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A strategic assessment of support services for "victims" in the South East

1. Executive summary

In 2012, the Ministry of Justice published a consultation document ‘Getting it Right for Victims and Witnesses’ and following the consultation process it was announced that from 1 October 2014, the majority of support services for victims of crime would be commissioned at a local level by the Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). To assist in this transition, the authors were commissioned by the South East PCCs (Thames Valley, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire and Kent) to undertake an initial strategic needs assessment to help shape proposals for commissioned support services. This document, together with an individual PCC Area Supplement for each area provides:

- A review of the relevant literature and research examining the extent and impact of crime, the needs of crime victims, and barriers to service provision.

- Local demographic information and a statistical analysis of crime data to examine the prevalence and nature of victimisation to assist in identifying the local priorities and needs of crime victims.

- An audit of existing non-statutory support services for victims of crime. To clearly illustrate this information, three tools have been developed; an interactive map identifying the locations of the victims’ services and an interactive flowchart mapping the victim’s journey, which assists in navigating the complex criminal justice process, and a Victims’ Services Table, which details the service providers in each area, the victims they support, the services provided and their partnerships with other agencies.
The interactive flowchart has been taken from the Victim’s Code of Practice (Ministry of Justice, 2013a) and it clarifies the different stages of the criminal justice system by delineating them into separate coloured Zones. Using the electronic document, the reader can navigate their way around the different Zones. Both the interactive map and flowchart can be accessed as an electronic document via the website link below.

http://icjs.port.ac.uk/Victims'ServicesMap/Victims'Services/story.html.

A hard copy of the flowchart can be found in Appendix A of this report and a Victims’ Services Table for each PCC area can be found in the PCC Area Supplements provided as separate appendages to this report.

The mapping of the victim’s journey illustrates the stages of the criminal justice process and the continuum of points of contact required, in accordance with the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a).

An analysis of current support service provision highlighting examples of good practice and gaps in service provision, and identifying commissioning priorities.

Recommendations seek to clarify the local needs of crime victims in order to identify opportunities to improve services for victims, to increase victim confidence to report and engage with the criminal justice system, and to inform the development of practical and
emotional support services through a co-ordinated and coherent
framework of collaborative partnership working, which victims are able
to access whether or not they have chosen to report the offence to the
police.

This report provides a critical assessment of the support services available
across the five areas, placing these within the essential wider context of
national policy. The findings are based upon the views of those victims,
service providers and criminal justice professionals who contributed to the
research. This report does not represent the views of the Police and Crime
Commissioners, but those of the authors and the recommendations made are
based upon the findings and evidence gained from the research data. Whilst it
may not be feasible for the areas to adopt and implement all the suggestions
made, it is hoped that each PCC area can draw upon the findings and adopt
an approach which is appropriate and suitable to meet the local needs of their
area, within the resources that are available.

1.1 Methodologies used in this research

An essential part of gaining an understanding of the needs of those impacted
by crime is by listening to the experiences of those individuals from their own
perspectives, including their experiences of the criminal justice response (if
reported) and their ability to access support services. This was gained by
drawing upon data collected by the PCC areas from focus groups already
undertaken, and the analysis of qualitative data gained from focus groups in
Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire and Kent, which had been separately
commissioned by the four OPCCs. The researchers attended and observed
eight of the sixteen focus groups undertaken. These focus groups provided
rich, qualitative data enabling an in-depth understanding from the victims’
perspectives.

Interviews were undertaken with key stakeholders, including professionals
from statutory agencies, non-statutory service providers, representatives from
Local Community Safety Partnerships, and representatives from the local
OPCCs. Questionnaires were distributed to those service providers where an interview could not be facilitated. Local and national conferences were attended which focussed on victim-centred policies, initiatives and services.

A matrix of the focus groups undertaken and all the organisations contacted and who participated in the research is provided in Appendix B, including a list of those organisations that were contacted but were unable to respond.

In addition, Appendix C provides a directory of national organisations that provide support services to victims of crime and Appendix D provides a directory of a range of other services that whilst not specifically and directly responsible for supporting victims of crime, do provide support either directly or indirectly through partnerships with other agencies.

1.2 A word about terminology

It is important to acknowledge that the terminology itself is deeply problematic. The term “victim” is one that we hear almost daily now, in a range of different contexts, and the definition of which is often assumed, but also much misaligned. The term is predominantly laden with negative connotations; “victims” are often believed to be either vulnerable, weak, and helpless; naïve and easily duped; or considered to be culpable for their own victimisation by being careless, negligent or exposing themselves to greater risks through their own behaviour.

Such negative connotations create a label that few would wish to be associated with and it is of little surprise that self-acknowledgement of being a “victim” is often resisted. This has an impact upon three crucial decisions for someone who has experienced victimisation, whether to:

- tell anyone (seek informal support)
- report the crime (seek formal assistance)
- seek help from specialist services (seek formal support)
This research found clear evidence that how people perceive the “seriousness” of the harm they have suffered (not always measured by the actual impact of the offence, but by the label it is awarded by others often in accordance with the crime type), and their perceptions of the types of formal assistance and support available, heavily influences the decisions they make to seek the relevant assistance and support.

However, for the purposes of this report, the term “victim” will predominantly be used, because it is the term that the majority of statutory agencies use and understand when referring to someone who has experienced victimisation, and is the term officially used in policies and legislation. However, it is also acknowledged that many non-statutory agencies eschew the term “victim” and prefer to use the word “survivor”, believing that it returns some autonomy, power and a sense of control to the person harmed, but is not a term accepted by everyone. As a compromise, both terms will be used interchangeably in this report.

1.3 Results of the Analysis

1.3.1 The Victims’ Perspective – what victims want:

Information – timely and accurate information about the criminal justice process and the progress of their own case, including explanations about procedures and their entitlements. Victims want an open and honest conversation about what is going to happen and what will be required of them.

Communication – the need for clear and consistent communication in the victims’ preferred method of contact preferably from one main source. Means of communication have improved significantly over recent years, but this has
not yet assisted in the ability of criminal justice agencies to keep victims of crime informed and updated.

**Access to support services** – not all victims may require support services, but all victims want the opportunity of being able to make an informed choice. Victims want to be told about the services available as soon after the incident as possible, and preferably by way of a conversation with someone rather than in the form of a standard letter. This will assist in removing one of the barriers that prevent victims accessing services.

Specifically, victims of crime want to know the type of support available, how it may benefit them and that they can access it at any time. It must be recognised that the timeline for when access to services is required may differ for each individual; victims of crime are not one homogenous group.

The provision of support services should be widely available for all victims and the decision to access these services should be made by the victim based upon the provision of information about what services are available and what they can deliver. Services should not be viewed as solely for victims of “serious” crime who are deemed to be particularly “deserving”, “vulnerable” or “needy”. Everyone can be affected by victimisation and feelings of disorientation, powerlessness, alienation, heightened anxiety and distrust are all perfectly normal and should be recognised as such, regardless of the crime type.

**1.3.2 The provision of a joined-up seamless process:**

Political rhetoric emphasising the need to put “victims at the heart of the criminal justice system” is now exhausted and it is time to put these words into actions with tangible benefits for victims. Current arrangements create
potential for duplication and inefficiency for victims of some crimes, and gaps in provision for others. To respond to what victims have told us as part of the research, a reliable, consistent and coherent way of communicating with victims needs to be developed, ensuring that a joined-up approach is adopted, where victims know which agency is contacting them, the role of the person who has made contact and what that person can do for the victim. This will make it unnecessary for victims to either:

- be contacted by a range of different agencies with similar and confusing titles, to have to repeat their story and continually re-live the experience and, on occasions, undergo numerous needs assessments; or,
- to have to continually chase a number of different agencies to find out what is happening in their case, to struggle to have the process clearly explained to them and to find out what help and assistance is available (whether it is practical or emotional). All of which can be extremely exhausting for someone who is trying to cope with the effects of a crime.

Currently, no one agency has responsibility for keeping victims informed throughout the whole process, instead different agencies are responsible at different stages of the journey. This leads to confusion for the victim and a disjointed experience of the criminal justice process. What is required is an approach which promotes all criminal justice agencies to take ownership of their responsibilities for keeping victims updated, informed and supported.

Some PCC areas have already responded by establishing models which essentially provide a one point of contact, although these models vary in what information is provided, how this information is delivered and who is responsible for the delivery (Sarkis, 2013; Avon and Somerset, 2014). However, regardless of which approach is adopted, it is essential that the outcome focusses on providing victims with timely and accurate information about their case and information about the support services available, from a consistent and reliable source, the benefits of which are:
• Victims to be contacted shortly following the initial response, by their stated preferred method, to be updated on the crime, and for victims to be asked how they are and whether they would like support, and victims to be provided with advice on what services are available.

• If a victim has been identified as vulnerable by the responding officer (determined by the impact upon the victim, not necessarily the crime type), then contact should be made within 24 hours and support offered, including a referral being made to the relevant support service, if appropriate. All victims identified as vulnerable or intimidated as defined by the Code of Practice of Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a: 9) should receive the specified enhanced entitlements.

• If a one point of contact model is adopted it does not have to be part of the police service, but the provider does need to be perceived as professional and possessing the necessary knowledge and expertise. Access to the range of different IT systems currently in use across the criminal justice agencies will be required.

• Victims to be provided with updates on the progress of their case, in particular to be advised of key developments (arrest, charge, bail, court dates, release and outcome) and to be kept informed periodically (as agreed with the victim) when there have been no developments. This is already a requirement of the Code of Practice of Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a).

• If the case progresses to court and the victim is required to attend as a witness, the victim should be provided with information, support and advice by the relevant specialist workers involved in their case (if appropriate), and the Witness Care Unit and the Witness Service. For the victim it is important that the process should be experienced as joined up and seamless.
• Victims to be informed of the outcome of their case, provided with an explanation of the sentence and referred on to the Victim Contact Scheme (if appropriate). To be advised of compensation, if relevant, and to be advised of any victim-centred restorative justice scheme available.

• Victims to be offered post-trial support, if required.

The benefits of adopting such a model are not only beneficial for the victim, but also enable efficiencies and savings for the agencies involved:

• providing information and regular updates means that victims no longer have to keep contacting the officer in the case (OIC) for information, therefore, freeing up the time of the officer and that of civilian staff in reduced phone calls.

• providing an initial triage service upon first contact following the initial response enables victims to make an informed choice and access the appropriate support services as and when they require them. Having the choice of declining a service rather than having to search and seek out a service for themselves, removes one of the major barriers to victims accessing services.

• The provision of timely and accurate information, in parallel with support services if required, may assist in reducing anxiety, improving confidence and encouraging victims to remain engaged with the criminal justice process.
• This may also increase the victims’ willingness to co-operate with the police investigation and evidence, and reduce rates of non-attendance at court, enabling witnesses to give their best evidence in court (if required), resulting in greater efficiencies throughout the process and achieving justice by enabling the court process to proceed.

• Greater victim satisfaction with the process (although not always necessarily the outcome), through being kept informed and gaining access to the appropriate support, can assist victims to cope and recover, and help them to return to some form of equilibrium that existed before the incident. This may also assist in improving victims’ overall confidence in the criminal justice process.

• This will enable people to return to their employment, remain in their home, improve their health and rebuild relationships, all of which will have numerous intangible benefits for the rest of society.

1.4 Identifying the needs of victims and commissioning priorities

An analysis of the local demographics for each area assisted in identifying the variables known to influence levels of risk and vulnerability to crime. This includes age, gender, ethnicity, health and levels of deprivation. Crime and victimisation data provide information on the extent and nature of crime in each area, indicating the levels and types of support required. The analysis also includes levels of recorded crime and prosecution rates for specific offences, to give an indication of the efficacy of the criminal justice process and the impact on victims’ experiences. Data from secondary research and interviews with key stakeholders helps to highlight areas of good professional practice, areas where further improvements are required and gaps where either no or very little service provision exists, but where there is evidence of a need.
A summary of the commissioning priorities for each area is provided in the PCC Area Supplements.

All of the areas have a complex network of statutory and voluntary agencies working to support victims and this report focuses on those non-statutory organisations specifically supporting victims of crime. By far the greatest number of well-established and experienced service providers focus on supporting victims of domestic abuse, a number of which extend their services to include men and some have specialist services for children, but not all. There are also some domestic abuse services specialising in the support of specific BME communities and some providing counselling to young people, although these are far fewer. The services provided include helplines, outreach, support groups, counselling, refuge provision, training and a range of programmes, including education and awareness programmes. What is distinct between the areas is the level of partnership and collaboration between these groups, ranging from a formalised consortium in one area, to areas where there exists very little overall co-ordination of services. It has been found that the services operate more efficiently where there is greater co-operation, as strong partnerships facilitate the sharing of expertise and resources, reducing any overlap in the provision of services and enabling easier identification of where gaps do exist.

A similar pattern exists with regards to rape and sexual violence services, with a number of well-established organisations, although these are fewer in number due primarily to lower levels of funding being provided, in contrast to the levels of funding for domestic abuse services. Whether these services are extended to male victims and children varies between service providers. Greater co-operation between the services that exist in each area could help to ensure that services are accessible to all victims, including children and young people, men and LGBT groups.
The largest provider of services to victims of crime generally across all the areas is Victim Support, which operates a Victim Care Unit in Shoreham, which acts as a central referral unit, receiving all the referrals from the South East police areas through its National Office. The Victim Care Unit undertakes an initial triage service and then if further support is required, the referrals are re-assigned to the appropriate regional office. Victim Support also provides a Witness Service in each area, some of which have a Young Victims and Witness Service. Some of the regional Victim Support areas also run their own specialist services, details of which are contained in the report.

However, evidence from the research indicated that not all victims were being offered support through this referral process. In particular, offers of support were not being sufficiently targeted at those with the greatest needs and too many victims were not being offered information about support services at all. How victims are provided with information about the support services available and how this is communicated is fundamental to ensuring that victims can gain access to the services they may need.

1.5 Models of best practice and the criteria applied

The remit of this research was to undertake a strategic needs assessment and an audit of existing support services for victims of crime. It was not possible within the time limits to undertake an evaluation of all the existing services, however, criteria were identified that indicated good models of best practice. Services that demonstrated best practice were those that responded to the individual needs of the victim and, whilst having the knowledge and expertise to understand the nature and impact of specific offences, tailored their support around the needs of the individual, rather than the crime type. Best practice was also reflected in the services collaborative approach with other agencies, through forums and strategic committees, and the development of partnership working, involving shared specialisms and expertise. However, it was found that many services were being discouraged
from sharing information and good practices due to increasing competition for funding, creating tensions and distrust amongst agencies which in the past had worked collaboratively. These tensions create barriers to services working together in partnerships, which reduces their overall effectiveness in ensuring their services are inclusive for all victims seeking support.

Further evidence of best practice were those services which were well publicised and easily accessible, either through helplines, outreach services, referrals from partner agencies and website presence. However, we found a dilemma facing many services; if they were to pro-actively advertise their services, they would struggle to meet the subsequent demand due to a lack of capacity, negatively impacting upon their ability to continue to deliver a quality service to those requiring support, and extending waiting lists further. Sustainable funding needs to be provided so that the delivery of services can be placed on a secure footing, thereby enabling them to develop and expand to other areas where no services currently exist. Examples of best practice found across the areas are examined in the report and identified in each PCC Area Supplement.

1.6 Identifying gaps in provision

As demonstrated in the PCC Area Supplements, a number of gaps were identified by the audit of victims’ services, which were applicable to all areas, and this was supported by evidence gained from the range of focus groups undertaken and information gained from service providers through interviews and questionnaires. The data identified gaps in support services for both specific groups of victims based upon age, gender and ascribed characteristics, and specific types of victimisation. The following categories have been identified and are referred to in more detail in both the report and the Area Supplements:
- Children and young people
- Male victims
- Hate crime, across the range of categories
- Specialist trauma and therapeutic counselling
- An emphasis on reducing repeat victimisation and prevention
- Development of victim-centred restorative justice programmes

However, there was evidence of a range of smaller independent organisations delivering very good services in these areas. This is where opportunities exist to share expertise and good practice across areas to assist in developing a wider range of services to meet local demands, and to make some progress towards ensuring that access to good quality support services does not remain a postcode lottery.

1.7 Recommendations

1.7.1 To work towards developing a model locally that provides victims of crime with timely and accurate information. Victims should be contacted shortly after the incident and provided with information and crime updates specific to the case. This first contact should provide an initial triage service, pro-actively offering information about relevant support services and referring people to these services, thereby requiring people to decline support, rather than relying on victims actively searching and seeking support for themselves. The unit or model adopted to provide this service does not have to be part of the local police force, but does need to be situated within close proximity, have ease of access to the relevant information systems and be staffed by a combination of well-trained, experienced professionals and volunteers.
1.7.2 If a specialist unit is developed, consider carefully the title of this unit, avoiding value-laden terms, and instead placing an emphasis on the provision of information for people who have experienced crime, for example, Crime Information Bureau or Victim Advice Bureau.

1.7.3 In partnership with the Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJB) in all areas, establish as a priority Victim and Witness subcommittees which have as its members senior officers from all the statutory agencies, acting as leadership champions for victims and witnesses issues (including the courts and judiciary), and representatives from service providers. These champions will be accountable for the development of a Victim Services Strategy to ensure the ownership of responsibilities to deliver information and services to victims and witnesses and ensure the implementation of victim-centred policies and legislation in their own agencies. This is essential to maintain the focus and momentum required to ensure victims of crime remain a major consideration in the implementation of policy and service provision.

