

**The Alternatives Program: Piloting a Programming
Alternative for First Time Family Violence Offenders**

March 2006

Final Report

**Prepared by:
Jocelyn Proulx and Marianne Rogowy
RESOLVE Manitoba**

Acknowledgements

This project was made possible through the hard work of many people. Foremost are the individuals who supervised the project within each of the three participating agencies. Tim Wall, Director of Evolve, had the vision for the project and the motivation to put it into action. Janice leMaistre, Crown Prosecutor, believed in the long term benefits of this type of project and put in a great deal of effort to make the program available to men charged with family violence. Marilyn Morrice, Director of Domestic Violence Unit of the Manitoba Justice Victim Services Branch, brought energy and enthusiasm to the project. All three of these individuals are to be commended for their pursuit of innovative ideas, their tireless efforts to overcome obstacles, their cooperative and helpful attitude, and their willingness to learn and be flexible. The Evolve program staff demonstrated job conscientiousness by putting in many extra hours to bring quality programming to the men and to keep active communication with other agencies. Their patience and dedication are gratefully recognized. Lori Grant is deserving of special recognition for her role as unofficial project coordinator who took on a large part of the interagency communication and of processing men into the program. Her diligence on the project and her care for the men in her program were essential in the application of this pilot. The Crown prosecutors promoted the program through their referrals and maintained case related contact with other agencies. Victim Services staff's care for victims and work to make them part of the process of justice and treatment for offenders played an important role in making this project possible. For their work in the early visioning and planning stages of the project, a special acknowledgement goes to: Sharon Perrault, former Director of the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Family Violence Program; Elaine Bergen, Clinical Supervisor at Klinik; Lori Grant and Terry Wilson, Counsellors at Evolve; and Duane Lesperance, director of the Men's Resource Centre. The RESOLVE researchers, Jocelyn Proulx and Marianne Rogowy provided research advice, worked towards evaluating the program, and documented the process and benefits of this program. Finally the men who completed the program assisted in the evaluation process by filling out pre and post program assessments. For sharing their ideas and having the courage to change their lives, they are acknowledged with gratitude.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Program

The Alternatives Project piloted a diversion program that offered men an alternative to proceeding with criminal charges. The purpose of the project was to develop a model for an effective response to domestic abuse offenders that could be applied locally as well as nationally.

The objectives of the Alternatives Pilot Project were to:

- a) Reduce recidivism for domestic abuse cases and reduce the backlog of cases reappearing in the family violence court.
- b) Offer therapeutic intervention to men who had been charged with domestic abuse and had no previous convictions.
- c) Reduce the risk of violence to the partners and families of men who had been charged with domestic abuse.
- d) Provide the partners and children of men who had been charged with domestic violence with the opportunity for service.
- e) Evaluate the success of the project in increasing knowledge about domestic abuse and its prevention, changing attitudes that were supportive of violence, and reduce violent behaviour in offenders.
- f) Form cooperative partnerships among service providers working with violent men and their families.
- g) Work towards establishing some standards for providing services to men charged and/or convicted with a domestic violence offence.

Evaluation

The current evaluation is based on: 1) interviews with the staff of the agencies involved in delivering the program (five from the Crown prosecutors office; four from Victim Services; five from Evolve); 2) a focus group with the three project supervisors and two additional representatives from Evolve; 3) a comparison of pre and post program surveys completed by 19 men who completed a group for men who behave abusively in their intimate relationships.

Expectations

The expectations of the agencies involved in the delivery of the program were: 1) to create a community based program for low risk men with first time family violence offences; and 2) to be able to evaluate the impact of the program.

Project Effect on Jobs

Although individuals felt their jobs were somewhat affected by working on the Alternatives Program, most felt it was a worthwhile endeavour. The project supervisors from each of the

agencies were the ones most affected by their involvement in the project, as it added a significant amount of time to their already busy schedules. The least impact was reported by the Crown prosecutors and the most impact was felt by the Evolve staff, who felt their resources were being strained. The added paperwork and the need to constantly adjust to the changing nature of the project was difficult. Both Evolve and Victim Services felt that they would need additional staff if they were to implement the program on a permanent basis.

Project Benefits

It was felt, especially by the Crown prosecutors, that the program could bring the men the treatment they needed and that their partners often wanted for them. Further, it would provide some form of rehabilitation in cases where conviction was unlikely because the complainant would not testify. This was one of the identified benefits of alternative measures programs outlined by the Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Spousal Abuse Polices and Legislation (2003). The Crown prosecutors also appreciated the long-term approach taken by the Evolve program. Corresponding with this opinion, researchers in men's programming have suggested that longer term and more intensive programs may result in more immediate and long lasting reductions in violence (Gondolf, 2002). The Crown prosecutors believed, from their records, that there was a very low rate of recidivism from the men who attended the Alternatives Program. At the very least, the program offered an additional resource for men, and research suggests that when more resources are available, there is a greater likelihood of reducing violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993; Gamache, Ealeson & Schock, 1998; Gwinn & O'Dell, 1993; Russell, 2002; 2001; Steinman, 1991).

For the agencies, the project provided an opportunity to learn more about each other and their services. It increased general awareness of the agencies and of the issue of domestic violence. In addition, it promoted the collaboration of community services, something both MacRae (2003) and Marshall (2001) identified as necessary to dealing with domestic violence and providing rehabilitative services to men.

Project Problems

Project supervisors believed that among the project problems were unrealistic expectations about all that could be done and a lack of planning and preparation for the project details. The lack of knowledge about the program by the staff of the agencies, particularly the Crown prosecutors and Victim Services were indicative of the need for more planning and information dissemination before the program began. The many problems encountered in getting the men into the program were unanticipated.

One of the biggest problems with the project was communication both among and within agencies. It was suggested that more regular contact throughout the project and dissemination of project information to all those involved would have been required to improve communication. Marshall (2001) predicted that communication would be a difficult process when diverse community partners came together to deliver an alternative measures program. This prediction

was supported by the experience of delivering the Alternatives Program in Winnipeg. This lack of communication along with the specific times for intake into the Evolve program at the beginning of the project, greatly delayed entry into the program. Continuous program intake was eventually implemented and this vastly reduced these delays.

