and 15.8 p.a. per fte worker for the rest of England).

## 6 Methodological steps

### 6.1 Dimensions of domestic violence help-seeking to model – actual supply and expressed demand

As discussed earlier, the data of women succeeding in accessing services due to domestic violence are a considerable under-count of overall help-seeking, and the underlying need for help and support, but they are the basis of these calculations.

If provision was established on the basis of this modelling, then it would be a key building block towards an adequate service infrastructure: the foundations of what is needed. The dimension of domestic violence help-seeking that is being modelled is based on expressed service demand – not the underlying need; and certainly not the underlying prevalence of domestic abuse. All the modelling, therefore, only addresses a sub-set of the actual need.

**Note** that, as discussed above, the supply for women and children from a particular Local Authority, would not necessarily be needed – in terms of Location – in that same Local Authority. The modelling on Location therefore intersects with the modelling of service Capacity and Type at this point (see Technical Paper 2). In terms of women's location strategies (Bowstead 2021), provision would be:

- in the same Local Authority and 100% non-accommodation services for Staying Put;
- 50% non-accommodation, 34% women's refuge and 16% other types of accommodation services for Remaining Local;
- in a different Local Authority and 85% women's refuges, 9% other accommodation services and 6% non-accommodation services for Going Elsewhere.

Therefore, the building blocks of demand will be brought together with the geographies of location for a national (England) model of type and capacity – see Technical Paper on Location.

However, the evidence base for domestic violence help-seeking to services is the women who did access the services that were available i.e. determined by the actual service supply. Using the Supporting People Programme data of 3 years of service exits (i.e. including the actual length of stay), the total actual service stay days per year was initially calculated as 2,589,153 days. Of these, 954,928 were in accommodation services and 1,634,225 in non-accommodation services. However, this is not the actual service supply as this only includes women who ended their service stay during the year and does not include the stays of the women who remained in services.

There is therefore a need to calculate the expressed demand for services, and to account for the women in services at the start/end of any year.

## 6.2 Calculating Expressed Demand for services per annum

The expressed Demand was calculated as the number of women newly accessing services p.a. multiplied by the mean stay lengths – accounting for the different mean stay lengths for accommodation/non-accommodation and London/Rest of England.

		no. of women new access pa	mean length of stay – days	total new woman-days pa
		New	LoS	New x LoS
Non-Accommodation services	Rest of England	11953	185	2214023
	London	792	232	183440
Accommodation services	Rest of England	11789	92	1083523
	London	1670	167	278758
	<b>TOTALS</b>	26,203		<b>3,759,744</b>

The expressed new demand for services per year was therefore estimated as 3,759,744 days (1,362,281 in accommodation services and 2,397,463 in non-accommodation services).

The total expressed demand in terms of number of women is estimated as this new demand p.a. (n=26,203) plus the women in the services at the start of each year (10,301). Of these, 17,191 are estimated as accessing accommodation services and 19,313 non-accommodation services.

		total new woman-days pa	no. of women in service per day	total women pa
		New x LoS	PD = (New x LoS)/365	New + PD
Non-Accommodation services	Rest of England	2214023	6066	18019
	London	183440	503	1294
Accommodation services	Rest of England	1083523	2969	14758
	London	278758	764	2433
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>3,759,744</b>	<b>10,301</b>	<b>36,504</b>

### 6.3 Calculating required accommodation family bedspaces per annum

To calculate the minimum requirement for accommodation per annum this total women p.a. accessing or in accommodation (n=17,191) is used with the earlier calculation of how many women can use each bedspace in a year: based on occupancy and length of stay, and differentiating between London and the rest of England.

		total women pa	women per space pa (10% voids)	family bedspaces required
		New + PD	WPS	(New = PD)/WPS
Accommodation services	Rest of England	14758	3.57	4134
	London	2433	1.97	1235
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17,191</b>		<b>5,369</b>

This gives a total minimum requirement of 5,369 family bedspaces.

This is slightly lower than the Istanbul Convention (Council of Europe 2011a; Council of Europe 2011b, 25) which enshrines the notion since the 1975 Select Committee of

one refuge (shelter) family place per 10,000 population (HMSO 1975, 2:xiii). On the current England population (ONS 2022), that would be 5,649 refuge spaces. The UK only ratified the Istanbul Convention in July 2022 (Council of Europe 2022) and has never reached the minimum level of refuge (shelter) bedspaces across the UK.

Because of the specialist requirements of domestic abuse accommodation support, most of these bedspaces would be in Women's Refuges. However, the category of Other Accommodation is also included within this – a range of supportive accommodation services accessed due to domestic abuse, but not specifically women's refuges. These may be accessed because of the unavailability or unsuitability of women's refuges, including the need for specialist support for additional issues, and support such as for older children. Other Accommodation is therefore not a homogenous category of service but is estimated as representing just over 16% of the accommodation services accessed due to domestic violence (approximately 27% when women remain local and 9% when they go elsewhere).