1.7.4 In partnership with the LCJBs, the Police and Crime Commissioners to contribute towards the development of clear pathways of engagement for victims and witnesses throughout the victim’s journey, ensuring compliance with the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a) and The Witness Charter (Ministry of Justice, 2013b).

1.7.5 In partnership with service providers, the Police and Crime Commissioners to facilitate through the commissioning process the provision of victim services which are co-ordinated and able to provide high quality care in response to need across the area, and to address any gaps in provision, which may disadvantage and
marginalise specific individuals, groups and communities, including those who choose not to report incidences to the police.

1.7.6 For the Police and Crime Commissioners to ensure that these services receive sustainable funding over a three year period, enabling them to plan and focus on service delivery through partnership working and, in return, that these services monitor and evaluate the services they provide in order to ensure quality provision and good value for money.

1.7.7 For all agencies, both statutory and non-statutory, who come into contact with victims and witnesses to remember that at the end of the statistics and performance data, there is a person who has suffered harm and many who may be suffering indirectly, who need to be listened to and responded to with humanity and compassion, in order for them to regain a sense of autonomy and equilibrium, and to assist in reducing the risk of further victimisation.
2. Introduction

2.1 Strategic context and aims of the research

Following the publication of a consultation document in 2012 (Getting it Right for Victims and Witnesses), the Ministry of Justice confirmed later that year the introduction of a new mixed model of national and local commissioning of support services for victims of crime.

From October 2014, local Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) will be responsible for commissioning the majority of support services for victims of crime in their area. Across the country, local commissioning will replace the old system of grant funding by the Ministry of Justice, although some services will still be commissioned nationally. This will include the Witness Service and the Homicide Service (currently being provided by Victim Support) some national helplines, and funding for rape support centres and victims of human trafficking.

The Ministry of Justice published a Victims’ Services Commissioning Framework (2013c) that, although not a mandatory guide, provides advice to PCCs on issues to consider when commissioning services for victims of crime. The framework recommends that the commissioning activity should cover eight categories of need:

- Mental and physical health
- Drugs and alcohol
- Shelter and accommodation
- Finance and benefits
- Family friends and children
- Outlook and attitudes
- Education skills and employment
- Social interaction
The service specification is for each area to commission support services in accordance with the needs of victims in their local communities, making a strategic needs assessment crucial in identifying commissioning priorities. To assist in this process, the authors were commissioned by the South East PCCs (Thames Valley, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire and Kent) in January 2014 to undertake an initial strategic needs assessment of victims’ services in all five areas, to be completed by June 2014, to help shape proposals for the commissioning of support services. This report provides:

- A review of the relevant literature and research examining the extent and impact of crime and the needs of crime victims, and barriers to service provision.

- A separate PCC Area Supplement for each area providing local demographic information and a statistical analysis of crime data to examine the prevalence and nature of victimisation to assist in identifying the needs of crime victims and commissioning priorities.

- Each PCC Area Supplement also contains an audit of existing non-statutory support services for victims of crime. To clearly illustrate this information, two tools have been developed; an interactive map which can be accessed as an electronic document via the link below and a Victims’ Services Table, which details the service providers in each area, the victims they support, the services provided and their partnerships with other agencies.

- A mapping of the victim’s journey to illustrate the stages of the criminal justice process and the continuum of points of contact required, in accordance with the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a). The interactive flowchart clarifies the different stages.
of the criminal justice process by delineating them into separate coloured Zones. Using the electronic document, the reader can navigate their way around the different Zones. Both the interactive map and flowchart can be accessed as an electronic document via the website link below.

- [http://icjs.port.ac.uk/Victims' ServicesMap/Victims' Services/story.html](http://icjs.port.ac.uk/Victims' ServicesMap/Victims' Services/story.html)

- An analysis of current service provision highlighting examples of good practice, gaps in service provision and identifying commissioning priorities.

- Recommendations to clarify what the local needs are for crime victims in order to assist in the development of innovative ways to deliver quality services through a co-ordinated and coherent framework of collaborative partnership working.

This report provides a critical assessment of the support services available across the five areas, placing these within the essential wider context of national policy. The findings are based upon the views of those victims, service providers and criminal justice professionals who contributed to the research. This report does not represent the views of the Police and Crime Commissioners, but those of the authors and the recommendations made are based upon the findings and evidence gained from the research data. Whilst it may not be feasible for the areas to adopt and implement all the suggestions made, it is hoped that each PCC area can draw upon the findings and adopt an approach which is appropriate and suitable to meet the local needs of their area, within the resources that are available.
2.2 Methodology

A mixed methodology was adopted in order to draw upon work that had already been undertaken in the local PCC areas. This included focus groups with victims of crime, including victims of domestic abuse, children and young people, and various events held across the areas involving statutory and non-statutory agencies to map the victim’s journey through the criminal justice process. A review of the literature was undertaken focusing on the impact of crime, the experiences of victims, national policies and practice guidance, and a range of the support services available.

Consultation with key stakeholders and service providers was undertaken in the form of semi-structured interviews, including a range of professionals from statutory agencies, non-statutory service providers, and representatives from the local offices of the PCCs, the Local Criminal Justice Boards and a sample of Local Crime and Safety Partnerships from across the areas. Questionnaires were distributed by email to those service providers where an interview could not be facilitated. Local and national conferences were attended which focussed on victim-centred policies, initiatives and services. Where contact could not be made with service providers due to non-response to requests for information, desktop research was undertaken through use of information already provided on the internet. A list of those organisations that participated in the research is provided in Appendix B and Appendix C provides a directory of national support services that were identified. Appendix D provides a directory of a number of other services that provide support either directly or indirectly to victims of crime through partnerships with other agencies in each of the PCC areas.

An essential part of gaining an understanding of the needs of those most impacted by crime is by listening to the perspectives of those individuals in their own words, including their experiences of the criminal justice response (if reported) and their ability to access support services. This was gained by
drawing upon data collected by the PCC areas from focus groups already undertaken, and by analysing qualitative data gained from focus groups undertaken in Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire and Kent, which had been separately commissioned and undertaken by Colquhoun Associates, Research Consultant, who has provided a separate report on the findings.

Colquhoun Associates held four focus groups in each area (except for Thames Valley) and participants were recruited from lists provided by the OPCCs. A total of four groups were undertaken in each area, segregated by gender and some by age (see Appendix B), and contained a mix of socio-demographic backgrounds, race, culture, disability and crime type. Two groups were run in one evening at the same location, followed by a further two groups in a different location in order to secure involvement across the area, with the exception of Hampshire, where all four groups were held in the same location. A discussion guide was used during the focus groups as a prompt and to ensure key areas were covered, but participants were given an opportunity to talk about those issues that were most important to them.

Four focus groups in Kent and four focus groups in Hampshire were observed by the researchers. The focus groups provided rich, qualitative data enabling an in-depth understanding from the victims’ perspectives and evidence gained from all the focus groups is drawn upon throughout this report.

2.3  A fresh approach to the co-ordination and commissioning of victims’ services

An acknowledgement of the failure of the criminal justice system to respond to victims of crime appropriately, with courtesy and respect, and the lack of services available to support and assist crime victims to cope and recover from their experiences of victimisation, began to emerge in the 1970s, with an emerging grass roots “victims movement”. This was followed by the
publication of crime surveys and increasing academic interest and research during the 1980s. The gradual progress towards “victim-centred” justice in England and Wales reflected broader developments at an international level concerning the need for enforceable victims’ rights and standards of service provision, in particular, the 1985 United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power and the 2001 Council of the European Union Framework Decision on the Standing of Victims in Criminal Proceedings.

This contributed to the wider politicisation of crime victims in England and Wales during the 1990s and the publication of the first Victim's Charter in 1990, which signified an acknowledgement of the importance of victims and witnesses as gatekeepers to criminal justice, and their crucial role in bringing offenders to account through their co-operation with and participation in the criminal justice process. Having recognised the need to improve the treatment of and services provided to crime victims, there has followed over the last two decades the introduction of a wide range of initiatives, reforms and legislation, all aimed at improving the criminal justice response to victims. The Victim’s Charters of 1990 and 1996 were replaced in 2006 with the introduction of the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (referred to hereafter as the Victim’s Code), under section 32 of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004. The Victim’s Code was subsequently revised in October 2013, and incorporates the principles of the European Directive (2012/29/EU) of the European Parliament, establishing the minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime.

The EU Directive was formally adopted by the UK in October 2012 and must be implemented by all member states by November 2015. Responsibility for providing services within the directive is shared between the Ministry of Justice and local PCCs. Responsibilities include providing all victims with access to free and confidential support services (whether or not the crime is reported to the police) and advice and practical support to prevent repeat
victimisation. It also requires that those victims with specific needs be provided with more specialist support, including trauma support and counselling. All statutory agencies stipulated within the Victim’s Code (Ministry of Justice, 2013a) are required to comply with the key entitlements as stated within the Code, together with the standards of care outlined in The Witness Charter (revised in December 2013), and the public sector Equality Duty (Section 149, Equality Act, 2010).

However, there is evidence from the literature and the findings from this research, that many of the minimum standards and entitlements are still not being implemented as intended, indicating that the political rhetoric of “putting victims at the heart of the criminal justice system” remains aspirational rather than a reality for many victims of crime. As the police are one of the main agencies with responsibilities under the Victim’s Code, it is the responsibility of local PCCs to ensure compliance with the Code and to ensure that the relevant support services are also available to assist crime victims to cope and recover.

Historically, support services have evolved from a range of non-statutory, voluntary, third sector agencies, some of whom formed part of the initial grass-roots “victims movement” emerging in the 1960s, and more latterly, statutory agencies who have had responsibilities and duties placed upon them by government to work with victims of crime through the development of policies and legislation at both national and local levels. This has resulted in a range of specialist services being developed, some aimed at victims of specific types of crime, others providing more generic services and support, all developing invaluable experience and insight to the needs and requirements of victims. However, this organically evolving landscape of victim-centred policies and support services, aided by disparate, piecemeal and predominantly short-term funding sources, has not assisted in the development of a coherent, consistent and sustainable range of services for victims of crime. As observed by Crawford and Enterkin (1999:4):
‘Victims services still lack coherence, co-ordination and synergy, and that instead, they tend to manifest a lack of clarity, confused and often conflicting aims and overlapping priorities.’

As a consequence, a complex network of support services can exist in some areas, whilst the provision of services can be patchy or non-existent in others, leaving victims of crime exposed to a postcode lottery of service provision. This has resulted in the underfunding of some essential services, an inability to sustain successful initiatives and has created tensions between service providers, inhibiting them from sharing information and working in multi-agency partnerships in order to assist victims to cope and recover.

Acknowledging this in 2012, the Ministry of Justice published a consultation document ‘Getting it Right for Victims and Witnesses’ and its response to the consultation later that year. It clarified the role of government in relation to victims and witnesses and set out the principles underpinning the reforms outlined. Central to this is the targeting of victim services at those who have suffered the greatest impact from crime and three categories have been identified:

- victims of serious crime
- the most persistently targeted
- the most vulnerable

However, it is important to acknowledge that the impact of crime can vary enormously depending on the personal circumstances of the victim, rather than focussing on the “seriousness” of the crime based solely upon the crime type. Subsequently, the Government has recognised that imposing a national, one-size fits all approach to victim care cannot meet the diverse needs of all victims across all areas of the country, but instead the commissioning of services is better served by responding to local needs.
The consultation identified eight categories of victims’ needs and the introduction of a commissioning framework for services based on outcomes that supported victims to:

a) cope with the immediate impacts of crime; and

b) recover from the harm experienced.

This requires a transition to a mixed model of local and national commissioning and the role of the PCCs is pivotal in identifying the needs of victims and witnesses in their communities and assisting them to cope and recover. The Ministry of Justice published a Victims’ Services Commissioning Framework (2013c) that, although not a mandatory guide, provides advice to PCCs on issues to consider when commissioning services for victims of crime.

The eight categories of victims’ needs as identified by the consultation:

- Mental and physical health
- Shelter and accommodation
- Family friends and children
- Education skills and employment
- Drugs and alcohol
- Finance and benefits
- Outlook and attitudes
- Social interaction

However, the eight categories listed above in relation to the support needs of victims remain very general and vague and some crime victims would not consider that they need help with a number of the categories specified. In fact many of the categories listed above are more in keeping with the needs of offenders, which is helpful with regards to crime reduction, as a high number of repeat victims frequently fall into both categories of “victim” and “offender”, an issue which is acknowledged later in this report.
Of far greater relevance to victims of crime are the needs identified by the responses made to the consultation process (‘Getting it right for victims and witnesses: the Government response’ Ministry of Justice, 2012:5), but are described in the report as “suggestions for additional categories considered”, although they reflect far clearer the needs of crime victims, but for some reason have not subsequently been included in the categories of victims’ needs:

- Information and empowerment
- Legal assistance
- Advocacy
- Protection/safety/risk reduction
- Restitution
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Emotional health

The priorities identified above concur with both the literature and research, including the earlier policy paper published by Victim Support (‘The rights of victims of crime’, 1995) and reiterated later in their paper ‘Criminal neglect: No justice beyond criminal justice, Victim Support, 2002), and reflect the views of both the service providers and victims in the current research. This indicates that the categories of victims’ needs may need to be revised in the future.

As part of the service specification detailed in the Commissioning Framework (Ministry of Justice, 2013c), PCCs will have responsibility for ensuring the victim’s pathway through the criminal justice process operates smoothly and that all agencies work effectively to meet the victims’ needs. However, it is important to acknowledge that not all victims of crime will choose to report their victimisation to the relevant authorities, therefore, it is essential that information regarding support services is widely publicised to ensure those victims are not excluded from accessing support. Some victims, after accessing support services, may choose to report the offence, and will then
need support to engage in this process. PCCs, therefore, will have a pivotal role in ensuring a multi-agency victim-centred support strategy is in place through effective partnership working, underpinned by a rigorous evaluation and monitoring of services to ensure and secure value for money.

However, whilst the introduction of an outcome based commissioning framework provides exciting opportunities for the development and improvement of support services for crime victims, it also brings a number of challenges. The new mixed model of commissioning has not been welcomed in all areas, as it represents a fundamental overhaul of current funding and provision. Existing service providers have voiced concerns regarding the potential for the politicisation of the commissioning process, therefore, it is essential to adopt a collaborative approach to the mapping and assessment of current service provision, both specialist and non-specialist, to ensure that knowledge, expertise and best practice is retained.

Assessing need is a fundamental step in the commissioning process and the auditing and mapping of the local areas will assist in identifying the range of existing service providers and where gaps in service provision exist. Gaining the views of service providers and those who receive the services is essential for PCCs to obtain a clearer picture of the types of services available, the local needs of victims and witnesses, and their current ability to access those services through the provision of information and advice, and whether the services meet their needs in assisting them to cope and recover.

Greater clarification will assist PCCs to identify what the needs are in their local areas and provide unique opportunities to develop new and innovative ways to deliver quality services through a co-ordinated, collaborative and coherent framework of partnership working. The implementation of monitoring and evaluation strategies will ensure the continued quality of service delivery and better outcomes for victims.
With a clearer understanding of local needs and requirements, PCCs can also plan to work in collaborative partnerships to develop future initiatives aimed at prevention. This is important, as this report confirms that many offenders will also have experienced victimisation and often the offending behaviour can be as a consequence of early experiences of victimisation. Preventative work together with the relevant support services can assist in breaking the cycle of repeat victimisation and offending.

An emphasis on longer-term sustainable funding will enable agencies to plan, recruit and retain qualified and trained staff, thus enabling service providers to spend more time on the provision of actual services than time spent on bidding for and securing short-term funding, just to repeat the process again a few months later. It is also hoped that a greater consistency in the commissioning of funding will reduce the tensions that currently exist between non-statutory service providers due to competition over scarce resources, and engender a more collaborative approach involving the sharing of expertise and best practice.

The commissioning framework provides an opportunity to develop a consistent and coherent approach to the provision of high quality services, accessible to all victims who need and require them, to assist them to cope and recover, and improve public confidence in the criminal justice system through a joined up system of partnership working, delivering planned outcomes efficiently and providing value for money.
3. A review of the literature – extent, impact and needs

One of the most profound influences upon criminal justice policy during the last twenty-five years has been the significant shift in emphasis from an offender-focussed criminal justice system to the focus being placed upon the victims of crime and the subsequent development of victim-centred policies and reforms. However, this re-emergence of victims of crime as a legitimate third party in the criminal justice process and, what commentators would argue, has been a long overdue recognition of victims as vital participants for the efficient and effective administration of criminal justice, has not been an accomplishment easily attained (Tapley, 2005a). Central to these reforms has been the role of specialist interest groups and individuals advocating and campaigning on behalf of crime victims and victims of specific offences, which despite their diversity, have undoubtedly contributed significantly towards the development of support services and the raising of political and public awareness of victims of crime.