Some of the problems were due to systemic issues. The existing court procedures and referral process delayed getting the men into the program. When the Alternatives Program began, the typical court procedure was to adjourn until a later time if there were problems with the case, leading to delays in referral up to 24 months. As the court and referral systems applied more stringent timelines (the option to go into programming had to be taken within first 12 weeks after arrest or not at all), referrals were made more efficiently. Because of the systemic changes that occurred over the course of the project, and what they learned from the pilot project, supervisors from each agency believed that a second pilot or an attempt at implementing a full program would be more successful.

Program Impact

Analysis of pre and post program assessments of men's attitudes and behaviours indicated that the men reported rarely using physical and sexual violence in their relationships and consequently there were few reported injuries to their partners due to conflict in the relationship. The use of reasoning and psychological abuse was more commonly reported. Further the results suggested that over the course of the program the men became more satisfied with themselves and their own gender roles. Assessment of services used by the men indicated that medical and social services were the most often used. There were some indications that given a larger sample size, attitudes may have been less supportive of sexual conservatism, the use of physical violence and of medical services may have decreased in the post program assessment.

In general the men had more negative than positive reactions to being arrested. The positive and negative reactions were similar in both pre and post program assessments. In terms of positive reactions, some men saw their arrest as helping them realize they had a problem and that they had to deal with it. Others saw it as an opportunity for change, learning and a better understanding of self and family. The negative reactions included being embarrassed, fearful, sad, angry, and feeling frustrated at the waste of personal time and time it took for the issue to be dealt with in the justice system. A significant number of men denied their responsibility by citing a misuse of the law or the over-reaction of the police and justice system.

Almost all of the men's reactions to participating in the program were positive both before and after their participation. Before the program the men felt enthusiastic and happy about being given the opportunity to change and make their life better. After the program most of the men reported that the program was generally helpful and changed their lives. Many also made specific mention of the things that had changed in their lives due to the program. For the most part, these included helping them effectively deal with anger and other problems, helping them be more open and honest, making them better listeners, and learning about themselves and their feelings.

A few of the men indicated that they believed their witnessing of violence in childhood led them to believe this behaviour was acceptable. The majority of the men (68%) reported witnessing violence while growing up, primarily between their parents or their parent and their parent's partner. Verbal insults, threats, slapping, and being thrown against a wall were the most commonly reported types of abuse witnessed.

The agencies involved in program delivery felt that most of the intended goals of the program had been met. There was a belief that the vast majority of the men who had gone through the program did not become re-involved with the justice system and that the time and cost resources for the justice system were reduced. However, better evaluation of program effectiveness and follow-up of the men after the program would have been required to truly determine recidivism and outcomes. Although intended, this was not accomplished. The intended goals of streamlining the treatment process was not accomplished either, as there was difficulty in having enough men referred to the program in a timely manner.

The benefits of this type of program were believed to extend to the men, their partners, their children, the community, and the justice system. Within this type of program, men would become healthier individuals without the stigma of a criminal record. Their partners would have access to more resources, would be assured of treatment for their partner, and would be less at risk for further violence. The men's children would have a better father and role model, and thus a better chance at mental health and a successful life. The community would benefit by having the men become healthier and remain productive members of society rather than being incarcerated. The justice system would benefit from a reduced backlog of cases, lessened workloads for prosecutors and reduced court costs through reduced recidivism rates. Victim Services felt that the program would help them bring better services to women, improve their relationship with their partners, and increase their satisfaction with the justice system. It was believed that many of these benefits were attained through the piloting of this program, but would be better assured through another pilot now that many of the problems have been resolved. Greater efforts towards outcome evaluations could be part of the second pilot with the intent of more definitive results on program effectiveness.

Recommendations

Among the many recommendations for the successful implementation of this type of program were:

- Taking a team approach to the program, working together and trusting each other.
- Pre-planning all aspects of the project including a system of communication.
- Employing a coordinator for the project.
- Be willing to be flexible and make changes when things are not working.
- Providing more groups and a greater diversity of groups to better serve the men.
- Follow through on actions. If a stay is only to be given after program completion, to only give it after notification of completion and to have official notices of completion.

Conclusion

Although not all, many of the project objectives were achieved. The program did provide therapeutic intervention to men charged with domestic violence and provided their partners and children with the opportunity for service. It was successful in forming a strong partnership among the agencies delivering the program, but did not maintain the partnership with other agencies. Some standards and important considerations for providing services to men charged and/or convicted with domestic violence offences were established through this project.

Although not proved, it was believed that the Evolve program because of its content, its intensity and length, would have reduced men's violent behaviour and therefore lessened the risk of violence to their families. Unfortunately the program was unable to provide an outcome evaluation and a determination of recidivism rates among the men. It was however, able to produce a process evaluation that will prove helpful in guiding another pilot project, with more outcome based results.

In 2003 the Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group Reviewing Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation made recommendations regarding alternative justices measures in the case of partner abuse. The conditions within which the Working Group felt that alternative measures would be acceptable were nearly all met by the Alternative Program. Hence, the social demand that the criminal justice system find alternative ways of dealing with domestic violence, and bridge the gap between legal and social services, (Ad Hoc Working Group on Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation, 2003) were addressed through the Alternatives Program. The agencies worked cooperatively together to conducted this pilot with little guidance and they learned a great deal from their experience. Based on this experience they were ready to implement a second piloting of the program. Their willingness to apply what they learned in a second pilot and to see the process as developmental in nature, speaks to their commitment to adding this type of program to their repertoire of services. It also places them in a position of leadership in producing quality and innovative programming. Because of their experience and characteristics, these agencies are in the best position to implement a second pilot and it is recommended that they do so with the intent of establishing a plan and means of eventually introducing the Alternatives Program as a permanent part of the services they provide to the Winnipeg community.

Recommendations

1. Implement Another Pilot Alternatives Project

The agency supervisors were interested in attempting a second pilot and felt it would be more successful because of the things they had learned from this first pilot and because of the systemic changes that had occurred. A more successful pilot could be used to support the implementation of a full time alternatives program. The potential benefits of this type of program to men, their families, and the community make it a worthwhile endeavor.