Therefore, out of the 5,369 bedspaces, 4,497 would be 'Women's Refuge' spaces and 872 'Other' types of support accommodation.

#### **6.4 Calculating required workers for non-accommodation support per annum**

As discussed earlier, basing required service capacity on the expressed demand for such services represents only a minimum requirement, as it is based on the actual provision of services available for women to access. Non-accommodation services under the Supporting People Programme varied very significantly from place to place, with some local authorities providing no such services either because there was no provision in their area or because such services were funded from other sources. For example, East London borough Newham has zero women recorded as accessing non-accommodation services whereas all its neighbouring boroughs do have women accessing non-accommodation services, including Hackney at over 20 p.a. and Greenwich at over 50 p.a.; and it is known that significant non-accommodation domestic violence services were provided in Newham at this time from other funding.

Funding from other sources was more likely for non-accommodation services than for accommodation services, and therefore it is appropriate to factor in an allowance for non-provision in the source data. From the Location analysis (see the technical paper on Location for more detail) a factor of approximately 1.24 was applied.

The minimum needs-based support workers required are therefore 1,003 assuming a caseload of 12 per fte, rising to 1,543 for a caseload of 8 per fte. An estimated minimum assuming only 10% of women have additional support needs would mean a total of 1,084 fte workers required.

		total woman-days pa	factor in allowance for non-provision in the source data	HSC – higher support caseload (8 per fte i.e. 15.8 or 12.6 p.a.)	SSC – standard support caseload (12 per fte i.e. 23.6 or 18.9 p.a.)	minimum needs-based support workers required – assuming 10% higher support
		TWD	TWD x factor	(TWD/Case p.a.)	(TWD/Case p.a.)	10% HSC + 90% SSC
Non-Accommodation services	Rest of England	18019	22344	1416	948	994
	London	1294	1605	127	85	89
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>19,313</b>	<b>23,948</b>	<b>1,543</b>	<b>1,033</b>	<b>1,084</b>

The estimation of only 10% at the lower caseload due to providing additional support is a likely under-estimation of need. In the Supporting People data, around 8% of women were disabled, and 6% has mental health needs, with around 2% of women with additional needs around alcohol or other drugs. However, rates and/or recognition of additional support needs have tended to increase over more recent years.

## 7 Formula for service provision: Overall service type and capacity minimum requirements

From this research, a formula for different types of services provision in England for women – recognising how women use refuges, other types of accommodation services, and non-accommodation services – has calculated the minimum provision required for this help-seeking due to domestic abuse. It uses administrative records of women’s help-seeking to services; as well as data on service location and capacity, and on characteristics of people and places, to analyse their association (or not) with different strategies and rates.

### 7.1 Accommodation services

A minimum of 5,369 family bedspaces, of which 4,497 should be ‘Women’s Refuge’ spaces and 872 ‘Other’ types of support accommodation.

Women’s refuge provision must include specialist ‘by and for’ provision, in addition to being women-only; whereas other accommodation may be more generic but

equally may be for higher and specialist support needs, such as by providing 24 hours' staffing, separate rooms for teenage children, or particular staff specialisms. Staffing roles and levels must therefore be factored in beyond the bricks-and-mortar of 'bedspaces' to provide genuine support capacity.

N.B. The majority of help-seeking to accommodation is across Tier 1 Local Authority administrative boundaries – 60% – but this is made up of women's different strategies to refuges (65% across boundaries) in comparison to other types of support accommodation (33% across boundaries). Planning, funding and provision – as well as eligibility – must therefore be across these boundaries, at the national and regional scales.

## **7.2 Non-accommodation services**

A minimum of 1,084 fte (full-time-equivalent) community-based specialist support workers (separate roles from 'advice'; or risk-based 'advocacy'); rising to a minimum of 1,543 fte workers to be able to support women with additional needs beyond the domestic abuse.

Specialist workers such as outreach, support or resettlement workers will work with a maximum number of women at any one time ('caseload') and for a range of timescales. A rights-based approach would provide holistic support, without arbitrary time limits. From this research, the timescales are based on the actual length of time women received such services, so are very much a minimum. This also does not include at all the support services children need and deserve.

N.B. The vast majority of help-seeking to non-accommodation services is within Tier 1 Local Authority administrative boundaries, or within London as a region, but access must still be needs- and rights-based and therefore available across boundaries.