This re-discovery of crime victims has been well documented by commentators, tracing the emergence since the 1960s of increasingly well-organised groups set up to assist or campaign on behalf of victims. The subsequent collection of groups with diverse interests and aims later became commonly known as the “victims movement”, but this term provides a misleading impression of unity and has been more accurately described as ‘ideologically heterogeneous’ reflecting the differences in underpinning philosophies and agendas (Mawby and Gill, 1987, Rock, 1990, Mawby, 2007, cited by Tapley, 2003:19). As such, the “victims movement” remains a loose association of groups and individuals today, supporting different aspects of victimisation, ranging from victims of burglary, homicide, domestic abuse, sexual violence, children, hate crime, road deaths and human trafficking, to name but a few.
Williams and Goodman (2007: 244) acknowledge that whilst a diversity of support services is healthy, especially if the different agencies work well together, competition for funding and resources has at times made relationships difficult. This has impacted upon service providers’ abilities to monitor and evaluate the delivery of their services, which has implications for ensuring the quality of these services. This is essential when a mixed model of services exists; consisting of both statutory and voluntary providers, funded from different sources and adopting different forms of service delivery. Providers need to demonstrate that they are operating to certain standards and offering a level of quality. In England and Wales, there has been no overarching set of service standards and organisations have tended to set up their own, dependent on the size of the organisation. The revised Victims Code of Practice (2013a) sets out the services to be provided to victims and the agencies to which these responsibilities fall, but there has been little evidence of the relevant agencies demonstrating compliance and whilst there may be compliance, this does not necessarily ensure that the services delivered are of a high standard. Some of the statutory agencies are required to undertake regular victim surveys, the police being one example, but these surveys do not include victims of all crimes and tend only to survey victims of volume crime. However, all the criminal justice agencies are monitored by HM Inspectorates and these undertake periodic thematic and joint reviews, some of which focus specifically on the agencies’ responsibilities for victims and witnesses (CCJI, 2009; HMIC, 2014; HMCPSI, 2009) which enables an independent evaluation of the agencies’ performance and where recommendations for improvement can be made. Given the range of responsibilities of both the police and the CPS towards victims of crime, a number of inspections, thematic and joint, are planned for 2014-15 (HMCPSI, 2014).

Earlier literature indicates that despite the plethora of initiatives and policies introduced during the 1990s, very little evaluation of these initiatives has taken place. JUSTICE (1998: 117) highlighted the need for an on-going programme of research, evaluation and monitoring of services provided to victims to
ensure that the expectations of victims were being met. An examination of the literature reveals that whilst there has been wide ranging academic debate regarding the needs and rights of victims, criticism of the criminal justice system and its treatment of victims, and debates regarding the introduction of reforms and the role of victims within the criminal justice process, there has been less literature focussing on the services that victims actually want themselves and whether the support services are providing victims with the services they need.

The purpose of this literature review is to provide an understanding of the extent and impact of victimisation, and to identify what is already known about the needs of crime victims. It will examine some of the literature that identifies a range of support services, the delivery of these services and which crime victims they aim to support. The review has found that the literature tends to focus on specific types of offences, with a significant amount of literature in some areas and less in relation to others. This tends to reflect the level of services that can actually be found delivering support to victims and reveals where there are gaps in service provision.

### 3.1 Acknowledging the extent of victimisation

The British Crime Survey (BCS) in England and Wales was first conducted in 1982 to find out about the extent of victimisation by asking a sample of respondents over 18 about any crimes they had experienced in the last twelve months. The findings were similar to those of a US National Crime Survey which found that, at best, only 50% of crimes were reported to the police (Bureau of Justice Studies, 1983, cited in Kelly and Erez, 1997:232). The BCS indicated far more victimisation was occurring than was being captured by police recorded statistics, thereby confirming that whilst official statistics drawn from recorded crime can provide useful insights into the extent and distribution of crime, they do not represent accurately the number of crimes committed and the true extent of victimisation. Whilst originally conducted
biannually from 1988, the BCS moved to an annual cycle in 2000, reflecting the government’s increasing use of the BCS as a tool to judge public attitudes towards crime and to inform criminal justice policy.

However, the use of mass surveys, such as the BCS, have faced a number of criticisms in the past, in particular, that they focused on more traditional crimes and failed to reveal more ‘hidden crimes’, including domestic abuse and sexual violence (Stanko, 1988), and their inability to examine the structural and social processes which reproduce the regularities and patterns of risk (Mawby and Walklate, 1994). Other methodological limitations include difficulties in obtaining a representative sample, as samples taken from a random population of households are unlikely to capture the experiences of the most vulnerable people in society, and that such aggregate results fail to capture the true impact and effects of crime.

Subsequent attempts have been made to address these weaknesses and from 1992 the use of self-completion questionnaires was introduced in order to capture respondents’ experiences of more serious and sensitive offences, such as domestic abuse, sexual violence and stalking (Mirlees-Black, 1999; Walby and Allen, 2004). Whilst acknowledging that there are a number of methodological limitations, statistical research and reports are published regularly using data from the BCS to focus on specific types of offence, offenders and victims, and are used to identify trends in victimisation and how the criminal justice agencies respond to it.

The survey is now conducted annually on a rolling basis and respondents include those aged 16 and over. The BCS has since been replaced by the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) and together with officially recorded crime, the survey remains the main indicator of levels of victimisation in England and Wales. In the year ending December 2013, 8
32 million crimes were estimated against households and residents across England and Wales. This figure is much higher than that noted in the police recorded crime figures and illustrates the extent of victimisation not being brought to the attention of the criminal justice agencies. An examination of police recorded crime and CSEW data is provided in the PCC Area Supplements for this report, which examine rates of crime and victimisation in each of the areas.

3.2 Risk and vulnerability to crime

Whilst victimisation can be the result of random acts committed by others, either deliberate or unintentional, crime survey data reveals that there are some factors which may place certain people at a greater risk of victimisation (such characteristics as age, gender, class, race and ethnicity), which suggests that some people may be more vulnerable to some forms of victimisation than others. The CSEW is analysed in order to identify those groups most at risk from crime and the information can be used as a tool by governments and the police to target crime prevention strategies and inform criminal justice policy. More recently it has been used to raise awareness and warn the public of risks of victimisation, placing a greater responsibility on individuals to protect themselves.

Risk of victimisation can also increase if people are identified as belonging to certain groups or those who participate in what some may consider as “risky” behaviour. Green (2007) provides an examination of the concept of vulnerability and the factors associated with it, and explores the concept of risk, offering a critique of the BCS and how it identifies those considered to be at most risk. In particular, he questions the relationship between risk, fear and the levels of harm suffered and argues that vulnerability has become a currency by which the value of the victim is measured. This relates to the concept of the “ideal victim” (Christie, 1986), whereby only those considered to be totally innocent and blameless are afforded the legitimate label of
“victim” and gain access to support services and criminal justice; achieving the status of “vulnerable” places victims in this category. Green (2007) questions the consequences of what he argues has become the commodification of victims, making links between wider ideological and economic interests.

A relevant example of this could be the victimisation of young men. Since its inception, the BCS (and now the CSEW) indicates that those most at ‘risk’ of victimisation are young men, aged between 18 and 25 years, yet paradoxically this group are less fearful of crime, feel less vulnerable and, as a consequence, there exist fewer support services available to assist them. A contributing factor to this paradox is that the majority of offenders also fall into this demographic and whilst there is evidence that many offenders also suffer high rates of victimisation, there are very few victim-centred support services to address this. This is an important factor when examining the victimisation of young people, both male and female.

3.2.1 Victimisation and young people

Up until recently, the victimisation of young people had remained hidden, instead of addressing youth victimisation the focus has been on youth offending and the control of young people (Muncie, 2003). However, a combination of high profile cases and a number of victimisation surveys aimed at young people, has revealed high rates of victimisation experienced by young people and the range of offences suffered, inflicted mainly by their peers, relatives and friends, in institutions that are meant to keep young people safe. A number of surveys have been undertaken during the last two decades on youth victimisation, but comparisons are difficult, as the surveys use a range of different age groups and definitions of offence types. The 2006 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (OCJS) showed that 30% of 10 to 15 year olds had been victims of either personal theft or assault in the previous 12 months (Roe and Ashe, 2008, cited by Millard and Flatly, 2010). The 2008
MORI Youth Survey (Phillips et al, 2009, cited by Millard and Flatley, 2010) found that 51% of young people aged 11 to 16 had been victims of crime and bullying incidents. Roe and Ashe (2008) highlighted that children can frequently be involved in low-level incidents, which may constitute an offence in law, but are not viewed as such by the participants, or others, and are therefore unlikely to come to the attention of the police or be recorded as crimes. There is also reluctance among children and young people to want to be seen as telling on others and being considered as “a grass” (NACRO, 2003).

Lau and Hoare (2012: 65) reporting on the findings based on data collected from 10 to 15 year olds from the 2010/11 BCS found that:

- Boys were around twice as likely as girls to have been a victim of violence (9.5% and 4.1% respectively).
- Children with a long-standing illness or disability were more likely to have experienced a violent incident compared with children without an illness or disability (15.0% and 6.1% respectively)
- Children who have been bullied in the last 12 months had a much higher violence victimisation rate (20.8%) than those who had not been bullied (3.3%), not unexpectedly, as children perceived that three in five violent incidents (62%) were part of a series of bullying.

More recently there has been the publication of high profile reports by organisations focussing specifically on children and in particular child safety and the use of the internet, cyber bullying becoming an area of increasing concern. The NSPCC (2013) undertook a survey commissioned by The Telegraph focussing on how access to internet pornography influences how young people behave in relationships and that 72% of the young people surveyed said that pornography should be talked about in Sex and
Relationship Education sessions in schools. The survey found that sexting and the sending of inappropriate content has become normal teenage behaviour, but has lead to increasing bullying, coercion, blackmail and harm. The Children’s Commissioner (2013) report ‘Basically…porn is everywhere’, found that greater access and exposure to pornography on the internet increased sexual uncertainty. It appeared to be related to children and young people’s perpetration of and victimisation through aggressive behaviour, and perpetuates less progressive gender roles and reinforces myths and stereotypes.

A report by the NSPCC (2009) examined the extent of exploitation and violence in teenage relationships and the need for greater education and awareness raising. In 2013, the Government launched its ‘This is Abuse’ campaign as part of its Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy, targeted at 13 to 18 year old boys and girls, as part of it’s Call to End Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy (Home Office, 2010). The government has also published guidance following the identification of common themes arising from Domestic Homicide Reviews (Home Office, 2013a) and information for local areas on how to implement changes relating to the revisions made to the definition of domestic abuse (Home Office, 2013b), which was expanded to include young people aged 16 to 17 in recognition of the extent of abuse that occurs in teenage intimate relationships.

CAADA’s (2014:10) report ‘In plain sight: Effective help for children exposed to domestic abuse’ outlines clearly what children are living with, how these children can be identified and provides recommendations regarding effective interventions. This includes age-appropriate help provided specifically for children in their own right. As illustrated in the PCC Area Supplements, there has been an emergence of services aimed specifically at young people, and increasing literature on therapies and counselling to address the long-term effects of trauma on children (Wesselmann, Schweitzer and Armstrong,
However, these specialist services remain few and this has been identified as a gap in service provision and a commissioning priority by the current research.

### 3.2.2 Victims of domestic abuse

When considering risk and vulnerability to crime, conversely those who are more fearful and feel most vulnerable to crime (the elderly, women and other groups considered most “vulnerable”), are said to proportionately suffer less victimisation, yet the greater provision of services and support are aimed at these groups, rather than targeted at young people and men. A now widely recognised exception to this rule are individuals who are at risk of domestic abuse (statistically acknowledged as mainly women), with statistics demonstrating that domestic abuse consistently accounts for between 16% and a quarter of all recorded violent crime and increasing reports of sexual violence (Office for National Statistics, 2014). One of the most significant contributions of feminist activism since the 1960s has been their relentless criticisms of the criminal justice system for failing to respond to violence against women adequately and their tireless campaigning for support services for women, which feminist organisations originally struggled to establish, amidst hostile, dismissive, ‘judgemental and women-blaming attitudes, on a level which is scarcely credible today (although these struggles, of course, do still occur’ (Hague et al, 2000: 116, cited by Harne and Radford, 2008: 173). From the beginning of the 21st century, these services have gradually emerged into the mainstream, due to increasing local and national government funding, the introduction of Crime and Safety Partnerships (Crime and Disorder Act, 1998), and the on-going development of policies and legislation, as outlined in the Government’s strategy ‘Ending Violence Against Women and Girls in the UK’ (Home Office, 2014).

Acknowledging that no one service can meet all the needs of survivors of domestic abuse (James-Hanman, 2000), the government emphasis since the
1990s has been on developing a multi-agency approach and co-ordinated partnership working. Co-operation between support services was not new, but what was new about this approach was the integration and co-operation between voluntary and statutory agencies. However, adopting such an approach comes with its own difficulties, as acknowledged by Blythe and Shaw (2009, cited by Tapley, 2010: 149):

‘The fundamental point that government guidance and local strategies often gloss over is that partnership work is difficult. There are differences in organisational culture, terminology, practice, operational priorities and training…. Each partner regards the other with a degree of professional scepticism and sometimes with downright distrust. Different interests, priorities and practice in multi-agency groups make collaborative work difficult.’

Factors contributing to these difficulties are the different levels of awareness, knowledge and understanding around the nature of domestic abuse within the different agencies, and the availability of funding; ‘who controls the funding is an on-going concern and reflects the power differentials which exist between statutory and voluntary agencies’ (Harne and Radford, 2008:149).

Adopting a multi-agency partnership approach to domestic abuse culminated in the development of Specialist Domestic Violence Courts (SDVC) in England and Wales from 2006, with pilots having been introduced in stages before 2003 and their effectiveness evaluated (Cook, Burton, Robinson and Vallely, 2004). Central to this approach was increasing the support and safety of victims and the introduction of MARACs (multi-agency risk assessment conferences) and IDVAs (Independent Domestic Violence Advocates) for victims assessed as ‘high risk’ (using the risk model introduced by CAADA, now known as the DASH model). However, despite positive evaluations of the SDVC (Cook et al, 2004), this research has found that in some areas the
SDVCs are either no longer operating as intended or are no longer operating at all.

However, the work of IDVAs and MARACs continues and although often overstretched, research demonstrates the positive results of providing specialist support to survivors of domestic abuse (Cook et al., 2004; CAADA, 2009, *Safety in Numbers*; CAADA, 2011; and CAADA, 2012, *A place of greater safety*). CAADA now publishes annual policy reports in the form of *Insights* National Datasets, which provide evidence of the intervention outcomes. A Themis Research Briefing (CAADA, 2013) evaluates the impact of co-locating IDVAs in hospitals and the benefits and success of this is examined further in the individual PCC Area Supplements.

Guides have also been published advocating a co-ordinated community response to domestic abuse (Standing Together Against Domestic Violence, 2011). Whilst STADV (2011) recognises the increase in focus on high risk victims of domestic abuse, it raises concerns that this tends to weaken the emphasis on prevention and early intervention, which was found in the current research. CAADA (2013) found that the co-location of hospital IDVAs assisted in identifying victims of domestic abuse earlier and helped with providing interventions earlier, in particular, at the point of contact with health professionals. This occurred mainly in Accident and Emergency Departments, through contact with maternity services and GPs (see Area Supplements).

Despite the British Medical Association (BMA, 2007) acknowledging in reports dating back to 1998, the extent and impact of domestic abuse, and discussions regarding the role of health professionals in identifying and dealing with the problem, progress to date has been slow. However, NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2014) has now published guidance on how health services, social care and the organisations they work
with can respond effectively to domestic violence and abuse. The Guidance contains 17 detailed Recommendations to help identify, prevent and reduce domestic abuse, and advocates the need to undertake strategic needs assessments, to consult with victims and service providers, and, in particular, for local commissioners of domestic abuse services to:

- Develop referral pathways that aim to meet the health and social care needs of all those affected by domestic violence and abuse.

- Ensure specialist services extend across local authority boundaries where there is not enough local need to justify setting them up within a particular local authority area.

- Ensure senior officers from the key services participate in local strategic partnerships to prevent domestic abuse and establish an integrated commissioning strategy.

- Assist in providing specific training for health and social care professionals and ensure trained staff ask people about domestic violence and abuse and adopt clear protocols and methods for information sharing.

- Tailor support to meet people’s needs, including help for people who find it difficult to access services, and to provide specialist services for children and young people and tailor support to meet people’s needs from all backgrounds.

Whilst there has been a significant expansion in service provision for survivors of domestic abuse, including for children and men, reflecting the politicisation and subsequent availability of increased funding, concerns regarding long-term, sustainable funding have always existed and continue to threaten the viability of some of these services. The range and availability of existing specialist domestic abuse support services are outlined in the PCC Area
Supplements and examples of good practice will be examined later in this report, including examples of good practice involving health professionals.

Evidence from focus groups held with survivors of domestic violence in a refuge as part of an outreach service (Tapley, 2010:148), indicated that the majority were satisfied with the initial response from police officers and welcomed the provision of alarms and the implementation of home safety strategies. They valued the on-going support provided by Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) and the availability of outreach services, which offered both practical and emotional support. However, participants commented on the lack of availability of counselling services, as these are limited to a number of sessions and there is often a waiting list:

“...and when there is help, it always seems several months away, past when you need it.”

“I waited for about three months for counselling but it has helped….been fantastic. I’ve had to start spreading them out though, as you only get 12 one-to-one sessions and I’m going to probably need some more counselling after the trial.”