2. Implement a Plan for an Outcome Evaluation

If a second pilot project is implemented an outcome evaluation should be part of that plan. The evaluation should include a plan to assess recidivism over the program and for some time after the program, victim assessment of the program, a pre and post program survey of attitude and behaviour change, a control group, and a larger sample size (at least 30 in each the program and control groups). Outcome results could be used to seek funding for the permanent implementation of an alternatives program and to add to the literature on diversion and treatment programs. Funds would be required to accomplish this evaluation.

3. Include a Detailed Project Planning Component

The agency representatives and supervisors stated the need for a lot of pre-planning prior to implementing a pilot or full alternatives program. Part of this pre-planning component should include composing an advisory committee made up of community agencies providing services to violent men and their partners. These agencies would have to be willing to commit to active involvement in the project. As suggested by the agency staff and other researchers (Marshall, 2001) it is the agencies and departments that have to commit to the project rather than specific individuals. Preliminary planning meetings would be required and could focus on outlining a common vision for the program, specifying the details of the program plan and project process, delineating a communication plan to be used throughout the project, and resolving problems that may hinder the process of the project. This detailed plan could then be objectively reviewed for potential problems and details by someone external to the project. Part of planning should also include informing all individuals involved in the project about the program and its process. This would provide a common level of understanding about the project from the beginning. Ensuring that everyone knows their role, making the program entry requirements clear, and providing training in new procedures would establish confidence and lessen confusion in project personnel. Knowledge of all available resources in the area and a willingness to use them would enhance the program. Any forms required by the project should be constructed and disseminated to the agencies delivering the program before the program begins.

4. Hold Regularly Scheduled Meetings Throughout the Project

The staff from the three agencies identified the need for more and regular meetings. They believed that these meetings would a) improve communication; b) ensure that everyone had the same information and kept updated on changes and problems; c) allow for more personal

connection among people in different agencies, which would facilitate interagency communication; d) active and joint troubleshooting throughout the project; e) facilitate more timely referrals; f) provide a mutual understanding of each agency's processes and requirements. Further, agency staff indicated that the support of the other agency personnel working on the project was a resource for them. Regular meetings of delivery staff and of the advisory committee could increase the amount of support for project personnel.

5. Hire a Project Manager

All of the agencies felt it was necessary to hire a project manager if a second pilot was done. This person would coordinate the referral process, be in charge of communication among agencies, organize meetings, and assist with the paperwork. Additional funds, office space and technology at one of the agencies would be required for this position.

Additional Consideration

If an Alternatives Program is ever implemented in full, it is suggested that referrals be made to more than one agency or that the agency being referred to obtain funding to add staff and programs to accommodate the extra clients without denying services to voluntary clients from the community. Referral to programs that would meet the specific cultural needs of the men should also be considered. MacRae (2003) also recommends that before a diversion program is implemented, adequate space in treatment programs must be ensured.

Introduction

Mandated Family Violence Programming

From 1983 to 1986 federal and provincial policy directives were implemented which required the police and the Crown to charge and prosecute all partner abuse offenses. The intention was to identify partner abuse as an inappropriate behaviour and to prevent abusers from reoffending. Since this time, some provinces have established specialized courts to deal with domestic violence cases. One example is the Winnipeg Family Violence Court.

In 1996 changes in the Criminal Code allowed the application of alternative measures in dealing with adult family violence offenders. The intent of these changes were to prevent further criminal behaviour and to circumvent the compounded harm of having minor offenders go through the criminal justice system. The diversion of first time or non-serious offenders would then free the courts to deal with the more serious offenders. Under the law certain conditions must be met for offenders to be eligible for this option. The offender must accept responsibility for the offense with which he is charged; he must consent to participate; he must be advised of his right to counsel; and there must be enough evidence to proceed to trial. Referral to alternative measures can be made before or after charges are laid and charges may be reinstated if the offender does not complete the alternative measure. Successful completion of the alternative measures can result in charges being stayed and no record of conviction. These changes served to increase interest in alternative ways of dealing with offenders. The Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation (2003) recommended the development of a justice system response to partner abuse that would rehabilitate the offender, ensure the safety of the victim and involve multisectoral coordination of this response. The Working Group also recommended more research to ensure more effective responses to partner violence. The Northwest Territories, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island have alternative measures programs for partner violence. This report presents the results of the piloting of such a program in Winnipeg.

Men who were being charged for the first time with family violence offences were given the option of going into mandated treatment program at Evolve, a family violence program offered through Klinik Community Health Centre. This option was based on the belief that offender treatment may promote longer term behavioural change than incarceration (Gondolf, 2002; Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 2000). Given that court mandated program participants have higher rates of program completion than voluntary attendees (Gondolf, 2002; Dobash, et. al., 2000), and that first time offenders are more likely to complete mandated programs (MacRae, 2003), these expectations were well founded for this group of men. Supporting evidence is found in a number of studies reporting that mandatory treatment for partner violence offenders resulted in decreased recidivism rates (Babcock & Steiner, 1999; Dutton & McGregor, 1991, Gamache, Edleson, & Schock, 1988; Rondeau, Brodeur, Brochu, & Lemire, 2001). It has been suggested that these types of mandated programs may lead the accused to more readily accept responsibility for his violence (MacRae, 2003). There is also research suggesting that treatment has little or no effect on recidivism (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Davis & Taylor, 1999). The Manitoba Family Violence Court Treatment Centres provide short term intervention and

have demonstrated varied success in reducing recidivism (Ursel & Gorkoff, 1996). Program variation in terms of approach, length, stability, staffing and participants likely affect rates of recidivism (MacRae, 2003).