## **8 Further Reading**

<https://www.womensjourneyscapes.net/>



## 9 References

- Atkinson, Cara, Rebecca Vagi, and DAHA. 2020. *Whole Housing Approach: Mobile Advocacy Toolkit*. London: Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance.  
[https://www.dahalliance.org.uk/media/10655/9\\_-wha-mobile-advocacy.pdf](https://www.dahalliance.org.uk/media/10655/9_-wha-mobile-advocacy.pdf).
- Bowstead, Janet C. 2015. "Why Women's Domestic Violence Refuges Are Not Local Services." *Critical Social Policy* 35 (3): 327–349.  
doi:10.1177/0261018315588894.
- Bowstead, Janet C. 2018. *What about the Men?* London.  
<https://www.womensjourneyscapes.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Womens-Journeyscapes-Briefing-paper-2-June-2018.pdf>.
- Bowstead, Janet C. 2019a. "Women on the Move: Administrative Data as a Safe Way to Research Hidden Domestic Violence Journeys." *Journal of Gender-Based Violence* 3 (2): 233–248. doi:10.1332/239868019X15538575149704.
- Bowstead, Janet C. 2019b. "Spaces of Safety and More-than-Safety in Women's Refuges in England." *Gender, Place and Culture* 26 (1): 75–90.  
doi:10.1080/0966369X.2018.1541871.
- Bowstead, Janet C. 2021. "Stay Put; Remain Local; Go Elsewhere: Three Strategies of Women's Domestic Violence Help Seeking." *Dignity: A Journal of Analysis of Exploitation and Violence* 6 (3): 4. doi:10.23860/dignity.2021.06.03.04.
- Council of Europe. 2011a. *Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence CETS No.: 210*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/home>.
- Council of Europe. 2011b. *Explanatory Report to the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/1680a48903>.
- Council of Europe. 2022. *The United Kingdom Ratifies the Istanbul Convention*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/-/the-united-kingdom-ratifies-the-istanbul-convention>.
- Coy, Maddy, and Liz Kelly. 2011. *Islands in the Stream: An Evaluation of Four London Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Schemes*. London: Trust for London, The Henry Smith Charity, London Metropolitan University.  
[www.trustforlondon.org.uk](http://www.trustforlondon.org.uk).
- DCLG. 2011. *Total Spend by Administering Authority per Primary Client Group 1 April 2010 - 31 March 2011*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7503/2015800.xls](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7503/2015800.xls).
- DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) and University of St Andrews, Centre for Housing Research. 2012. "Supporting People Client Records and Outcomes, 2003/04-2010/11: Special Licence Access [Computer

- File] (No. SN: 7020)." Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor].  
10.5255/UKDA-SN-7020-1.
- HMSO. 1975. *Report from the Select Committee on Violence in Marriage, Together with the Proceedings of the Committee (1974/5 H.C. 553). Vol 2: Report, Minutes of Evidence and Appendices*. Vol. 2. CMND 553-II. HMSO.  
[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview:pdfevent?pgId=e6bf3a16-c1ee-4ed3-bfd8-acf8596048ec&pdf=/app-bin/parliamentary-paper/c/4/3/8/1974-064271\\_complete.pdf](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview:pdfevent?pgId=e6bf3a16-c1ee-4ed3-bfd8-acf8596048ec&pdf=/app-bin/parliamentary-paper/c/4/3/8/1974-064271_complete.pdf).
- ODPM. 2002. *Supporting People Handy Guide: Addressing Domestic Violence in the Supporting People Programme*. ODPM.  
<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20080528054100/http://www.spkweb.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/FE1D13C8-A9B3-4AF4-A32D-C3E8DDCC1F1D/1770/SummarySupportingPeopleHandyGuide.pdf>.
- ONS. 2022. *Population and Household Estimates, England and Wales: Census 2021*. London: Office for National Statistics.  
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationandhouseholdestimatesenglandandwalescensus2021>.
- SafeLives. 2016. *Independent Domestic Violence Advisors: Under-Funded and over-Worked*. Bristol: Safe Lives.  
<https://safelives.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Prospective%20PCC%20Idva%20fact%20sheet.pdf>.
- Webb, Caitlin, Miranda Pio, Sarah Hughes, Elizabeth Jones, Vanya Dzhumerska, Monika Lesniewska, Emma Retter, et al. 2020. *Pathfinder Toolkit*.  
<https://www.standingtogether.org.uk/blog-3/pathfinder-toolkit>.
- Women's Aid. 2018. "How Long Do Survivors Stay in a Refuge?"  
<https://www.womensaid.org.uk/how-long-do-survivors-stay-in-refuge/>.
- Women's Aid. 2022. *Women's Aid Annual Survey Reports*. Bristol: Women's Aid Federation of England. <https://www.womensaid.org.uk/womens-aid-annual-survey-reports/>.