Participants also stated that there needed to be more support for their children. Some of their children were receiving help from professionals provided through social services and some schools were attempting to help, but the resources available are limited. The impact of domestic abuse upon children as both direct and indirect victims has up until recently been a neglected area, as discussed above (CAADA, 2014), and whilst services to support children are gradually emerging, these are often only available in some areas, as found in the current study. A lack of specialist counselling services has also been identified and is highlighted in the PCC Area Supplements.
3.3 Understanding the needs of victims

Despite the campaigning and non-statutory provision of specialist support services for female victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence, and an increasing concern for victims of crime more widely during the 1980s, it was acknowledged that little thought had been given to the experiences, thoughts or feelings of the victims themselves, whilst the few studies that had looked at victim experiences had found some disturbing results. Earlier research in the UK focusing on the Magistrates Courts highlighted a need for the better treatment of victims, concluding that: ‘Many of the people in our study were victims who reported crimes, but were left with unpleasant memories of a frustrating and unhelpful experience with the law. They may in future turn to the law only as a very last resort’ (Vennard, 1976, cited by Tapley, 2003: 31).

Studies in the US indicated that the criminal justice system would benefit from ‘being nicer to victims’ (Kelly and Erez, 1997: 232) and that contrary to a common misconception by prosecutors, victims and witnesses were not uncooperative, but were instead intimidated by the criminal process, apprehensive about how they would be treated and unaware of what would be expected of them (Bureau of Justice Studies, 1983, cited in Kelly and Erez, ibid). Findings from a witness satisfaction survey (Tapley, 2005b) concluded that the provision of information was an important factor in witness satisfaction, but dissatisfaction was caused by changes in court dates (43%), and that almost 70% of respondents found the experience of giving evidence frightening and intimidating. Only 44% of victims of domestic abuse said they would be prepared to go to court again (Tapley, 2005b).

As observed by Shapland, Willmore and Duff (1985, cited by Tapley, 2003:30) ‘the whole edifice of the “victim movement” has largely been built according to other people’s ideas of what victims want or should want’. To address this gap in knowledge, Shapland et al (1985), conducted a longitudinal study aimed at capturing the experiences of victims of violent crime as they experienced the
criminal justice process, from when they first reported the crime to the final outcome. Amongst the most significant findings to emerge from the study was the attitude of the police as a prime determinant of victim satisfaction. Other primary causes of dissatisfaction included lack of knowledge about the criminal justice process and information relating to the progress of their case. As observed by the authors, the victims’ experiences demonstrated the presence of a paradox within the criminal justice system, highlighting in particular: ‘the contradiction between the practical importance of the victim and the ignorance of and ignoring of his (sic) attitudes and experiences by the professionals within the criminal justice system’ (ibid: 177).

Summarising the findings from the earlier study, Tapley (2003: 31) observed that:

‘The dissatisfaction experienced by the victims occurred as a result of the criminal justice agencies failing to recognise and respect the importance of the victim’s role in the process. Instead victims were actually excluded from participating in the process by the withholding of essential information. Lack of knowledge is disempowering and not only denies victims the safety and protection they deserve, but also limits their ability to make informed choices. This process of alienation not only reinforces a victims’ lack of status, but causes them to experience a secondary victimisation by the process itself.’

3.4 Being kept informed: the importance of effective communication

The importance victims attach to being kept informed has been well documented over the last three decades (Maguire and Bennett, 1982; Victim Support, 1995; Audit Commission, 2003; Victim Support, 2011). In particular, victims of violent crime and crimes against the person have been found to experience further distress if they are not kept fully informed of what is
happening and why at all stages of the process, both pre- and post-trial (Newburn and Merry, 1990). Lack of information has consistently been raised as a cause of victim dissatisfaction and despite a plethora of reforms during the 1990s, Tapley (2003) found in a qualitative, longitudinal study undertaken with victims of violent crime, that this remained a primary cause of frustration.

Another decade later, and the message expressed by victims who participated in the focus groups for the current study was mixed. Whilst victims of domestic burglary appeared to be the most satisfied with police contact and being kept up to date, victims of violent crime were the least satisfied with the response they received:

“Their follow-up was great. They did phone me and we had someone come round to advise us on how to make our house more secure…absolutely fantastic the service we received from them, really reassuring.” (Victim of burglary)

“You hear all of these stories…rubbish…they bent over backwards. The support officer was brilliant with my son…we were all affected, but he was the nervous wreck.” (Victim of burglary)

“Back door removed from the frame…money, jewellery taken…called police immediately…dealt with the police detective and crime scene investigators. Kept in the loop throughout…being kept in the loop was almost closure.’ (Victim of burglary)

“The police officer who came round to take a statement was excellent and really understanding…she said they take car crime really seriously and they have had a few in the area…they said they would contact me…I can’t fault them.” (Victim of car crime)

“I live alone. This man was doing all sorts of things. He was standing in front of my house and staring in…. he slashed my car tyre…he did all kinds of things…he is still there…no one has spoken to him…what can
a voice on the telephone do? Maybe the Crime Prevention Officer….it was promised to me at one point, that he would come, but he never did…I did phone 101….never heard a thing.” (Victim of stalking and harassment)

“Other than a two minute conversation afterwards….none of them explained what would happen…they promised that they would let you know what is happening…they didn't…I only found out he had been released because he phoned me again himself.” (Victim of domestic abuse)

“It was racist. I was just walking on a kerb... just punched me for nothing…I said I can't forget... they said OK... maybe this gentleman go to court...I don't know...never been caught...I don't know the progress now...probably still in progress... they have got my number and address.” (Victim of hate crime)

“Even though they knew what he was doing...his blood smeared across our front door...they didn't seem interested at the time...I got more support from a different officer...after an attempted burglary...than I did over threats to kill...it just doesn't make sense at all.” (Victim of harassment and threats to kill)

This appears to reflect an inconsistency in the approach provided to victims of different offence types and an apparent hierarchy of victims. This was reflected across a number of the focus groups, with victims of burglary receiving a ‘gold star’ service, whilst victims of personal violence, domestic abuse and stalking were left feeling unsupported and uninformed, despite the introduction of a range of policies and legislation aimed specifically at these offences. In particular, evidence from the range of focus groups consistently demonstrated that victims of crime want two types of information that needs to be both timely and accurate:
• Information about the criminal justice process
• Information about the progress of their case

The criminal justice process can often involve a long and complex journey, particularly for those victims whose case progresses to prosecution and a trial. It involves a range of professionals and institutions, whose processes and terminology can be confusing, alienating and exclusive, and from the perspective of the victim, can sometimes appear to be solely concerned with the offender:

“They are too interested in looking after the offender...because obviously you are innocent until proven guilty...and they are too busy in looking at that, to think about the victim and what they have gone through.”

Timely and accurate information at all stages is essential, as is the manner in which it is conveyed. The 1990s saw the publication of a range of information leaflets for victims, but as observed by Williams (1999: 389) ‘It is difficult to imagine distressed victims and survivors turning to this turgid, bureaucratic prose for relief.’ This sentiment is reflected in a comment made by one of the Focus Group participants:

“I was given a leaflet...I always made sure I had the police officer’s email...I had loads of issues... I felt that if I had been the perpetrator I would have six people around me, but since I was the victim I didn’t have anybody.”

This raises the important issue as to how information can best be effectively conveyed to victims. The current study found some victims were contacted by a number of agencies in the initial stages following an incident, particularly
victims of burglary, who saw the responding officers, a forensics team and sometimes another officer to provide information on prevention. For domestic abuse victims identified as ‘high risk’, some were contacted by a number of people, many with similar sounding titles, which only added to their confusion in trying to remember them all. However, following the initial contact, communication appeared to stop abruptly, with no further follow-up. Whilst victims may have been told initially by the responding officer what may happen next, in the aftermath of a crime, some did not understand all the information being provided at the time. As observed by Ashworth (1998:64, cited by Tapley, 2005c: 246), greater attention needs to be devoted to the techniques of communication, as ‘being told is not the same as being caused to understand.’

The development of Victims’ Charters and a Victim’s Code of Practice is important in clarifying the responsibilities of the different agencies, but the same body of research above found that the majority of victims were often unaware of their entitlements, as they had not been told about them. As Ashworth (ibid: 246) rightly acknowledges, when right-holders are not informed of their rights, ‘it undermines the very value that the right was intended to respect.’ The majority of the victims attending the focus groups for the current study did not remember being told about the Victim’s Code of Practice, although one did remember being given a card with some details on it.

Tapley (2003) concluded that what victims require is information to be provided by a consistent, professional source that can be easily contacted and relied upon to provide up-to-date and accurate information when required. Having become the main source of information for the participants in her own study, she proposed a designated point of contact for victims to be provided by individuals who are specifically trained to work with victims and have an understanding of both the impact of victimisation and a thorough knowledge of
the criminal justice process. Tapley (2003, cited by Tapley, 2005c: 247) suggested that:

‘This service could provide the bridge between the two parallel discourses that currently exist between the criminal justice professionals [in particular the police and the CPS] and victims, and would provide victims with access to a fair and balanced criminal justice process.’

Drawing upon the recommendations from this research (Tapley, 2003), the Audit Commission (2003) in its report ‘Victims and Witnesses: Providing Better Support’ emphasised the need for improvements in communication, resulting in the establishment of Witness Care Units (WCU) in 2005, as part of the No Witness, No Justice initiative (Criminal Justice System, 2004), but the limitation of this scheme is that the WCU only makes contact with victims following the first hearing when a ‘Not Guilty’ plea has been entered, which leaves what is often a long period of time between the initial response and the first hearing. Whilst it remains the responsibility of the officer in the case (OIC) to keep victims informed during this time (as was the case in all the PCC areas), feedback from the focus groups in this study found that in the majority of cases, this was not happening, but where it was, those victims were the most satisfied:

“I would have liked to have felt included in the process…I didn’t feel that…I wasn’t updated, I wasn’t told if they’d caught someone…I wasn’t told if the case was closed or not.”

“The case was allocated to one particular man…one particular person to talk to, that I thought was important. Not having to phone different numbers and talk to different people. I had one point of contact. He was fantastic…he kept me completely informed as to what was happening.”
Current methods adopted by the different areas in relation to keeping victims informed are examined in some of the PCC Area Supplements and the role of the Witness Care Units are considered later this in report. The Victim’s Code of Practice also places the responsibility for advising victims of support services on the responding officers and the difficulties associated with this are also explored in the Thames Valley PCC Area Supplement.

Professionals working with victims of crime must also be aware that the need for provision of information may assist victims in coping with the impact of victimisation, the intensity of which can be wide ranging. Their lack of understanding regarding the criminal justice process and knowledge of the progress of their case may only act to aggravate these symptoms further, in many cases resulting in victims disengaging from the criminal process and withdrawing their co-operation from investigations and the trial, the consequences of which are outlined in the PCC Area Supplements.

3.5 Recognising the impact of criminal victimisation

Attempts to rectify the failings of mass surveys resulted in a number of smaller-scale qualitative studies emerging in the 1980s and 1990s, which focussed on specific victim groups and more serious types of crime, and began to highlight the acute stress and adverse physical, practical and financial effects suffered by many victims of crime (Zedner, 1994). Such studies focused on the effects of crime (Janoff-Bulman, 1985), the treatment of victims by the criminal justice system (Adler, 1987) and the needs and services for crime victims (Rock, 1990; Williams, 1999).

It is now more widely recognised that the impact of criminal victimisation is a highly individualised experience and that the impact upon individuals for both similar and different crimes can vary significantly (Gale and Coupe, 2005; Walklate, 2007). These factors can include age, gender, ethnicity, culture,
income, social status and networks, which all contribute to how an individual experiences any form of victimisation and it is this, not the offence type, that must be taken into consideration. These factors reveal each individual’s different levels of vulnerability and their subsequent ability to deal with unexpected and unwelcome events, what Walklate (2007:75) describes as their personal or structural vulnerability. This refers to a person’s resilience to crime and the factors that may influence their ability to cope.

Measuring the actual level of harm caused is an even harder task, as observed by Green (2007:93), ‘there can be no easy and objective measure of the amount of harm caused to an individual by a particular crime’ Impressions can be misleading and even those individuals assumed to be the most resilient to crime; men, those of high income and social status, and those with strong social support networks, can still be affected and require support services to assist them, but these characteristics can also act as a barrier to some people accessing them, as expressed by a focus group participant:

"While not every crime is life threatening …they are all very different based on how they affect you. There is a lot of generalisation about crime, but not much thought is given to how it would impact on an individual."

3.5.1 Psychological and emotional harms

Whilst the most obvious effects of crime are often considered to be the extent of loss and damage which have been caused to property and the physical injuries suffered from crimes of violence, less often recognised are the considerable and unexpected emotional consequences of a criminal act (Victim Support, 1995). According to social psychologists, what makes crime such a powerful stressor is that criminal victimisation challenges individuals’ fundamental beliefs about themselves and their worlds (Norris, Kaniasty and Thompson, 1997). Most predominant amongst victims is their sense of loss of
control and the shattering of cognitive beliefs. As noted by Johnstone (2002: 64), the most fundamental problem with crime is the ‘concrete damage’ it causes to victims, which described by Zehr (1990, cited in Johnstone, *ibid*) is ‘mostly psychological and relational; being a victim of crime is a deeply traumatic occurrence because it damages the victim’s sense of autonomy, order and relatedness.’

Theoretical explanations assert that individuals lead their daily lives around cognitive meanings about themselves and the world around them. However, the experience of victimisation shatters three basic assumptions: a belief in personal invulnerability, a positive view of oneself and the perception of the world as a meaningful place (Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983). As a result, the victimised person feels a sense of helplessness and vulnerability, as a world they once perceived as safe and predictable may suddenly appear dangerous and unpredictable.

In addition to feelings of helplessness and an inability to defend oneself, victims may also feel a sense of incomprehension at what has occurred. Unlike victims of accident and disease, victims of crime are faced with the realisation that their suffering is the product of another person intentionally singling them out for harm (Greenburg and Ruback, 1992:3). Consequently, victims of crime suffer a number of losses in addition to the overt effects of the crime itself: ‘The loss of trust in other human beings: the loss of confidence in the ability to protect oneself and one’s property; and the loss of faith in an ordered and just world’ (Victim Support, 1995: 3). As reiterated by a participant of a focus group:

“It depends on the crime, how it is going to affect you. It deeply affected me and left me with anxiety and lots of problems. It changes your reality. It is your home and it is the one place… you should feel safe.”

(Victim of burglary)
Whilst the findings of these psychological studies have been supported by later research, the limitations of their findings have been highlighted, particularly in regard to the demographics they tend to represent. Dunn (2007: 259) observes that the analysis appears to be based upon middle-class European approaches to how society is ordered and how it functions, and fails to acknowledge the lived realities of people living in abusive relationships or places where violent conflict is a daily fact, and cites Spalek (2006) who emphasises the experiential differences of black people and who when surveyed scored lowest in their ‘belief in a just world’ compared with white males of low socio-economic status, who showed greater support for the concept. Spalek (ibid) comments that ‘services supporting the victims of crime, developed largely from these mainstream analyses, will insufficiently help victims who belong to minority ethnic communities and argues that the secular nature of victims’ services does not address the diverse needs of ethnic communities. Services aimed at those who have experienced crimes which come under the label of ‘hate crime’, including people with disabilities, LGBT and transgender groups, are discussed below.

3.5.2 Patterns of reaction to criminal victimisation

To assist in understanding victims’ reactions to crime, Zehr (ibid) identified a pattern of reaction that is common to most victims, in particular, victims of violent crime. The pattern consists of three phases: an initial impact phase, a recoil phase and a recovery phase.

The initial impact phase relates mostly to the emotional reactions where victims can be ‘overwhelmed by feelings of confusion, helplessness terror, vulnerability’ (Zehr, ibid). Whilst these feelings tend to decline in the recoil phase, these are often replaced by the more powerful emotions of anger, guilt, anxiety, wariness, shame and feelings of self-doubt. During this phase it is suggested that victims undergo a traumatic adjustment in their self-image,
with those who once felt they were trusting or caring, now feeling wary and suspicious of others. This can affect not only their relationships with others, but it can also affect views of their environment, especially their home if they have been burgled, been raped by an intimate, suffered domestic abuse or experienced repeat anti-social behaviour. A place where they once felt safe and secure has now become an unpredictable and potentially hazardous place. The third phase, involving recovery, can only be achieved when their needs have been met. Zehr (ibid) also describes this as the ‘reorganisation’ phase, where victims ‘recover from the emotional trauma, regain their sense of autonomy and power, and resume normal relationships with others. While their experience may still affect them, ‘it no longer dominates them’. However, it is argued that if victims’ needs remain unmet, they will remain in the recoil phase.

Evidence of this pattern of reaction was found by Tapley (2003) in relation to victims of violent crime, and was particularly evident in the experiences of three victims of historic sexual abuse. Upon meeting the victims, it was clear that all three remained in the recoil phase, although the actual offences had happened over twenty years ago. Having finally reported the offences and, despite an exceptionally difficult journey through the criminal justice process, securing a successful conviction, you could see they were finally entering the recovery phase, having had their victimisation recognised, believed and acted upon. As identified by Zehr (ibid), while their experience may still affect them, ‘it no longer dominates them.’

Evidence of the pervasive psychological impact of victimisation and the pattern of reaction outlined above could also be identified amongst some of the Focus Group participants for the current study; evidence of both the initial impact and recoil phases were demonstrated. A number of the participants expressed some surprise by how affected they had been by the crime and for them this had been unexpected, that somehow they had just expected to cope. Initially many had not thought they would be overly affected by the
crime and so had not thought they would need support. However, as time went on, they started to become aware that they had changed their behaviour (for example, going a different route to avoid where the incident happened, increasing the security of their house to the point where they began to feel imprisoned), and for both male and female participants, it made them aware of their own feelings of vulnerability and the impact the crime was having on them. Not feeling able to cope made them feel weak, as though something was wrong with them. For many, at this stage, just having someone to reassure them that what they were feeling was normal, a natural reaction, and some advice on what could be done to help in regaining that sense of control, would have been sufficient, but access to such a service was not being offered. They were receiving very little or no information about the case, and being left to cope in a vacuum:

“You want to be updated on what's going on. You want to be kept in the loop…so that you are not just sitting at home thinking what is going on.”