Finding a treatment that would reduce recidivism would serve to reduce the number of victims and the systemic costs of violence (medical, social service, justice, and productivity costs). In addition, many victims want and ask for treatment for the offender (Moyer, 2000). However, in Winnipeg, there are few such programs offering services to male offenders with changes pending. Further, as indicated by the Ad Hoc Working Group, this type of undertaking requires coordination of services and collaborative partnerships among justice system, victim services, and social services (in this case those providing treatment). It has been stated that treatment is most effective when offered through a coordinated community response (MacRae, 2003; Marshall, 2001). When more services are available to victims and offenders, there is a greater likelihood of reduced violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1993; Gamache, Ealeson & Schock, 1988; Gwinn & O'Dell, 1993; Russell, 2002; 2001; Steinman, 1991). Although there is a need for community collaboration, the many challenges faced by these types of partnerships, can hinder the application of alternative measures. In this paper, community partners who worked together on the piloting of an alternatives measures program discuss the factors required to make this type of collaboration work.

The Alternatives Project

The Alternatives Project piloted a diversion program that offered men an alternative to proceeding with criminal charges. The purpose of the project was to develop a model for an effective response to domestic abuse offenders that could be applied locally as well as nationally. The goals of such a programming model were to:

- a) Reduce the number of incarcerations and the rate of recidivism for domestic abuse.
- b) Reduce the backlog of domestic abuse cases appearing and reappearing in the family violence court.
- c) Creating healthier families within the community.
- d) Strengthen the cooperative relationship between service providers and the justice system.
- e) Add to the research on effective intervention programs.
- f) Establish some standards for providing services to men charged and/or convicted with a domestic violence offence.

First conceptualized in 2001, the Alternatives Pilot Project received funding from the Winnipeg Foundation in 2003 and concluded in December 2005. The project was a collaborative venture involving the Department of Justice, The Women's Advocacy Program (now the Victim Services Department of the Domestic Violence Unit of Manitoba and referred to in this document as Victim Services), Evolve (a Family Violence Program at the Klinik Community Health Centre), and RESOLVE (a family violence research centre at the University of Manitoba).

The objectives of the Alternatives Pilot Project were to:

- a) Reduce recidivism for domestic abuse cases and reduce the backlog of cases reappearing in the family violence court.
- b) Offer therapeutic intervention to men who had been charged with domestic abuse and had no previous convictions.
- c) Reduce the risk of violence to the partners and families of men who had been charged with domestic abuse.
- d) Provide the partners and children of men who had been charged with domestic violence with the opportunity for service.
- e) Evaluate the success of the project in increasing knowledge about domestic abuse and its prevention, changing attitudes that were supportive of violence, and reduce violent behaviour in offenders.
- f) Form cooperative partnerships among service providers working with violent men and their families.
- g) Work towards establishing some standards for providing services to men charged and/or convicted with a domestic violence offence.

Before being considered for participation in this pilot project, the men had to meet criteria from each of the partnering agencies. Referrals came from the Crown prosecutors in consultation with Victim Services. The selection criteria for these two agencies were as follows:

- No concerns that the victim was currently at risk.
- No prior convictions for domestic violence or other violent offences.
- No weapons used during the commission of the offence.
- No serious physical injury sustained by the victim.
- No other outstanding criminal charges.
- No mental health problems or active substance abuse issues.
- A desire to change his behaviour.
- A willingness to attend and fully participate in group counselling.

Men who met the criteria of these two agencies were given the option of participating in the Evolve Men's Family Violence Group Counselling Program in exchange for having their charges stayed. The men who were interested, were asked to enter into a peace bond, a condition of which was completing the men's counselling program from Evolve. Once they completed the program their charges would be stayed. Failure to complete the program would result in a breach of the peace bond and charges would be reinstated. The men who selected this option were responsible for contacting the Alternatives Program Coordinator at Evolve who arranged for an in person consultation meeting to determine whether he was then appropriate for the group.

This Alternatives Program was similar to the Early Intervention Treatment in the Ontario Domestic Violence Courts and the Yukon Territory Domestic Violence Treatment Option, in that the criteria for program eligibility include being low risk for violence, having no prior convictions, not using a weapon, and not causing significant harm to the victim. In the Ontario and Yukon programs a guilty plea results in being referred to treatment as a condition of bail and is offered prior to sentencing. Participation in the program is then considered in sentencing

(MacRae, 2003). The only difference in the piloted Alternatives Program was that the charges were stayed if the man completed the program. This made it similar to some programs in the U.S. (for example the Pittsburgh Domestic Violence Court) where the accused enters into a bond and charges are dropped if he completes the program, and can be reinstated if he does not complete the program (MacRae, 2003).

One of Evolve's conditions for participation in the Alternatives Program, was that men had to agree to have one of the Evolve counsellors contact their partners. These partners were given the opportunity to talk with a counsellor from Evolve or to be referred to counselling at another agency of their choice. The women received information about the program and their partner's attendance, however nothing that their partner shared in the group was discussed with the women. Nor were any discussions they had with a counsellor shared with their partner. This type of concern for victim safety is typically demonstrated in alternative programs (MacRae, 2003).

The men who participated in the Alternatives Project were placed into the Evolve Men's Group Counselling Stage One Program, consisting of two meetings per week for a total of 24 to 28 sessions over 12 to 14 weeks. Initially, eligible men had to wait until a new group began in order to join. During this time they participated in pre program group sessions which met one evening per week. These prep groups were educational sessions intended to prepare the men for the Stage One Group. The purpose of the Stage One Group is to help men end their abusive behaviour, to better understand their actions, to recognize the effect that their actions have had on their relationships, to develop healthier intimate and parental relationships based on trust, respect, equality and responsibility, and to assist men to better identify, understand and communicate their needs and feelings. Eventually, the programming changed to allow men to join a continuous Stage One Group at any time, which facilitated the process of referral into the group. Groups consisted of about 12 men and two facilitators, one male and one female. At the end of the Stage One Group the men were given the option of accessing other services, such as individual counselling, a parenting group or a couples group at another agency. Participation in these programs was voluntary and was not a condition of the peace bond or the Alternatives Program.