“I think they should keep you updated…if you had never had to experience anything…. you are wondering if you have to attend court…it’s nice for someone to ring you up and explain what would happen.”

The stage at which this occurred for the focus group participants varied, for some it was shortly afterwards, for some it was weeks or months afterwards, but at this point it made them realise that perhaps they may be in need of some support. This demonstrates very clearly the different timelines with regards to the impact of victimisation and that although the stage at which this may occur varies, it is crucial that victims are made aware of what services are available and how they can be accessed. However, it became apparent that the level of knowledge about support services amongst the focus groups
was mixed, at best patchy, and that not all of them had received information about the services available and/or contact from Victim Support.

“Your needs change…it’s gone six months and it’s only now I am thinking, actually that may be good.”

“I phoned Social Services, I tried to get counselling because I was waking up in the middle of the night…it brought me down…I knew that I needed to sit down with someone…and just have them wash it out and clear out…put me back together again and keep me going… I really felt there was no-one anywhere…I was looking up numbers for Victim Support, but I never found anybody.”

Of importance and relevance to this study is the use and non-use of victims’ services by victims and the factors that influence patterns of help seeking behaviour among victims of crime.

“Sometimes where you are at on the scale of what has happened to you, sometimes all you want is some information and clarification what is going on, some reassurance.”

“The police officer on the night did not say that I would be contacted by Victim Support about what had happened or do you want some help or anything…I think it might have been because it was not a serious enough incident, I felt it was for me.”
4. Barriers to accessing support services

Evidence from this study has confirmed that the majority of people will not access support services following an incident, even if they have reported the offence, which indicates that whilst they have accepted to some extent, the label of "victim", they remain reluctant to seek any assistance. Sims, Yost and Abbot (2005: 361) explored use and non-use of victim services and found that type of crime and age were significant predictors of service use, with older victims of violent crime more likely to report than younger victims of non-violent crime and that:

‘Those who did not use services reported getting assistance from friends or family members, not being told about services, or not thinking it was worth the trouble to seek out such services. Also, victims demonstrated very little knowledge about the types of services provided by victim service programs.’

A review of the empirical literature relating to help seeking among victims of crime undertaken by McCart, Smith and Sawyer (2010) in the United States provides further evidence to support what has been found in the current study. Despite crime victimisation representing an important public health problem in the US (crime victims are at risk of experiencing a range of psychological problems, including PTSD) their study found reluctance among victims to seek support. Whilst acknowledging that distinctions in the literature are often made between formal and informal sources of support, their study found that informal networks may help facilitate the use of more formal services by encouraging victims to seek out professional help. This was particularly found to be the case for females of domestic abuse (McCarrt et al, 2010). As Tapley (2003) found, speaking to close friends or family often helps to reaffirm that what individuals have experienced is indeed victimisation and should be reported and encourages them to seek support.
McCarter et al (2010) divided barriers to seeking mental health services into two broad categories; emotional and instrumental. Emotional barriers included feelings of fear, shame and embarrassment, fear of not being believed, and being labelled and stigmatised as a crime victim. Instrumental barriers included shame and embarrassment, and a fear of being stigmatised for needing to seek mental health support, differences in cultural beliefs surrounding seeking professional support, the cost of seeking support and a lack of awareness of the services available.

Lack of awareness of support services was found among participants in the focus groups:

“If I had someone talking to me down the phone, talking about victim support, I probably would take it up. I seemed to just think it was just mentioned in a letter that they sent me…one little sentence at the bottom…retrospectively I would have done it and benefited from it.”

“If they don’t give you the information, you don’t know it is out there…there is lots of things out there for people to get help…nobody ever gives you the information.”

Brickman et al (2002, cited by McCarter et al, 2010: 203) conducted a large national survey of adult crime victims who had reported the offence to the police and found that the most common need was for emotional and psychological support (75%), and that approximately 50% reported needs for information and advocacy when dealing with the criminal justice agencies and the court system, and 25% required more tangible support with regards to replacing property and improving security.
What is important to note is that whilst almost all of the respondents turned to informal sources for emotional support, their needs for information, advocacy and tangible resources were often unmet. Furthermore, less than half of the respondents reported any awareness of support services within their own communities. This indicates clearly that a number of the eight categories of need identified by the consultation process (Ministry of Justice, 2013c) and, in particular, the categories identified by respondents to the consultation, are not currently being met. The conclusions reached by McCart et al (2010: 203) outline what still needs to be achieved to ensure that the categories of need identified are met through the commissioning of support services:

- There has been limited work examining whether existing services match what victims say they need, suggesting that crime victims’ needs often go unaddressed. This may be due to a lack of relevant services or the limited marketing of available services.

- There exists increasing research on female victims of rape and domestic abuse and there needs to be greater inclusion of male victims and other forms of violent crime.

- Services provided through programmes specifically designed to meet victim needs can be particularly effective, although greater evaluation is required.

- More evaluation is needed on the impact of services on victims and whether these services match victims’ primary needs.

- Greater information is required about how to optimise the delivery of victim services, although initial evidence suggests that co-ordination leads to improved victim satisfaction.

4.1 Acknowledging the needs of male victims

Whilst literature relating to male victims of crime remains limited, this is an area where greater attention is gradually being placed, but a lack of
knowledge and understanding of the needs of male victims remains a barrier to the development of appropriate services, whilst a more immediate barrier remains the reluctance of male victims to seek support, thereby creating a vicious circle.

A recent study in Australia helps to identify some of the key factors influencing adult male victims of violent crime accessing support services and the types of services required (Bricknell, Boxall and Andrevski, 2014). Similar to the UK, crime and victimisation data in Australia indicates that men are more likely to be victims of violent crime (with the exception of sexual assault, domestic abuse and abduction), but that adult male victims are missing from broader discussions around the impact of crime and the provision of services. In New South Wales it was found that whilst there are a number of support services that male victims could choose to engage with, none of these services were specifically targeted at men. Stakeholder perceptions were sought and Bricknell et al. (2014:X) summarised that male victims were more likely to experience feelings of shame as a result of an offence, attributed to feelings of failure and emasculation; male victims experiencing distress present (at least publicly) differently to women and are more likely to display emotions of anger; and that some men normalise some types of violence and may not acknowledge the impact of the victimisation or see any reason to seek assistance, other than medical treatment, if required. Evidence of this was found in the focus groups for the current study:

“It is not very manly to be a victim is it? I bet the women were far more at ease with the concept…”

“At times you are too busy being angry to realise you are a victim…You want to punch someone…get hold of them…. but you don’t actually sit back and think, this is because I’m a victim…we are not very good at admitting to being a victim.”
Bricknell et al (2014 x) identified that the process through which victims of crime had to negotiate the criminal justice process and are presented with opportunities to engage with formal support services, may be likened to what stakeholders have termed a ‘pathway of contact’, and identify a number of personal, social and structural factors which act as a barrier for male victims of non-sexual and non-domestic violence to access formal support services (ibid: xi):

- The shame of victimisation and being seen as ‘weak’ and less masculine.
- Lack of knowledge about the availability and accessibility of support services
- Privacy concerns and fear of reprisal for reporting the offence
- Prior negative experiences when dealing with the police as either an offender and/or a victim
- Transient lifestyles
- Structural/systematic barriers which included criminal justice partners failing to identify male victims as requiring assistance and support services.

Crucially, the stakeholders in the study were:

‘…consistent in their view that the quality and content of the first contact with male clients was particularly crucial. Further, most of the stakeholders observed that male victims were much more receptive to an offer of assistance if it focused on guidance and information, with underlying emotional support.’

(Bricknell, et al, 2014: xi)
The quality and content of first contact with responding police officers and service providers has been identified as important throughout the report and is also an important factor in relation to victims of hate crime.

4.2 Acknowledging the needs of victims of hate crime

As identified in the PCC Area Supplements, there is significant underreporting when it comes to all the categories of hate crimes (Home Office, 2013c). There were also concerns expressed by some stakeholders, particular Community Safety officers, that some hate crimes are still being responded to as ASB, rather than being recognised as hate crime, thereby leaving victims believing that the harm they are suffering is not being taken seriously. There were examples of victims who participated in the focus groups having suffered a hate crime, but not having this acknowledged by the police officers who responded to the incidents, thereby contributing to the under-recording of hate crimes and a failure to offer the appropriate support and information to the victims.

In the first Home Office Statistics publication to produce statistics on hate crime, focusing on the extent of and perceptions towards hate crime, Lader (2012: 13) found:

- Hate crime was more likely to be repeatedly experienced for household crime offences than for personal crime offences: 37% of victims of household hate crime had been victimised more than once, compared with 19% of victims of personal hate crime.

- The police were more likely to come to know about hate crime than BCS crime overall; 49% of incidents of hate crime came to the attention of the police compared with 39% of incidents of BCS crime overall.

- 53% of hate crime victims were satisfied with the police handling of the hate crime incident and 45% were not satisfied. Victims of hate crime
were less satisfied with this police contact than victims of BCS crime overall.

- In only 45% of incidents of hate crime, victims thought the police took the matter as seriously as they should, compared with 65% of incidents of BCS crime overall and victims of hate crime were less likely to think the police had treated them fairly or with respect.

- Victims of hate crime were more likely than victims of BCS crime overall to say they were emotionally affected by the incident (92% and 86% respectively).

The literature and research provides further evidence that victims of hate crime are more likely to be emotionally affected and twice as likely to experience fear, panic attacks and difficulty sleeping (Home Office, 2013a). Sin, Hedges, Cook, Mguni and Coomber (2009) found that in relation to disabled victims’ experiences, there is a need for police to have a greater awareness and understanding about disability to avoid making ill-informed decisions and that people with disabilities held perceptions that they will not be listened to or taken seriously by the police or the criminal justice system. As already acknowledged, victimisation can be experienced very differently by every individual, but in particular with regards to victims of disability hate crime, the effects may appear at different stages and not just immediately after the event (Roulstone and Sadique, 2013, Beadle-Brown, Richardson, Guest, Malovic, Bradshaw and Himmerich, 2014).

With regards to minority groups, many lack trust and confidence in the police, which was also found to be similar for victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime (Hall, 2013). Victim Support (2006:19) found that ‘Hate crime can result in a deeper impact on the victim’s culture, identity and self-esteem because people are attacked for a central element of their identity that cannot be changed.’ A survey of support service providers found that the provision of information was by far the most common support provided (89%), emotional
support (30%), advice (12%) and signposting (12%), with just over half requiring practical assistance (financial, security, welfare, medical treatment) and that just under 60% of service providers agreed that they were unable to meet the needs of all the victims of hate crime they supported (Victim Support, 2006). Barriers found included language and lack of understanding and knowledge of the professionals working in mainstream services (sic).

There has been an increase in the capacity for third party reporting, but it has been found that the information is not always appropriately passed on or acted upon. A number of police services now have facilities for third party reporting on their websites, as referred to in the PCC Area Supplements. The College of Policing (2014) has recently published operational guidance on hate crime, clarifying definitions of the different strands, legislation, the problems of under reporting, issuing guidance on responding to and investigating hate crimes and support for hate crime victims, and contains examples and practical advice and instruction on how service delivery to hate crime victims can be further improved. This includes the need to encourage greater community engagement through building relationships to improve confidence in the police and work in partnership with the specialist organisations that represent the different strands of hate crime.

4.3 Acknowledging the needs of victims of fraud

There is a perception among some members of the public that fraud is a 'victimless' crime or has little impact upon the victims (Fraud Advisory Panel, 2006, cited by Button, Lewis and Tapley, 2014). However, up until recently, there has been only a very small literature on fraud victims compared with other crimes. In England and Wales, in 2005, the Attorney General initiated the Fraud Review, which culminated in a report with many recommendations, one of which was the establishment of the National Fraud Authority (NFA) and one of its first tasks was to enhance the support given to victims of fraud. To help achieve this, the NFA and ACPO commissioned research, undertaken by
Button, Lewis and Tapley (2009), the findings of which are summarised by Button et al (2014), who provide an analysis of the diverse offences and extensive range of behaviours encompassed under the label of fraud, and outline the impact of fraud. The most obvious consequence is financial loss, with many having to sell their homes, return to work following earlier retirement, left unable to secure credit, lose small businesses or face bankruptcy, whilst for others it resulted in reputational damage, poor mental and/or physical health, a breakdown in relationships and changes in behaviour. Similar to other victims of crime, for some the impact can be minimal, but the vast majority can suffer a wide range of consequences, some of them far-reaching and pervasive, impacting not only on the victim, but their family and friends as well (Button et al, 2014: 37). The research found that there was very little support for victims of fraud and this led to the coordination of action from various government departments and agencies, subsequently outlined in the initiative ‘Fighting Fraud Together’ (Home Office, 2011) and the development of Action Fraud, which provides victims with a single place to report fraud and to access practical advice and referral to Victim Support, whose volunteers received training to meet the needs of fraud victims. However, evidence from the current research has found that victims of fraud are dissatisfied with the response received from Action Fraud:

‘I lost three quarters of my life savings in an investment fraud. They have a website Action Fraud, but they tell you very discouragingly that they are inundated… you feel very alone… it happened in April and it was January before I heard back from the police. Victim Support is mentioned as an option on the website and I ticked the box. The way the website is presented makes you think they will not get to you at all, which is not good… fraud is just as much a crime against a person.’ (Victim of fraud)

A victim who was referred on to Victim Support by her bank, was very satisfied with the support received, despite no action being taken against the offender and no recovery of the finances lost:
‘I have tracked down where these fraudsters are myself…. I virtually got told that because it is out of the UK we won't do anything… there is a lot of internet crime and I think that is disgusting… I was in a bad place… if it hadn't been for Victim Support… I’d be on the street.’ (Victim of fraud)

It is clear from the small sample of fraud victims who participated in this research that victims of fraud are not receiving the levels of support required. A Freedom of Information request was made by the authors to find out if there is any performance data available on the use of Action Fraud and whether there has been any evaluation of the scheme since it was rolled out nationally in 2010. A response was received in September 2014 confirming that no independent evaluation has yet been undertaken.

A common theme throughout the literature reviewed above has been the lack of information made available to victims about the criminal justice system, the progress of their case and the support services that are available to them, as echoed by participants in the focus groups for this study:

“The biggest and most useful thing is information. It is not just Victim Support information, but also the information on the case.”

One of the fundamental problems regarding victims of crime is that there is no one agency responsible for them, instead, the journey of the victim involves varying degrees of contact from a range of agencies at different stages of the process, often based upon the type of crime you have suffered and the level of risk you are perceived to be of further harm. At some stages, contact from different agencies may overlap, but during others, there may be long periods of time where no-one is responsible and victims are left to wait, worry and wonder in a seemingly endless vacuum. This is the victim’s journey.
5. Mapping the victim’s journey

An electronic interactive flowchart of the victim’s journey has been developed to assist in navigating the complex criminal justice process, which can be accessed as an electronic document via the link below. The flowchart has been taken from the Victim’s Code of Practice (Ministry of Justice, 2013a) and it clarifies the different stages of the criminal justice system by delineating them into separate coloured Zones. Using the electronic document, readers can navigate their way around the different Zones. A hard copy of the flowchart can be found in Appendix A.

5.1 Navigating the victim’s journey through the criminal justice process

http://icjs.port.ac.uk/Victims'ServicesMap/Victims'Services/story.html

5.2 Victims’ experiences of the criminal justice system

Evidence from the literature reviewed, the interviews undertaken with key stakeholders and the victims’ focus groups held for the current study, all indicate that the experiences of victims can be very mixed, depending on a number of variables, including their personal characteristics, the crime type, their location and the stage that their case progresses to in the criminal justice system.

However, overwhelming evidence indicates that the majority of victims were most dissatisfied with the lack of information and communication received from the relevant agencies at the various stages of the process, in particular, with regards to information about the criminal justice process, the progress of their case and access to support services. Evidence has also indicated that
one of the most common barriers to accessing support services is not being aware of the services that exist and what the services can offer.

“It doesn’t need advertising. It just needs to be brought forward through the police because when there is a problem you go to the police.”

“I didn’t know what Victim Support did to be honest.”

“My understanding is that they are a voluntary organisation…voluntary sector…like the Samaritans, staffed by volunteers.”

“I would rather the police do something rather than Victim Support. When I had someone ring up I thought it was the Samaritans…first thing I thought is that I didn’t want advice on the phone saying ‘poor you’…what I want is police out there doing their job.”

If the flowchart is examined, the different points of contact required between the relevant agencies and the victim are clearly indicated, and each contact provides an opportunity for victims to be kept updated, but also provides opportunities for victims to be asked how they are, whether they are receiving any support and, if not, providing advice on what support services are available, what they can offer and how they can be accessed, including directly referring victims to the most appropriate services. It is better that victims are made to decline offers of support, than be required to have to actively search out and make contact with support services they know very little about, at a time when they may be feeling their most anxious and vulnerable.
5.3 Navigating the victim’s journey

5.3.1 Zone 1: Reporting the crime - All evidence reviewed emphasises the importance of the initial contact and the reaction of the first responders to the victim. Represented as Zone 1 in the flowchart, this can be a call-handler after dialling 101 or 999, or it can be a responding officer attending an incident, or meeting a victim for a pre-arranged appointment. Whatever the circumstance, this is the victims’ first experience and impression of the whole criminal justice system and it’s impact should never be underestimated (Tapley, 2003: 155).

It is at this stage that responding officers are required to assess whether the victim can be considered vulnerable and/or intimidated and ask whether they would like to make a Victim Personal Statement, and there are opportunities to provide information about the criminal justice system and make victims aware of support services, including referring victims’ details on to Victim Support. Research indicates that levels of satisfaction with the initial police response are high, consistently above 70%, although for certain groups, experiences can be less favourable, for example, male victims, victims from all hate crime categories, and female victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse, if not considered entirely to fit the stereotype of the “ideal victim” (Christie, 1986; Tapley, 2003; 2010). The initial response can also determine whether the victim’s journey continues forward to Zone 2, or abruptly ends.

5.3.2 Zone 2: Police investigation - Further contact with the victim may be required through the on-going collection of evidence, forensics analysis or requiring the victim to assist in the identification of suspects. In all PCC areas, it is the responsibility of the OIC to
provide this information, unless the victim has been assigned to a specialist officer and then the responsibility for updating the victim or victim’s family passes to them. During this stage, further information regarding the criminal justice system and available support services could be provided. Depending on the length of the investigation and whether or not a suspect has been identified and subsequently arrested, time spent in Zone 2 can be lengthy.

5.3.3 Zone 3: Charge and pre-trial hearings - This involves the charging of a suspect and pre-trial court hearings. This can be a particularly anxious time for a victim, who may not have expected an arrest to of occurred and for the CPS to decide on a charge and initiate a prosecution. A number of important decisions are made during this stage, but at no time are the majority of victims consulted and some are not kept informed of the decisions made or offered an explanation. For example, an out of court disposal may be decided upon (fixed penalty fine or a caution), or there may be a substantial alteration made to a charge, and in the majority of case is the role of the CPS to inform the victim (for all the CPS responsibilities towards victims see the Prosecutor’s Pledge, CPS, 2005). If at this stage the suspect pleads guilty, it is either the role of the OIC/specialist officer to keep the victim updated or the case is passed to the police Criminal Justice Department to let the victim know of the final outcome. There is evidence to suggest that at this stage, where no more is required of the victim, very little information is passed on and where victims have been actively discouraged from attending the court where details relating to their case will be heard. However, all victims should be informed of the final outcome and if the sentence exceeds 12 months and is for an offence of serious violence or sexual assault, victims would miss Zone 4 and go straight to Zone 5.
If a Not Guilty plea is entered, responsibility for contacting and updating victims is passed to the Witness Care Unit, although the OIC/specialist officers should still remain involved. This can be a particularly anxious time for victims and a further assessment should be undertaken to check whether a VPS has been taken or requires updating, and if the victim has been identified as vulnerable or intimidated, the police should discuss with them (if not already done so) the availability of special measures and liaise with the CPS to ensure that a timely application can be made to the court.

The WCU should refer all victims to the Witness Service (WS), although in a number of areas this is not being done automatically. Good practice was identified in Kent and Hampshire, where automatic referrals were made to the WS, together with relevant up-to-date information about the case. The WS will work with the victim, if required, to provide emotional support during the trial and should offer all the victims the opportunity for a pre-trial court visit. During this time victims should be kept updated at all times regarding the status of the suspect, whether they have been remanded in custody, or released on bail, what bail conditions are in place and what a victim must do if the conditions are breached.

At this stage, it should be ensured that victims have access to the relevant information and support services to ensure that they proceed to Zone 4. However, for a number of reasons (outlined in the PCC Area Supplements) some victims may decide to withdraw their co-operation at this stage and make a withdrawal statement or they may decide not to attend the trial.
5.3.4 **Zone 4: Trial** - The victim should be provided support by the WS on the day of the trial and offered a separate place to wait away from the defendant and their family and friends. In some courts a separate entrance may also be provided. If previously applied for, special measures should have been arranged, and in some cases this will involve giving evidence from a remote site via video link rather than having to attend the court. The Crown Prosecutor should introduce themselves to the victim, answer any questions on court procedure or processes, provide them with a copy of their witness statement (if not previously provided) and acknowledge whether the victim has requested to read out their VPS in court following the trial. It is also the role of the Crown Prosecutor to keep the victim updated if there are any delays, seek the victim's view if considering the acceptability of a plea, and explain if there is an adjournment, or if the outcome of the case is concluded by way of a conviction. It is the role of the WCU to inform victims of the outcome of the case and to explain the sentence awarded.

5.3.5 **Zone 5 – Post-trial:** both stakeholders and victims advise that there is very little support from statutory agencies post-trial. Only victims whose offender has been sentenced to custody for twelve months or more for a serious violent or sexual offence will be entitled to receive information from a Victim Liaison Officer as part of the Victim Contact Scheme, which is a statutory responsibility of the Probation Service under Section 69 of the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000, and the initial contact should be made within eight weeks of the date of sentence. For details of the Victim Contact Scheme a guidance manual can be found on the Ministry of Justice website, whilst a recent critique of the scheme by the Victim’s Commissioner, Baroness Newlove was made in May 2013 and a government response published on the [www.justice.gov.uk](http://www.justice.gov.uk) website in November 2013.
Evidence from the current study reveals that victims often require support post-trial, whether the outcome has resulted in a conviction or not, however, this is often the time when any support being offered subsequently ends. They may need more information about the sentence or information regarding on-going concerns about safety, for example, restraining orders, release dates, etc; (HMIC, 2014). There may be a particular need for support in the form of counselling and this is examined later in this report.

This mapping of the victim’s journey has demonstrated the complexity of the criminal justice process from the victim’s perspective, but demonstrates very clearly the opportunities for contact to be made with victims at the various stages and, importantly, opportunities to remind victims about the available support services to ensure they can access support at a time when they may require it, without them having to ask or search for it. However, to enable victims to receive good quality services it is essential to ensure that the services are available.
6. Victims’ services – priorities, best practice and gaps in provision

An audit of victims’ services was undertaken for each of the PCC areas and the findings have been captured in the PCC Area Supplements, which provide a table of victims’ services, detailing the range and types of services available, and conclude by providing a summary of the commissioning priorities for each area. A review of the local priorities and needs were considered, drawing upon the perspectives of a range of stakeholders. Examples of good practice were highlighted and gaps in service provision identified. A brief summary is provided below of a small selection of examples of best practice that we found, but it is not exhaustive and does not constitute an evaluation of the organisations and the overall effectiveness of the services they deliver, as this was not within the scope of the current research, given the limited time available. Instead, these examples are used to illustrate the criteria that were found to contribute to models of best practice and can be drawn upon to develop services in other areas where gaps may exist.

6.1 Models of best practice

The criteria adopted to identify models of best practice emerged from the research by talking to service users, service providers and stakeholders. The services found to be meeting the criteria were those that responded to the individual needs of the victim and, whilst having the knowledge and expertise to understand the nature and impact of specific offences, tailored their support around the needs of the individual, rather than the crime type. To enable them to do this, the organisations offered a range of services, from one-to-one counselling, groupwork, advocacy, practical advice and assistance, to events, training and education, which fulfilled a local need. The organisations able to provide a range of services were not necessarily the largest, but those who tended to adopt a collaborative approach with other agencies, through forums and strategic committees, and the development of partnership working, involving shared specialisms and expertise. Evidence of good networking and
partnership building was found when the same organisation was mentioned favourably on a number of occasions by a range of stakeholders and service users. However, it was found that many services were being discouraged from sharing information and good practices due to increasing competition for funding, creating tensions and distrust amongst agencies which used to work collaboratively.

Further evidence of best practice were those services which were well publicised and easily accessible, either through helplines, drop-ins, outreach services, referrals from other agencies, and provided further information and advice through a website presence. However, we found a dilemma facing many services; if they were to pro-actively advertise their services, they would struggle to meet the subsequent demand due to a lack of capacity, negatively impacting upon their ability to continue to deliver a quality service to those requiring support and extending waiting lists further.

### 6.1.1 Domestic abuse

As demonstrated by the information provided in the PCC Area Supplements, in all areas by far the largest group of service providers were those delivering support services to survivors of domestic abuse, where demand was high for a range of services to meet the needs of survivors all at different stages on their own journeys to recovery. Domestic abuse is also a priority of all the CSPs. Whilst the majority of the organisations reviewed delivered a wide range of services responding to the needs of survivors and worked in partnership to varying degrees with other statutory and non-statutory agencies, the Kent Domestic Abuse Consortium (KDAC) demonstrated a model of very good practice.

KDAC was formed in April 2013 and is made up from the area's four main domestic abuse services, each with their own specialisms in terms of
responding to specific needs and working with particular groups. This enables them to share and exchange a range of specialist services and expertise, and the joint funding of the IDVA service enables a more consistent level of delivery across the county. The substantial benefits of the IDVA service to high-risk survivors of domestic abuse are summarized in a report by CAADA (2011). However, across all areas it was recognised that services for victims assessed as medium to standard risk needed to be improved and this was highlighted by HMIC (2014). For many service providers this was not because survivors assessed at a lower risk were not a priority, but more due to a lack of resources.

SATEDA (a member of the KDAC consortium) is very pro-active in developing strong partnerships with a range of organisations in the local community, which assists in raising awareness and benefits the service users. A good partnership with Kent police is demonstrated, through the attachment of a dedicated officer, while co-location with the Community Safety Unit and housing teams ensures good communication and information sharing between relevant agencies. SATEDA extends its services to remote areas and hard to reach groups by setting up drop-in centres and works closely with schools, health services, CAB and the local media to promote awareness and make new links with services that will benefit their service users.

Surrey has a Joint Service Level Agreement, which includes East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services, Chapter 1, Your Sanctuary and Walton & Hersham Citizen’s Advice Bureau. The Joint Service Level Agreement has been identified as a model of best practice nationally and has contributed towards consistent and sustainable funding, resulting in a greater consistency of domestic abuse services across the area, as commented upon by some of the local Community Safety Partnerships. Provision is allocated on the basis of local need and the service providers work in partnership to provide an IDVA service, outreach, refuge services, deliver awareness training to other agencies, contribute to the IRIS project (working with local GPs) and some
specialist support services for children, although there is no current therapeutic support for children who are or have experienced domestic abuse.

Aurora New Dawn (Hampshire) was founded in 2011 by a small group of women with extensive knowledge and experience of working in this sector and, despite its short history, has established a range of services for survivors of domestic abuse and sexual violence, including counseling, groupwork and advocacy. In particular, Aurora has built strong partnerships with a range of different agencies to enable it to expand its work and campaigns on a number of related issues. It works very closely with Hampshire police, providing training and developing new initiatives, such as the police car project, which involves members of the team accompanying response officers to incidents of domestic abuse. This assists greatly with sharing knowledge and information, as it provides officers with a far greater understanding of the nature and dynamics of domestic abuse. Aurora also works in partnership with other agencies to provide a Stalking Clinic and Hampshire and IOW PCC awarded funding in November 2013 to pilot a Stalking Advocate. Despite the Government strengthening legislation in relation to stalking and harassment, this remains an issue little understood by the statutory agencies and the work of a specialist advocate will contribute to awareness-raising through training and working partnerships. Aurora also works in partnership with health care agencies through the PIPPA Alliance and IRIS Project.

PIPPA Alliance is a group originally made up of local specialist sexual and domestic violence services in Southampton with the aim of providing a clear point of contact for professional workers who in their roles may come across people who are experiencing domestic abuse. PIPPA provides advice, information and support to professionals and can assist in undertaking risk assessments and refer on to appropriate services. They also provide training and consultancy to raise public awareness and understanding. However, due to insufficient resources, the majority of PIPPA work is being undertaken by the small team of IDVAs at Southampton City Council, who host the helpline,
together with work undertaken by Consultant Nurses and Midwives at Southampton hospital. Most importantly, PIPPA provides invaluable links between health professionals and domestic abuse support services, previously an area where no links or partnerships existed, yet where there is the greatest demand. The guidance published by NICE (2014) supports the establishment of such partnerships, promoting an environment for disclosing domestic abuse, ensuring trained staff ask people about domestic abuse and adopting clear protocols and methods for sharing information. Victims of domestic abuse may not want to seek support from the police, but if they are injured, hurt or suffering from conditions caused by domestic abuse, they will seek treatment from a GP or a hospital. All women who are pregnant or have young children will also be in contact with a range of health professionals. A service that helps professionals to identify individuals who may be suffering domestic abuse and can assist them in seeking support, is a valuable one and a model of good practice.

6.1.2 Male victims of sexual abuse

Whilst the majority of domestic abuse services now extend their services to men, literature has suggested that male victims may benefit from services designed and tailored specifically to their needs. However, as found in all the areas, there were very few, if any, specialist services for male victims. One local service specifically tailored for male victims of sexual abuse was found in Sussex. Mankind UK, despite its name, only operates in Sussex and provides one-to-one counselling support for male victims of sexual abuse, and is a commissioned counsellor for the local SARC. The organisation is run by one person, who is research active and uses this to inform and develop his own professional practice. To assist in delivering the service he uses a number of qualified counsellors and is shortly looking to start a new group programme. He recognises that men respond very differently to victimisation, often externalising the affects, rather than internalising as women predominantly do. He advised that organisations run for men by men were not very good at developing partnerships, particularly because they tended to be run by just
one person and they lacked the time and resources required to network. He also stated that other organisations may not share the same underlying philosophies and can sometimes have political agendas. With regards to working with other organisations run by female service providers, he has in the past experienced some hostility from women at conferences he has attended. However, it could be argued that there would be substantial benefits if smaller organisations across the country working specifically with male victims did collaborate and share their expertise, extending this knowledge to other organisations also working with men.

6.1.3 Sexual violence and rape

Portsmouth Area Rape Crisis (PARCS) is an established organisation working with survivors of sexual violence and has always offered its services to both women and men. Of particular interest is that PARCS encourages and sponsors a range of research projects that it uses to inform professional practice and enhance service provision. PARCS now also supports survivors of domestic abuse as it was found that a high number of its service users had been abused by intimate partners, which is an area in recent years that has been increasingly acknowledged by both statutory and non-statutory agencies and where specialist support services are required, in particular, trauma counselling.

Family Matters, based in Kent, works with survivors of sexual violence and abuse, including women, children and men. This organisation is particularly good at identifying gaps in service provision and developing services to address them and extends its services to some areas in Surrey. Of particular note are the crisis workers that provide out of hours support for the SARCS in Kent and Surrey.
The role of the SARCs is to provide a range of services to victims of sexual violence all in one place, so that they can receive all the support they require without having to contact and visit a number of different agencies and have to repeat the trauma, often exacerbated further by the range of initial responses received, some positive and others negative. SARCs are not solely focussed on supporting criminal justice prosecutions, but if and when the victim is ready to decide whether to report the offence, support is available to help them with this process, sometimes provided by specialist support through the work of Independent Sexual Violence Advocates (ISVAs), although there is a shortage of these specialist workers across all areas. Further details of the SARCs which operate in the different areas are referred to in the Area Supplements.

6.1.4 Hate Crime

Hate crime is another priority of the CSPs and whilst the number of organisations focussing specifically on victims of hate crime are few, a number of models of good practice were identified, two of which operate in Sussex. The West Sussex Hate Incident Support Service is operated by Victim Support and offers a dedicated service to victims of hate crime consisting of three main strands; third party reporting, raising awareness and individual casework support. The benefit of dedicated teams is that they are able to monitor and gain specialist knowledge about the types of hate crimes occurring across the county. Awareness raising has assisted with the development of local partnerships, including the CSPs, where hate crimes are still being inappropriately responded to as ASB by some agencies, and links are being made with other crimes, identifying important overlaps, including the identification of Honour Based Violence, and helping to reach vulnerable groups in hard to reach communities.

The ‘Safe from Harm’ project identifies and offers support to vulnerable people suffering from ASB and hate crime. The service is offered to any victim
of ASB or hate crime where a risk assessment has been undertaken identifying someone as being vulnerable and at a high risk of harm (if capacity allows, medium risk cases will also be given support). The scheme was evaluated in 2012 and demonstrated the added value it provided to supporting vulnerable victims, and that it assisted in providing a service to vulnerable people that did not previously exist. In particular, it was recognised that it offered support that other agencies did not have the capacity to provide. The report concluded that the scheme was highly valued and was integral to the success of a harm-based approach.

Across the areas there are a number of established groups which provide services and support to people with disabilities and whilst they were not set up to work specifically with victims of disability hate crime, their work by its very nature involves contact with individuals who will have been impacted by hate crime. In response, some organisations have developed some expertise and specialist knowledge in this area, which needs to be shared with other agencies and would be of particular benefit to victims of disability hate crime.

Examples of good practice include the Keep Safe programmes run across some of the areas to help reduce levels of vulnerability and risk. The Safe Places scheme has been established in some areas where local retailers put stickers in their windows to indicate that the shop is a place of safety should they become anxious or experience hate crime and need a safe place to wait while they contact someone for support. Chaos Support is an organisation in Hampshire which provides support and opportunities for young adults with learning disabilities and has introduced ‘Buzz off’ a hate crime support group.