In the initial stages of the project an advisory committee was established to help guide the process, troubleshoot, and provide support. Members of the advisory committee consisted of representatives from the Department of Justice, Victim Services, Evolve, The Family Centre of Winnipeg, The Aboriginal Health and Wellness Centre, the Family Violence Prevention Branch, Department of Corrections, the Men's Resource Centre, and RESOLVE. These agencies were either directly involved with the project, or were involved in providing community based services for men and/or offenders. As the project progressed the committee met less often and many members left. This paper explores possible reasons for this occurrence and potential ways of preventing it.

Klinic's Perspective and Approach to Family Violence

When reading this report it will perhaps be useful to the reader to have a general understanding of Klinic and the beliefs, values, and approach that underlie the program in which the men in the Alternatives Project participated. Evolve is a program of Klinic Community Health Center and was established in 1978. Funded by the Department of Family Services and Housing through the Family Violence Prevention Program, Evolve offers individual and group counselling to people who have been abused in an intimate relationship, people who have behaved abusively in an intimate relationship and to children and youth who have been affected by family violence.

The goals of the Evolve program are to help people whose lives have been affected by domestic abuse to:

- increase their ability to identify and understand the affects and impact of domestic abuse
- increase their capacity to understand personal needs, feelings, strengths and resources
- increase the capacity for self-protection
- increase personal accountability and responsibility
- increase productive, positive and respectful coping skills
- improve decision –making abilities
- reduce isolation and construct positive support systems
- reduce the affects of domestic abuse and symptoms of post traumatic stress
- identify and integrate alternatives to abusive behaviour
- improve communication skills and the ability to express feelings and needs
- improve interpersonal relationships and skills
- increase ability for self care and self reliance and self esteem
- increase their capacity to create an environment that promotes the well being of children and positive parent child relationships
- decrease feelings of shame

Healthy families and relationships are characterized by mutual respect, dignity, equality and individual responsibility. These relationships nurture and support every individual's physical, emotional and spiritual wellbeing. Healthy families contribute to an environment where it is possible for each person to thrive and realize their full potential. When people experience control over their own destiny, self-worth, meaning, purpose and a genuine connection with others it is possible for individuals and families to live free of fear, violence and abuse. A healthy family is also one that is able to live with enough to eat, in proper shelter and free of oppression and discrimination.

Society and its institutions cultivate the attitudes, values and systems necessary to build and sustain healthy and safe families. Families in turn play a vital role in creating healthy individuals. Preventing domestic abuse therefore requires a systemic and comprehensive approach that addresses issues of poverty and oppression. Freeing families from violence and abuse means freeing families from poverty, discrimination and oppression. Each person in the family must also experience their own personal liberation including those whose behaviour has restricted the personal freedom of others.

Klinic acknowledges that family violence occurs within the family and places interventions within the relational contexts in which it occurs. Like relationships, family violence dynamics

are complex and therefore require sophisticated and multidimensional responses. Services and healing should not be provided in isolation and instead should be connected to partners, children, family, larger support systems and the community in which people live.

Klinic's approach to family violence prevention is grounded in a belief that clinical interventions be based upon the goals, needs and circumstances of the client. Family violence, like most family dynamics, is complex and multi-layered and therefore requires a comprehensive and systematic approach. It is important that each person's uniqueness and developmental needs be carefully considered. Klinic provides people who are seeking help to stop abusive behaviour with an environment and therapeutic relationships based on support, compassion, acceptance, validation and respect for each individual. While Klinic promotes personal responsibility and accountability it also believes that behaviour does not determine a person's value, worth or define their identity. Supporting people through a process of change is predicated on an ability to see and acknowledge the whole person and not just one aspect of their experience or being. Acceptance, compassion, empathy and even a sympathetic point of view along with a belief and commitment to personal responsibility and accountability are necessary for promoting and sustaining non violent behaviour. As such, Klinic does not take an adversarial or confrontational approach to family violence prevention but rather seeks to understand each person's experience and establish meaningful alliances to help them achieve their goals. Klinic's approach is not based on shaming but rather seeks to understand those issues and factors that motivate behaviour. Effective interventions require that we recognize the important role that fear, attachment, abandonment, and previous trauma play in motivating and sustaining abusive behaviour. The understanding of why some people behave abusively requires analysis that goes beyond issues of power and control. Consideration of fear, attachment, abandonment, and trauma in the motivation and sustaining of abusive behaviour is necessary.

Klinic believes that language plays a central role in the process of understanding the world and how that particular world view is passed on to others. The counselling community has a mandate to reflect on the power of language for the process of change and within a healing context. Klinic staff are vigilant about the words and language they use relevant to domestic abuse and to the understanding of their broader implications. For example when considering words such as "offender/perpetrator" and "victim" attention is given to:

- the message and meaning behind these words
- whose voice is being heard in describing the events of abuse (police, prosecutors, men, women, children)
- the function these words serve for researchers, counsellors, lawyers, funders, and the individuals within the system
- the power dynamic between the persons using the words and the persons labeling them

Klinic is becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that the men who register for domestic abuse programs are frequently the same men who register, or could register, for the trauma, substance abuse or mental health programs. The women served by Klinic are frequently the same women who begin their healing through a number of other paths such as Child and Family Services, and substance abuse and trauma recovery programs. Klinic is involved with people who come from situations of intergenerational violence. This awareness is magnified by the knowledge that within communities some people are more oppressed than others. Besides

gender, ethnicity, economics, and education make distinctions among levels of oppression impossible. Thus dichotomies such as “offender” and “victim” is not helpful to the process of changed.

Klinic is aware of the need for clear categories for conducting research, in prosecuting those who have broken the law, and in differentiating individuals for funding purposes. At the same time they hold that these labels and categories do not reflect the complexity of the issue and may in the end contribute to systemic ongoing abuse. The language that promotes change must open and not constrict possibilities and honour justice in every respect. The tension of different needs and values is inevitable in a multidisciplinary partnership.

Methodology

Participants

The original intent was to have 24 men in the program and 24 control group men who had not participated in the program. Due to problems getting men who did not participate in the program to complete the surveys, a control group was not obtained. Although a total of 33 men participated in the program, 24 completed the program and only 19 completed both a pre and a post program survey.