Young Deaf Hope is part of a pilot project aimed at supporting young deaf people aged 11 to 30 in London and the South East and undertakes safety
awareness work aimed at tackling abuse suffered by young deaf people. Of concern has been an increase in their work with deaf young people who have experienced significant levels of abuse from a range of different communities, indicating that many individuals may have ascribed characteristics that expose them to a range of vulnerabilities, including hate crime, honour based violence and domestic abuse. Deaf Hope is a national charity and hold conferences to raise awareness of abuse experienced by people in the deaf community.

‘Triangle’ is based in Sussex and is a registered intermediary service supporting very young children and young victims of crime, ensuring they are able to give their best evidence through joint investigative interviewing and for court proceedings. ‘Impetus’ is an organisation based in Brighton and Hove that delivers a range of services aimed at improving the well-being and quality of life of vulnerable adults. It provides a range of advocacy services, including a Victim and Witness service to victims with learning disabilities who are required to attend court through the provision of a trained advocate, which is funded by the Ministry of Justice. This is an example of good practice, but a prior interview with the WCU in Sussex would indicate that they are not aware of this service. Impetus advises that they provide advocacy when victims report crime, during interviews with the police and assist when they attend court. Difficulties in relation to receiving referrals from the police are that the police do not always identify that a person has a learning disability, so do not seek specialist support. Some areas have developed the use of a card “Help Me, Help You” which individuals can give to the police if they are experiencing difficulties and will help explain if they have a disability.

Impetus does not currently work with the WCU or the WS, but would be interested in developing better links with them. An example of a service that has already been developed in Dorset is outlined below and has been included in this report as it has been recognised as a proven model of best practice that other areas could learn from in order to improve the service
provided to victims and witnesses with a disability.

6.1.5 Person Centred Witness Preparation and Profiling Service – Bournemouth People First

As is becoming increasingly recognised, the CJS requires victims and witnesses to have enormous resilience to cope with the CJ process itself, many suffering secondary victimisation (often unintended) as a result of their involvement with CJ agencies and procedures. For vulnerable and intimidated victims and witnesses the process can be even more confusing and traumatic, especially if required to give evidence. For successful prosecutions, the CPS favours individuals who will make "good", "credible" witnesses, but a person's ability to give their best evidence in Court can be effected by a number of variables, including the nature of the crime, whether they know the offender, and their own ascribed characteristics which may increase their level of vulnerability, including age, health, ethnicity, culture and disabilities.

The Witness Profiling Service provided by Bournemouth People First covers Bournemouth and Poole, and offers an intermediary service, which involves person centred witness preparation and a profiling service to assist and support individuals with learning disabilities to give their best evidence in court. The service is delivered by one Independent Learning Disability Advisor (ILDA) and it started in 2009. It was inspired by a similar scheme adopted in Liverpool in the mid-1990s, which was commended as good practice by HMCPSI and HMIC (2002) in their Joint inspection into the Investigation and Prosecution of Cases involving Allegations of Rape.

The ILDA works only with adults with Learning Disabilities. He meets with them to assess their requirements and writes a report, which provides a detailed profile outlining the vulnerability, the special requirements needed and advice for Counsel. The ILDA will work with the family and a number of
cases involve historic sexual abuse offences, sexual violence and domestic abuse. The ILDA often acts as a single point of contact for the victim and will chase up issues that arise, liaising with the police, the WCU and the WS. The ILDA now has a good relationship with the police and will be contacted by them if they think they require his assistance, and he has built up good relationships with the WCU and the WS. The ILDA is also a member of the Wessex Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel and has contributed to the development of better working practices of the CPS in the prosecution of disability hate crimes.

6.1.6 Children and young people

It was found that in all areas specialist services for children and young people who had experienced victimisation were limited. Whilst a number of the domestic abuse services do now offer some specialist support, this is still not consistent within or across all areas. However, a number of smaller organisations do exist which provide invaluable services for children and young people and investment is required to develop these further and share good practice across the region. Not all of them can be outlined here, but full details can be found in the PCC Area Supplements.

An organisation identified as offering a valuable service specifically to children who have been victims, and their parents, is Safe! in Oxfordshire. It provides a range of services to 8 to 25 years olds, although most of the work that it undertakes is with young people aged 11-15. The service started in 2007 and gained charitable status in 2011. It offers an invaluable service through the provision of face-to-face work with a qualified and professional Support Worker, which is individually tailored to meet the needs of the young person. Safe! cannot provide long-term counselling, but do try to be flexible. This can be difficult when working with young people going through the criminal justice process, as this can take a long time and additional support is required, as young people find the process very stressful. Young peoples’ experiences of
the criminal justice process are quite negative and influenced by the same things that impact on adult victims; lack of information, not being kept up to date, long delays if the case is going to court and, overall, a general feeling that “the criminal justice system has little regard for the needs of victims.” Safe! works in partnership with the Young Victim and Witness Service provided by Victim Support. The organisation would like to expand, but because of the lack of capacity, the service believes that it is only scratching the surface. A visit to a school to speak about their service resulted in 5 referrals being made the following day, which can create a dilemma when deciding how far to publicise its services. For more details about the service, see the Thames Valley PCC Area Supplement.

The Clearstone Trust Hampshire provides support for young people up to 21 years and specifically supports young people affected by domestic abuse. Services include individual and group-based support. Programmes include the Summer Daze and Runaway Tortoise projects for children aged between 11 and 16, which involve arts based sessions, and one to one mentoring support. It has opened a Training Centre that provides a café, meeting space and short-term accommodation for young people. It runs projects to develop skills, improve confidence and self-esteem, and employment, including young people being involved in work at the Centre. In 2012, it supported 146 young people and 30 adults.

The East Kent Rape Line runs The Openness Project, which supports and listens to young people experiencing sexual abuse through its Openness helpline and dedicated text line, and has more recently been able to offer face to face counseling. Of particular value, has been the running of young peoples workshops in schools across the county raising awareness, promoting safety and challenging myths.

6.1.7 LGBT communities

Whilst there are a number of support groups available for the LGBT
community, there are few that focus specifically on providing a service for victims of crime, however, this is an area that seems to be developing through a range of small independent organisations. In Thames Valley, Q:Alliance provides a range of services for the LGBT community including a youth group for ages 13-25, and a counselling service, which supports individuals struggling with various issues including homophobic incidents. AAHT are an organisation that raises awareness of homophobia or transphobia affecting individuals of the LGBT community in Buckinghamshire, and Cygnets is a Transgender Support Group based in Woking, Surrey. Chrysalis are a group based in Hampshire and they provide support for transitioning transgender adults and those who have transitioned without support, through meeting centre groups, counselling, and life skills workshops. They also provide support groups to those supporting an individual through the transition process, and gender awareness training to other organisations.

6.1.8 Counselling services

Whilst a number of the service providers identified above provide counselling services, the majority advised that there is a shortage in the provision of trauma based counselling, which many victims of crime require access to. A small number of counselling services operate in Kent, but the one that stands out is Rubicon Cares, which is widely referred to very positively by a range of statutory and non-statutory agencies in Kent. Rubicon Cares is managed by two people who both work on a voluntary basis and specialist counsellors are sub-contracted to support victims of serious crime. However, serious crime is not defined by the crime type, but by the impact it has had on the victim. The service offers a helpline service and specialist trauma counselling for victims of crime, both adults and children (from 13 years old). It is able to offer services across the community and can provide its services in a number of languages. It is attempting to reach all communities, including LGBT, disability groups, the elderly and has seen an increase in the number of male victims. It offers its services countywide using multi-agency locations, but is based in Maidstone. Victims do not have to have reported an offence to access their
services, however, their experience of working with victims of crime who have been engaged with the criminal justice process has resulted in the development of some expertise in this area and the service works closely with the Kent Probation Service’s Victim Contact Scheme Officers.

The Lifecentre in Sussex specialises in counselling survivors of rape and sexual abuse. Services include, telephone and text helpline counselling, email counselling, face-to-face individual counselling, psych-educational groups for survivors, couples’ counselling and counselling for family, friends and partner of survivors. It also operates a third party reporting system, developed through its close partnership with Sussex Police, so that survivors can provide intelligence anonymously. Sussex is currently involved in two initiatives aimed at improving statutory agencies’ responses to people suffering with mental health problems. (See Sussex Area Supplement page 32).

6.1.9 Dual labels - working with victims and offenders

As discussed in Section 3 of this report, for many years the focus has been on young people as offenders rather than being seen as victims of crime, but it can be difficult sometimes to separate the two. Victims and offenders are not always mutually exclusive groups and a high percentage of offenders also experience victimisation, not always necessarily as a consequence of their offending behavior, which is normally assumed, but sometimes it can be early experiences of victimisation that have led to their offending. We found examples of good practices involving work with victims, who may also be offenders, which contribute to reducing repeat victimisation and the prevention of crime.

The Brighton Women’s Centre in Sussex provides support for women involved with the Criminal Justice System in a safe and empowering environment. Services include counselling, drop-in sessions, group-work,
holistic therapies and self-improvement courses. BWC provide specialist counselling for victims of domestic and sexual abuse, and trauma, and is a recognised provider for specialist rape counselling. Catch 22 in Hampshire works to improve the confidence and resilience of young women engaged in offending, inappropriate relationships, who may be vulnerable to exploitation or have been victimised. Support provided consists of one-to-one emotional support as well as practical support and information to assist women in accessing education, welfare support, health services and other programmes.

Surrey also has a Women’s Support Centre which provides support to women who are involved in the criminal justice system due to offending behavior, or who may be at risk of offending, and may have a number of vulnerabilities, including high rates of repeat victimisation. In particular, they work with victims who come from hard to reach groups, co-ordinating support by working in partnership with other statutory and non-statutory agencies. In particular, they provide support to victims who have a range of problems, which may exclude them from accessing support from other services, including mental health and substance misuse issues.

An example in Hampshire of good practice targeted at reducing youth re-offending is the “Change and Challenge” programme run by Safer North Hampshire. It involves all the relevant agencies working with young offenders to demonstrate the consequences of crime on both offenders and victims. This includes being introduced to the work of Victim Support and gaining a better understanding of the impact of ASB and crime on victims, although it often reveals the extent of victimisation having been experienced by the young people on the programme, who can then be offered additional support. However, there is minimal funding for this programme and it mostly runs on the goodwill of the CSP staff and the agencies involved.

Another organisation based on both prevention and support is SWAAY, based
in Reading. It is aimed at young men 10-21 years and is a specialist provider of care for young men who have displayed sexually harmful behaviour and who may have experienced abuse themselves. Services include trauma therapy using CBT and REBT, education and aftercare.

The Hampton Trust in Hampshire is also predominantly involved with work with offenders, but runs the ‘Turnaround project’, which is provided to young children who have experienced and witnessed domestic abuse.

Victim Support in Hampshire is undertaking a pilot project that started in Autumn 2013 called the Victim Awareness Programme, which provides an out of court disposal and can be made as part of a Conditional Caution. It is aimed at perpetrators of “low level” offences, which would only normally attract a caution, and requires the perpetrator to attend a three-hour course aimed at raising victim awareness and developing a greater understanding of a victim perspective. Offenders have to pay £45.00 to attend and failure to comply with the condition will result in a court hearing. Police decide on who is appropriate to receive the Conditional Caution and victims should be consulted. This is an innovative project and is currently being evaluated by a student at the University of Portsmouth.

The importance of these programmes cannot be underestimated, as they not only provide an opportunity for offenders who have experienced victimisation to seek help and support, but also contribute to reducing repeat victimisation and re-offending.

6.2 Identifying gaps in provision

The PCC Area Supplements conclude with a detailed summary of commissioning priorities for each area. A number of the priorities apply to all
areas, and this has been supported by evidence gained from the focus groups and interviews with service providers. This relates to gaps in services specifically being provided to victims of crime rather than more generic support services. The areas where the largest gaps were identified include the following groups:

- Children and young people
- Male victims
- Hate crime, across the range of categories
- Specialist trauma and therapeutic counselling
- Victim-centred restorative justice programmes

A specific area identified by the CSPs and service providers was the lack of mental health service provision. This links with the need for more trauma informed counselling, in recognition of the specific impact crime has on individuals, as acknowledged in Section 3 of this report and in the eight categories of need identified by the Ministry of Justice (2013c). If the trauma suffered is not responded to early enough, victims of crime can develop long-term mental health problems and this affects all age groups.

However, as outlined above, there is evidence of smaller organisations delivering very good services in these areas and this is where expertise and good practice can be shared across areas to assist in developing a wider range of support services to meet local demands and to make some progress towards ensuring that access to good quality support services does not remain a postcode lottery.
7. Conclusion

This research has provided a strategic victims’ needs assessment and an audit of current support service provision for victims of crime in the South East, drawing upon the perspectives of victims of crime, service providers and key stakeholders. It has provided an audit of victims’ services and identified areas of good practice, which could be extended and developed further to address the gaps found in service provision. It has examined the victims’ journey through the criminal justice process and identified where services and support can be provided and improved upon to assist crime victims to cope and recover.

The Police and Crime Commissioners have an exciting opportunity to actively promote the development of coherent, co-ordinated and quality services for all victims of crime who require it, whether the offences are reported to the police or not, and they also have an opportunity to influence the policies and practices of criminal justice agencies to further improve their responses to victims of crime.

The current research has echoed the findings of a body of research undertaken over the last three decades which makes it transparently clear that what victims of crime want (and should be able to expect as standard) is timely and accurate information in relation to the:

- Criminal justice system
- Progress of their case throughout the criminal justice process
- Support services available, what they offer and how they can be accessed, based not on the offence suffered, but the impact on the victim.
This research has found that whilst “putting victims at the heart of the criminal justice system” remains the aspiration of many, what the majority of crime victims experience falls far short of this. If this is to be achieved, it requires the re-focussing of priorities and further changes in the professional cultures and training of the criminal justice agencies, including the judiciary.

To contribute to these changes, the Police and Crime Commissioners can work in partnership with statutory and non-statutory organisations to expand the best practices identified and benefit from the knowledge and expertise that already exists to develop new innovative services to benefit victims of crime.

In collaboration with the agencies and service providers, further research is required to ensure that services are meeting the needs of victims and current practices are monitored and evaluated in order to develop agreed standards of professional practice which are fully compliant with government policies and legislation, to ensure that the interests and concerns of victims are addressed.
8. Recommendations

8.1 To work towards developing a model locally that provides victims of crime with timely and accurate information. Victims should be contacted shortly after the incident and provided with information and crime updates specific to the case. This first contact should provide an initial triage service, pro-actively offering information about relevant support services and referring people to these services, thereby requiring people to decline support, rather than relying on victims actively searching and seeking support for themselves. The unit or model adopted to provide this service does not have to be part of the local police force, but does need to be situated within close proximity, have ease of access to the relevant information systems and be staffed by a combination of well-trained, experienced professionals and volunteers.

8.2 If a specialist unit is developed, the title of this unit should be carefully considered, avoiding value-laden terms, and instead placing an emphasis on the provision of information for people who have experienced crime, for example, Crime Information Bureau or Victim Advice Bureau.

8.3 In partnership with the Local Criminal Justice Boards in all areas, establish as a priority Victim and Witness subcommittees which have as its members senior officers from all the statutory agencies, acting as leadership champions for victims and witnesses issues (including the courts and judiciary), and representatives from service providers. These champions will be accountable for the development of a Victim Services Strategy to ensure the ownership of responsibilities to deliver information and services to victims and witnesses and ensure the implementation of victim-centred policies and legislation in their own agencies. This is essential to maintain the focus and momentum required to ensure victims of crime remain a major consideration in the implementation of policy and service provision.
8.4 In partnership with the LCJBs, the Police and Crime Commissioners to contribute towards the development of clear pathways of engagement for victims and witnesses throughout the victim’s journey, ensuring compliance with the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (Ministry of Justice, 2013a) and The Witness Charter (Ministry of Justice, 2013b).

8.5 In partnership with service providers, the Police and Crime Commissioners to facilitate through the commissioning process the provision of victim services which are co-ordinated and able to provide high quality care in response to need across the area, and to address any gaps in provision, which may disadvantage and marginalise specific individuals, groups and communities, including those who choose not to report incidences to the police.

8.6 For the Police and Crime Commissioners to ensure that these services receive sustainable funding over a three year period, enabling them to plan and focus on service delivery through partnership working and, in return, that these services monitor and evaluate the services they provide in order to ensure quality provision and good value for money.