In addition to the pre and post program surveys, interviews were conducted with five individuals from the Justice Department, four from Victim Services, and five from Evolve who were involved in the Alternatives Program. At the end of the project a focus group was conducted with five members of the original advisory group who represented the three agencies delivering the program. These included one representative from the Department of Justice, one from Victim Services, two from Evolve, and one formerly from The Family Centre of Winnipeg and currently from Klinik.

Procedure

The counsellors at Evolve who delivered the program had the men complete a pre program survey before beginning the program and a post program survey after they finished. The surveys were number coded and did not contain the men's names. The surveys were given to RESOLVE for analysis. All of the men who took part in the Alternative Program were asked to sign a Confidentiality Policy form from Evolve. This form is signed by all of the men who take part in Evolve's men's programs. A copy of this form is attached in Appendix A.

RESOLVE contacted the individuals involved in the Alternatives Program from the three partnering agencies. Those agreeing to participate took part in a one hour interview either over the phone, or in person, as they preferred. Only two of the 14 service providers did phone interviews. All participants signed a consent form prior to the interviews. For phone interviews, consent forms were faxed to participants. A copy of this consent form can be found in Appendix B. The names of the participants were not attached to their interview responses; all interviews were number coded. Only the agency they represented was noted.

The focus group with representatives from the three partnering agencies was arranged by the director at Evolve. RESOLVE was invited to serve as facilitator and recorder. In the focus group the three partnering agencies discussed the process of the project from a more systemic and contextualized perspective.

Measures

The pre and post program surveys consisted of the instruments described below. A copy of the surveys can be found in Appendix C.

Sex Role Scales (Burt, 1989). The literature has linked more traditional sex role beliefs with a greater risk for abusive behaviour. Changes in these beliefs often result from family violence programming. For each of these scales responses to items are rated on a scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 7 (extremely satisfied). The scales are as follows: **Satisfaction with Own Sex Role Scale** assesses the individuals satisfaction with certain aspects of their sex role; **Sex Role Stereotyping Scale** assesses stereotyped beliefs about the roles of men and women; **Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale** assesses beliefs that men and women play adversarial roles, with each trying to gain the upper hand over the other. **Sexual Conservatism Scale** assesses traditional beliefs about sex roles.

The Conflict Tactics Scale – Revised. This scale, constructed by Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman (1996), assesses how often individuals have used different tactics to deal with conflicts in their relationship. Responses are scored on a scale ranging from 1 (this never happened) to 6 (this happened more than 20 times). The scale is comprised of reasoning, psychological abuse, physical violence, injury, and sexual violence subscales.

The Psychological Maltreatment of Women Scale. This scale, developed by Tolman (1989) assesses male partner's psychological abuse of their female partners. Respondents indicate how frequently they acted in specified ways with their partner on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very frequently). The scale contains two subscales: the dominance-isolation subscale and the emotional-verbal subscale.

Use of Community Services. Constructed for this project, this measure asks participants to indicate how many times they or their family have used a number of different services within the past year.

Observed Physical Violence in Childhood Home. Constructed for this project, this measure assesses if respondents observed violence between their parents, a parent and their partner, or other guardians when they were growing up. The type of violence was also recorded.

Participant Reaction. Respondents were asked to describe their reactions to having been arrested for domestic violence and to participating in the alternatives program.

Interview and Focus Group Questions. The questions used for interviews and focus groups with representatives from the agencies involved in the Alternatives Project were constructed for this project. The interview questions addressed issues such as how their job and agency were affected by the project, what resources were needed, the beneficial and problematic features of the project, and recommendations for similar projects. The focus group questions asked about expectations, roles, barriers, and suggestions for improvement of future endeavours of this sort.

Problems and Limitations

Only 19 completed pre and post tests were obtained and there was no control group with which to compare potential changes in the program group. The small number of participants makes the pre and post program comparisons tenuous. Further, the men who chose to participate in and complete the Alternatives Program may differ in some way from those who chose not to participate or who did not complete the program. The small sample size and the lack of a control group preclude any conclusions about the effectiveness of Alternatives Program. Results should be interpreted with extreme caution and should be used to inform future research on areas of potential change.

The project took longer than anticipated for a number of reasons. First, it took a while to establish a system of rapid communication and coordinating the referral process among the three partnering agencies. Second, the pool of candidates using the initial criteria was smaller than anticipated. Initially the program would only accept men who had no previous charges. The selection criteria were reviewed and adjusted to make the program available to men who had no previous convictions but who may have had previous charges. This change invalidated the first four pre-tests that were done. Changes in staff and summer court recess also interrupted the consistency of the referral process. In addition, all participating agencies involved in delivering the program underwent systemic and/or procedural changes throughout the course of the program. These changes likely had an effect on the men's experience in the program. This further calls into question the results of the pre and post program surveys.

These problems and limitations changed the evaluation of the Alternatives Project from an outcome evaluation to a process evaluation, assessing the development of the program. Thus, although the results do not inform on program effectiveness they provide important information on the issues faced in delivering this type of program and the resolution of potential problems. In this respect it will likely prove useful for individuals and agencies who plan to develop another pilot or full Alternatives Program in Manitoba and other provinces.

Results

The Experience of Delivering an Alternatives Program: Interviews with Agency Staff

Agency Roles

The Alternatives Project involved three primary participating agencies: The Justice Department (Crown prosecutors), Victim Services (formerly Women's Advocacy Program), and Evolve. Representatives from each of these agencies were asked to discuss their role on the project. The results revealed a strong interconnection among these three agencies. The Crown prosecutors examined offenders' files to determine whether or not the men fit criteria to participate in the Alternatives Program. These criteria have been detailed above. The Crown prosecutors then made contact with Victim Services and identified the cases they were considering for program referral. Victim Services then reviewed the case to determine if it was appropriate for the Alternatives Program and consulted with the victims in these cases to ascertain their views on having the accused offered the Alternatives Program option. Victim Services then contacted the Crown prosecutors to identify the cases they felt were appropriate for the Alternatives Program and the Crown prosecutors then made the official referral to the men's program at Evolve.