8.7 For all agencies, both statutory and non-statutory, who come into contact with victims and witnesses to remember that at the end of the statistics and performance data, there is a person who has suffered harm and many who may be suffering indirectly, who need to be listened to and responded to with humanity and compassion, in order for them to regain a sense of autonomy and equilibrium, and to assist in reducing the risk of further victimisation.
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Appendix A: Flowchart of the victims' journey
**Appendix B: Matrix of participating organisations, focus groups and conferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONTACT</th>
<th>PCC Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wessex CPS Disability Hate Crime Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire PCC Domestic Abuse conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support Regional Manager</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Trust</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Hagger, OPCC</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Franklin OPCC Isle of Wight</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Area Rape Crisis Service</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Police - Inspector</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Police - Superintendent</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora New Dawn</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Rape Crisis</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham and Gosport Family Aid</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Women's Service</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysalis</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer North Hampshire Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Portsmouth Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPPA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Crisis Training Day, University of Portsmouth</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF CONTACT</td>
<td>PCC Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Care Unit, Shoreham</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Care Unit and Dinah Longden OPCC</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex Hate Crime Support Service (VS)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe From Harm Project</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankind UK</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetus</td>
<td>Interview by phone</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Centre</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAAC Counselling</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterflies Child &amp; Adolescent Counselling Services</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Community Development Association</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors' Network</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fed- Disability Advice Centre</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support Brighton &amp; Hove Male victims</td>
<td>Phone Contact</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Victim Support</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Police - Detective Superintendent, Public Protection Unit</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adur and Worthing Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex Safer Communities Partnership</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Safe in the City Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Local Criminal Justice Board</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF CONTACT</td>
<td>PCC Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale Action to End Domestic Abuse (SATEDA)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kent Women's Aid</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Matters</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Gatward, OPCC</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Local Criminal Justice Board</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Care Unit</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Contact Officer, Probation</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Start Shepway / New Beginnings Abuse Project</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon Cares</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Start Shepway / New Beginnings Abuse Project</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVSS</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell Forest Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE! Project</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF CONTACT</td>
<td>PCC Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE! Project</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Police - Sergeant, Protecting Vulnerable People Unit</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Police - Superintendent and Chief Inspector</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer MK</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time2Talk</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Crisis Centres - Oxford, Wycombe, Aylesbury and Reading</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Resource</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Contact Unit, Probation</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Women's Aid</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK ACT Women's Refuge</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK Women's Aid</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Life, My Choice</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews undertaken with the Director, two Project Workers, Youth Officer, an anti-bullying co-ordinator and a member of the Board of Trustees.

Interview undertaken with representatives from all four Rape Crisis Centres.

Interview undertaken with Victim Support team following a team meeting in Thames Valley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witness Care Unit</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC - Shona Morrison and Jemma Graham</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Women's Support Centre</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YourSanctuary</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead Women's Aid</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services and all Surrey DA providers</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Joint response provided for all Surrey DA providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASASC</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Policy Advisor, Surrey Police</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJB representative</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC - Lisa Herrington</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with the Victim's Code, Victim and Witness Commissioner, London</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>re Gay British Crime Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>re VS Performance Statistics, not received in time for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT UNSUCCESSFUL OR RESPONSES NOT RECEIVED - INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth Services</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Survivors</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings and Rother Rainbow</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Women's Centre</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME Community Services</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Switchboard</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI - East Sussex Domestic</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Community Safety</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Elder Abuse</td>
<td>Sussex/National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley Community Safety</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Community Safety</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex Community Safety</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Hastings Partnership</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Housing Trust-</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Wealden Partnership</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks Community Safety</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Colchester, LCJB</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern Community Safety</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandelion Time</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Start Thanet</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Start Canterbury</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moat Housing</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis Women's Refuge</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethink Sahayak</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Salus</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kent Rape Line</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanet Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethink</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Refuge</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daybreak Family Group Conferencing</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch 22</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Domestic Abuse Services</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lamp Trust</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Women's Aid</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearstone Trust</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiSter's</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRASACC</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASAC Winchester</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire police – inspector</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmoor CAB</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Steps Project</td>
<td>Hampshire/Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>PCC Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Guildford Partnership</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Action for Families</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAINS</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Waverley Partnership</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Citizen Advice Bureau</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Patey, Surrey Police</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Surrey Domestic Violence Outreach</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOCUS GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUPS</th>
<th>PCC Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Surrey (Dec 2013) Survivors of domestic abuse (20 female, 2 male)</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Surrey (Feb 2014) Young People Advisory Group (6, male and female)</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Thames Valley, SAFE! Young people and their parents</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Thames Valley, Victim Support</td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Kent, Ashford (24.06.13) Victims</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Kent, Ashford (24.06.13) Victim Support, Witness Service, Witness Care Unit</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Kent, Maidstone (04.07.13) Victims</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCC Kent, Maidstone</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(04.07.13) Victim Support, Witness Service, Witness Care Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>PCC Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colquhoun Associates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate - 1 female group 18-45 years</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate - 1 female group 46+ years</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford - 1 male group 18-45 years</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford - 1 male group 46+ years</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton - 1 female group 18-45 years</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton - 1 female group 46+ years</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton - 1 male group 18-45 years</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton - 1 male group 46+ years</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton - 1 female group 18-45 years (attended by researcher)</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton - 1 female group 46+ years (attended by researcher)</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton - 1 male group 18-45 years (attended by researcher)</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>1 male group 46+ years (attended by researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>1 female group 18-70 years (attended by researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>1 male group 18-70 years (attended by researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate</td>
<td>1 female group 18-70 years (attended by researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate</td>
<td>1 male group 18-70 years (attended by researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Directory of national victims' organisations

National Services providing support to Victims of Crime

**General Victim Support Services**
- Victim Support – www.victimsupport.org.uk
- Crimestoppers – www.crimestoppers-uk.org
- Barnado’s – www.barnardos.org.uk
- SupportLine – www.supportline.org.uk (Generic support line)
- STISH (Sudden Trauma Information Self Help) - www.stish.org

**Violence Against Women and Girls**
- Eaves – www.eavesforwomen.org.uk
- Rights of Women – www.rightsofwomen.org.uk
- Helen Bamber Foundation – www.helenbamber.org
- Women & Girls Network – www.wgn.org.uk
- Against Violence & Abuse – www.avaproject.org.uk

**Domestic Abuse**
- National Domestic Violence helpline – 0808 2000 247
- Women’s Aid Federation – www.womensaid.org.uk
- Refuge – www.refuge.org.uk
- Shelter - www.shelter.org.uk
- CAADA (Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse) – www.caaada.org.uk
- Hidden Hurt – www.hiddenhurt.co.uk
- National Centre for Domestic Violence – www.ncdv.org.uk
- This is Abuse – www.thisisabuse.direct.gov.uk
- Respect – www.respectphoneline.org.uk
- Jewish Women’s Aid – www.jwa.org.uk

**Male Domestic Abuse Victims**
- Mankind Initiative - www.mankind.org.uk
- Men’s Advice Line – www.mensadvice.org.uk

**LGBT Domestic Abuse Victims**
- Broken Rainbow- www.brokenrainbow.org.uk
- LGBT Domestic Abuse Forum – www.lgbdaf.org

**Victims of Elder Abuse**
- Action against Elder Abuse – www.elderabuse.org.uk

**Sexual Violence**
- Terrence Higgins Trust – www.tht.org.uk
- Rape Crisis England & Wales – www.rapecrisis.org.uk
- The Survivors Trust – www.thesurvivorstrust.org
The Roofie Foundation – www.roofie.com
The Lucy Faithfull Foundation – www.lucyfaithfull.org.uk
Stop it Now – www.stopitnow.org.uk
Rape and Abuse Line - www.rapeandabuseline.co.uk
Respect – www.respect.uk.net

**Historical Childhood Abuse**
National Association for People Abused in Childhood – www.napac.org.uk
HAVOCA (Help for Adult Victims of Child Abuse) – www.havoca.org
One in Four – www.oneinfour.org.uk

**Male Sexual Violence Victims**
Survivors UK – www.survivorsuk.org

**Non-abusing parents/carers of sexually abused children**
MOSAC – www.mosac.org.uk

**Honour- Based Violence and Forced Marriage**
Karma Nirvana – www.karmanirvana.org.uk
Ashiana Project – www.ashiana.org.uk
Imkaan – www.imkaan.org.uk
IKWRO – www.ikwro.org.uk
Halo Project – www.haloproject.org.uk
Freedom Charity – www.freedomcharity.org.uk
Honour Network Helpline – 0800 5999 247

**Stalking and Harassment**
Network for Surviving Stalking - www.nss.org.uk
National Stalking Helpline – www.stalkinghelpline.org
Digital Stalking – www.digital-stalking.com

**Trafficking, Slavery, Prostitution and Sexual Exploitation**
Chelsea’s Choice- www.alteregocreativesolutions.co.uk/chelseas-choice/
Stop the Traffik – www.stopthetraffik.org/uk
NWG Network – www.nwgnetwork.org
Parents Against Child Sexual Exploitation – www.paceuk.info
Anti-Slavery International – www.antislavery.org

**Young Victims of Crime**
The Hideout – www.thehideout.org.uk
Childline – www.childline.org.uk
NSPCC – www.nspcc.org.uk
Child Victims of Crime – www.cvoc.org.uk
Children’s Society – www.childrenssociety.org.uk
ECPAT UK – www.ecpat.org.uk
**Kidscape** – [www.kidscape.org.uk](http://www.kidscape.org.uk)
**Bullying UK** – [www.bulling.co.uk](http://www.bulling.co.uk)
**Anti-Bullying Network** – [www.antibullying.net](http://www.antibullying.net)

**Hate Crime**
(Some of these organizations are not specifically focused on hate-crime victims but provide general support to these groups)

Stop Hate UK – [www.stophateuk.org](http://www.stophateuk.org)
Equality Advisory Support Service – [www.equalityadvisoryservice.com](http://www.equalityadvisoryservice.com)

**Sub-Cultures**
The Sophie Lancaster Foundation – [www.sophielancasterfoundation.com](http://www.sophielancasterfoundation.com)

**Race or Religion**
The Monitoring Group – [www.tmg-uk.org](http://www.tmg-uk.org)
Forum Against Islamophobia and Racism – [www.fairuk.org](http://www.fairuk.org)
Tell MAMA (National Organisation for Muslim Victims) – [www.tellmamauk.org](http://www.tellmamauk.org)
National Assembly Against Racism – [www.naar.org.uk](http://www.naar.org.uk)

**LGBT**
Mermaids – [www.mermaidsuk.org.uk](http://www.mermaidsuk.org.uk)
Galop – [www.galop.org.uk](http://www.galop.org.uk)
The Lesbian & Gay Foundation – [www.lgf.org.uk](http://www.lgf.org.uk)
Stonewall – [www.stonewall.org.uk](http://www.stonewall.org.uk)
The Albert Kennedy Trust – [www.akt.org.uk](http://www.akt.org.uk)
The Gender Trust – [www.gendertrust.org.uk](http://www.gendertrust.org.uk)
Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays – [www.fflag.org.uk](http://www.fflag.org.uk)
IMAAN LGBTQI Muslim Support Group – [www.imaan.org.uk](http://www.imaan.org.uk)
Safra Project for LBT Muslim Women – [www.safraproject.org](http://www.safraproject.org)
Schools Out – [www.schools-out.org.uk](http://www.schools-out.org.uk)

**Disability/Mental Health**
Regard – [www.regard.org.uk](http://www.regard.org.uk)
Ann Craft Trust – [www.anncrafttrust.org](http://www.anncrafttrust.org)
Scope – [www.scope.org.uk](http://www.scope.org.uk)
Leanord Cheshire Disability – [www.leanordcheshire.org](http://www.leanordcheshire.org)
Disability Rights UK – [www.disabilityrightsuk.org](http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org)
Voice UK (disability-related crime) – [www.voiceuk.org.uk](http://www.voiceuk.org.uk)
Respond – [www.respond.org.uk](http://www.respond.org.uk)
Mencap – [www.mencap.org.uk](http://www.mencap.org.uk)

**Gypsy Travellers**
The Gypsy Council – [www.gypsy-association.co.uk](http://www.gypsy-association.co.uk)
Friends, Families and Travellers – [www.gypsy-traveller.org](http://www.gypsy-traveller.org)
The Traveller Movement – www.travellermovement.org.uk

**Asylum Seekers/Refugees**
Refugee Action – www.refugee-action.org.uk
Refugee Council – www.refugeecouncil.org.uk
Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants – www.jcwi.org.uk

**Fraud**
Think Jessica – www.thinkjessica.com
Action Fraud – www.actionfraud.police.com

**Homicide**
SAMM (Support After Murder and Manslaughter) – www.samm.org.uk
SAMM Abroad (Support After Murder and Manslaughter Abroad) – www.sammabroad.org
NVA (National Victims’ Association) – www.victimsfirst.org.uk
Through Unity – www.throughunity.com
The Moira Fund – www.themoirafund.org.uk
Escaping Victimhood – www.escapingvictimhood.com
MAMAA (Mother Against Murder and Aggression) – www.mamaa.org
AAFDA (Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse) – www.aafda.org.uk
ASSIST (Assistance, Support & Self-help in Surviving Trauma) – www.assisttraumacare.org.uk
KnifeCrimes.org – www.knifecrimes.org
The Jimmy Mizen Foundation – www.jimmymizen.org
Winston’s Wish – www.winstonswish.org.uk
Mothers Against Violence – www.mothersagainstviolence.org.uk

The following bereavement charities may also be of relevance to surviving family members in cases of homicide:
Daisy’s Dream – www.daisysdream.org.uk
Child Bereavement UK – www.childbereavement.org.uk
Cruse Bereavement Care – www.crusebereavementcare.org.uk
Grief Encounter – www.griefencounter.org.uk
The Compassionate Friends – www.tcf.org.uk
Sudden – www.suddendeath.org
Care for the Family – www.careforthefamily.org.uk

**Victimisation/ Bereavement by Road Traffic Crime**
Roadpeace – www.roadpeace.org
Brake – www.brake.org.uk

**Kidnap and Hostage**
Kidnap Victim Support – www.kidnap-support.com
Hostage UK – www.hostageuk.org
Reunite International – www.reunite.org
Abducted Angels – www.abductedangels.org

**Terrorism**
Disaster Action – www.disasteraction.org.uk
Foundation for Peace – www.foundation4peace.org

**Fraud**
Think Jessica – www.thinkjessica.com
Action Fraud – www.actionfraud.police.com
Appendix D: Directory of other agencies that indirectly support victims of crime by PCC area

Services that are not victim-specific, but have been identified as involved in providing support to victims or working in partnership with victim-specific services:

All areas identified the significance of agencies including local authority departments, housing providers, social registered landlords, Health- GPs, and CCGs, mental health teams, Adult and Children’s’ Services, Schools, Probation, Fire and Rescue Services, and Drug & Alcohol services. A number of areas also identified the Troubled Families/ Family Support Programme as a programme that might be relevant to supporting victims.

**Surrey**

Citizens’ Advice Bureau - [www.citizensadvice.org.uk](http://www.citizensadvice.org.uk)
Welcare - [www.welcare.org](http://www.welcare.org)
Home Start – [www.home-start.org.uk](http://www.home-start.org.uk)
Samaritans – [www.samaritans.org](http://www.samaritans.org)
Youth Support Service
Virgin Health - [www.virgincare.co.uk](http://www.virgincare.co.uk)
Children’s Centres
Mediation Services
Windmill Drug and Alcohol Services - [www.sabp.nhs.uk/services/drug-alcohol/windmill/Contact%20us/index.html](http://www.sabp.nhs.uk/services/drug-alcohol/windmill/Contact%20us/index.html)

**Thames Valley**

Children’s Society – [www.childrenssociety.org.uk](http://www.childrenssociety.org.uk)
Talking Therapies (NHS) – [www.talkingtherapies.berkshire.nhs.uk](http://www.talkingtherapies.berkshire.nhs.uk)
P3 – [www.p3charity.org](http://www.p3charity.org)
Asylum Welcome – [www.asylum-welcome.org](http://www.asylum-welcome.org)
Red Cross – [www.redcross.org.uk](http://www.redcross.org.uk)
Citizens’ Advice Bureau - [www.citizensadvice.org.uk](http://www.citizensadvice.org.uk)

Family Centres
Age UK – [www.ageuk.org.uk](http://www.ageuk.org.uk)
Q:alliance – [www.qalliance.org.uk](http://www.qalliance.org.uk)
Family Mediation Services
Compass – www.compass-uk.org
CRI Recovery Service – www.cri.org.uk/recovery_miltonkeynes

Sussex
Citizens’ Advice Bureau - www.citizensadvice.org.uk
Mind Out - www.mindout.org.uk
Home Works – www.southdownhousing.org/services/housing-support/homeworks
Health in Mind (NHS) – www.sussexpartnership.nhs.uk/index.php/services/him
Friends, Families and Travellers – www.gypsy-traveller.org
Women Travellers’ Group

Brighton Street Team
Mind Out – www.mindout.org.uk
The Fed – www.thefedonline.org.uk

Hampshire and the Isle of Wight
No Limits – www.nolimitshelp.org.uk
Youth Options – www.youthoptions.org.uk
Motivate – www.motiv8south.org.uk
Off the Record- www.off-the-record.org.uk
Citizens’ Advice Bureau - www.citizensadvice.org.uk
You Trust – www.lifeyouwant.org.uk
Italk – www.italk.org.uk
Moving on Project – www.the-mop.org
Age UK Isle of Wight – www.ageuk.org.uk/isleofwight
Barnardo’s – www.barnardos.org.uk

Community Watch
Missing Abroad – www.missingabroad.org
Health Watch – www.healthwatchisleofwight.co.uk
UKSA – www.uksa.org
Lucie Blackman Trust – www.lucieblackmantrust.org
Simon Says – www.simonsays.org.uk

Kent
Kenward Trust – www.kenwardtrust.org.uk
Citizens’ Advice Bureau - www.citizensadvice.org.uk
Red Cross – www.redcross.org.uk

Home Improvement Agencies
Children’s Centres
Connexions – www.cxk.org.uk

First Counselling
Tonbridge Counselling Service – www.tonbridgecounsellingservice.co.uk
Sevenoaks Christian Counselling Services – www.sevenoakscounselling.org.uk
Fegans Counselling for Children & young People – www.fegans.org.uk