Impact on Work

1. Staffing

All 17 of the Crown prosecutors in the Family Violence Unit were involved in the Alternatives Program. The five that were interviewed reported that the project became part of their jobs by presenting another resource for referral and thus did not affect their jobs a significant amount. Eight staff from Victim Services and all five counsellors from Evolve were involved in the Alternatives Program. For all three agencies, one person was delegated as having primary involvement in the development of the project, but everyone was involved in its delivery.

All agencies felt that they had a sufficient number of staff for a pilot project, however many felt that should the program continue on a full time basis, extra staff would be required. Suggestions consisted of: 1) having a person specifically assigned to handling referrals, and to be in charge of communication among agencies; 2) having extra assistance with paperwork; 3) having more counsellors at Evolve to provide more programs, in order to cut the waiting period for the men and to serve a greater number of men; and 4) having a person in the justice system that would be able to quickly find and relay information needed by the two other agencies. Evolve staff found their limited access to justice system information impeded the process of getting the men into the program.

2. Resources

In general most individuals interviewed felt there were sufficient resources to deliver the Alternatives Program, particularly after the introduction of email communication. The support of others in the project was one of these resources. However, the need for additional communication resources was often mentioned. First, some felt that it would have been helpful to have more collaborative meetings involving everyone on the project. Such a meeting at the beginning of the project would have allowed everyone to be given the same information at the same time. With this equal understanding of the project, only men qualified would have been referred from the beginning. It would also have provided a mutual understanding of each agencies processes and requirements. Done throughout the project, these meetings would have allowed all individuals involved to mutually discuss problems and changes to the process. Some respondents were unsure to whom they should go for troubleshooting problems and these types of meetings would have clarified this position and offered an arena for troubleshooting. Project meetings would have allowed individuals to form more personal connections which would then have facilitated phone and email communications.

Second, there was often a lag in response time when questions were asked or when information was required and thus more effective communication forms, such as regular meetings and the later added emails, would have been helpful. Third, a better system of information exchange would have facilitated referral to the program, however because of FIPPA creating this type of system would have been challenging. Fourth, it was suggested that a pamphlet explaining the program and the process for entering the program should have been developed. The pamphlet could have been given to the men to read at their leisure, when they were less stressed than at their first entry into the criminal justice system. It would also have been given to defense councils, many of whom did not understand the admissions criteria and were making inappropriate referrals to the program.

Other resources that were not necessary, but would have proved beneficial were also mentioned. Although most of the forms and paperwork required for the project were provided to staff, some forms, particularly for Victim Services staff, had to be constructed along with databases as the project progressed. Despite reports that secretarial assistance was not required, it was felt that it would have been a welcome resource to reduce some of the job strain. Finally, as mentioned, Evolve would have appreciated the resource of additional counsellors to offer more programs consecutively and thus increase the number of men served.

3. Job Impact

The Crown prosecutors indicated that the Alternatives Program had a positive impact on their jobs. It provided a positive option to use when there was little chance of the victim testifying and thus little chance of conviction. Men for whom conviction was unlikely were able to receive help with relationship and anger issues. Crown prosecutors further appreciated that the Alternatives Program gave them an additional referral resource, one that was better suited to some of the men than other resources. In the case of Victim Services, representatives indicated that they only had to ask victims a few extra questions about their views on having their partners participate in the Alternatives Program.

Evolve staff felt that the Alternatives Program added some degree of stress to their jobs. To accommodate the program there were extra groups in addition to the regular programs, creating some job strain. Although extra staff were hired to assist with the counselling and paperwork generated by the Alternatives Program, the staff reported that if the program continued, they would require more full time staff. It was also stated that more counsellors would be able to provide more concurrent programs, even further reducing waiting times for the men. Despite the challenges of providing this additional programming, the staff found the process stimulating.

The largest job impact was reported by the project supervisors from each agency. Numerous meetings and phone calls to work out project details added significantly to their existing workload. Given that these individuals played supervisory roles in their agencies, their jobs were already stressful and the added task of supervising this project added to this stress. They had to field questions and concerns posed by their staff and resolve project related problems.

Positive Impacts of the Project

A number of positive effects of the Alternatives Program were reported by individuals at all three agencies. Crown prosecutors felt that the Program was a positive treatment resource from an agency (Evolve) in which they had a lot of confidence and trust. It was preferable option that ensured some type of treatment for men when the complainant was not prepared to testify against her partner. They also appreciated that the Program was more intensive and longer term than most other programs. In support of this position, researchers in men's programming have suggested that longer term and more intensive programs may affect more immediate and long lasting reductions in violence (Gondolf, 2002). The Crown prosecutors believed, from their records, that there was a very low rate of re-involvement with the criminal justice system from the men who attended the Alternatives Program. Recidivism tended to occur when men were waiting for their program to begin.

People from Victim Services stated that the Alternatives Program gave them a viable option in cases where women wanted their partners to get help but not be criminally charged. It connected both men and women to additional resources, providing them with help they may otherwise not have received. Through the program Victim Services could follow up on some of the male partners of their clients, something not otherwise available to them. For Evolve the positive impact was related to their own knowledge and counselling practices. They noted that the program encouraged clinical discussions about the type of programming they offered and educated them as to the workings of the criminal justice system.

This latter point was reiterated by individuals from other agencies. They felt that working together collaboratively allowed them to learn how the other agencies functioned and their mandated processes. They further indicated that they had more communication with other social systems than they had prior to the pilot project. Many reported gaining insights into what aspects of this type of program work and which require more attention. Thus, most enjoyed their experience as a learning processes.

Many individuals felt that the Alternatives Program offered a beneficial option in the form of extensive programming that addressed men's issues and behaviours more thoroughly than some other programs. An added benefit was that the men would no longer have a criminal record and thus avoid the stigma and stress associated with conviction. Agency representatives believed that this served as an added incentive to taking and remaining in treatment. Positive effects for the men came from learning to talk about their situations and learning to mentor others in similar situations. Positive effects for victims resulted from knowing their partners were getting the help they needed and would not have a criminal record. For partners, it also reduced the stress that accompanies being involved in the criminal justice system such as testifying against a partner.

Staff from the participating agencies reported that the Alternatives Program led to increased awareness of the agencies and of the issue of domestic violence. Evolve and Victim Services became more widely known as the community became aware of this new program. These agencies became better known to the men and women served by the program and thus became another resource for them to access after program completion. The program brought additional awareness to the problem of domestic violence and reinforced actions to act to end violence. It responded to the social demand that the criminal justice system find alternative ways of dealing with domestic violence (Ad Hoc Working Group on Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation, 2003), and bridges the gap between legal and social services. Although not proved, it was believed that the program may have also minimized the time and cost spent in the criminal justice system on domestic abuse cases.

Conflicts and Other Negative Impacts

The project appeared to create one main conflict for each agency. For Victim Services, it was the process of assessing the accused for his eligibility to enter the program, as their mandate is focused on helping victims rather than the offenders. The conflict faced by the Crown prosecutors office was that the charges were stayed before the counselling took place and there was a concern that the offenders were using the Alternatives Program as a way to avoid the justice system. Further the defense often did not understand the criteria for the Alternatives Program, because they were never given the list of criteria that was given to the Crown prosecutors. Consequently they would try to refer their clients into the program when they were not eligible.

The main conflict for Evolve was an ethical/philosophical one. To be eligible for the Alternatives Program the men had to admit responsibility for their actions, otherwise they were denied treatment. Some of the counsellors felt it was unethical to deny men treatment. Some felt the men were only admitting responsibility to get into the program and avoid criminal charges. They were concerned that the men's different motives for being in the program would adversely affect the group dynamics. This, however, did not appear to be the case. Finally, contrary to their typical operation, Evolve was dependent on other agencies, particularly the Crown prosecutors, for information before they could begin their work with the men.

Time conflicts and structural constraints were reported by workers at all three agencies. For some the project added a great deal of work and stress to their jobs, particularly due to the

amount of paperwork, attending meetings, and addressing problems. Having one person in charge of referrals to the program and one person to handle the administration and paperwork, specifically for Victim Services and Evolve, were suggested as ways of alleviating the time constraints. The developmental nature of the project required constant modification and therefore more time and effort on the part of staff. Finally, although most felt there was a clear description of the project and what each person's job on the project entailed, some individuals felt that the process changed throughout the course of the project and there was sometimes a delay in being informed of changes.

Problems and Resolutions

Initially there was a problem getting the men into the program, first because the criteria for entry was too stringent. The original criteria was that only men who did not have any previous charges would be eligible to be in the program. As very few men met this criteria and the Crown had to find other programs for them, the criteria was changed to allow men with previous charges into the program as long as they had no previous convictions. This made many more men eligible for participation in the program.

The second hindrance to men getting into the program was the nature of the Evolve men's program. Because the start dates for the Evolve men's program were fixed and if the date was missed, the men had to wait for an extensive period before the next start date. During this time some men re-offended and others became very frustrated with the process. Evolve's response was to stagger the intakes into the program, allowing the men to begin at different times. This solved two problems: 1) the concern that the lapse of time increased the likelihood of the men re-offending or breaching and, 2) the belief that having the treatment closer to the time of the offence would increase their ability to make a connection between the incident and its outcome and thus increase the impact of treatment.

Respondents from all three agencies felt that it took a long time to get men to accept responsibility for their actions because in their fear of conviction, they did not want to be seen as admitting their guilt. It was suggested that this may have occurred because of the time between the man's being charged, his evaluation, referral, and then beginning the program. It was believed that this lessened his ability to connect his responsibility for his behaviour and his getting help to change his behaviour. This would have been addressed to some degree by changes in intakes into the Evolve program. Further, it appeared that some of the men did not understand the point of the Alternatives Program and this exacerbated their reluctance to see their abuse and violence as wrong.

Communication among agencies was problematic, with some of the miscommunications occurring within agencies. For example through Victim Services, the men's partners were to be given pre and post program questions assessing their views of the program, however this was not formally announced, thus, some workers did not administer these questions. Other workers thought that once the tests were given that individuals would mail in their responses, which did not happen. In hindsight, it would have been easier to ask a simple question about clients thoughts and feelings about the program during the interview. Further, some men were still

being referred to the Alternatives Program after the pilot project was completed. It was suggested that training and information sessions with all workers involved in the project would have reduced confusion and ensured everyone was aware of the overall process and their tasks within that process.

However, most communication problems occurred between agencies. There were uncertainties about who to contact and difficulties making phone contact. Phone contact was the main source of communication, as Evolve was initially not using the email system. Delays in communication often caused confusion as to whether a man who called their program had met the Crown's criteria for entry. This improved when Evolve only became involved in the process after both the Crown prosecutors and Victim Services had discussed the case and made a formal referral to the program. When email became the primary form of communication, among agencies, the problem was somewhat alleviated. However, training Evolve staff in the use of emails would have produced a more rapid and effective use of this form of communication. A lack of access to information because of FIPPA created problems for Evolve and Victim Services. However, once the use of PRISM was introduced, many of the FIPPA regulations were lifted and information exchange was facilitated. Problems in communication among and within agencies often delayed an already lengthy process. The staff from Evolve felt that the time from being charged, through the assessment of the person and his situation, the referral process and then commencing the program was too long, leading to frustration for both themselves and the men. Some felt that these delays meant that some men got lost in the system and were not served by the program. In addition, the project ran longer than anticipated, causing further stress and frustration for Evolve staff.

Recommendations for Future Implementation

Interviews and focus groups with those involved in delivering the program revealed a number of recommendations for any future implementations of this type of project. First, a willingness to work on a team and to take a teamwork approach was recommended. This involves a respect and understanding of other agency's perspectives, agendas, workload, and requirements.

Much pre-planning would have to be done, such as developing any forms to be used before the program was implemented. Having preliminary planning meetings to discuss the program and its process and any concerns individuals may have would provide a common level of understanding about the project from the beginning. Ensuring that everyone knows their role before the project begins and making the admission requirements clear to everyone would work to avoid some of the confusion experienced. Knowledge of all available resources in the area and a willingness to use them would enhance the program. Partners like Victim Services who help women could become more of an informational resource for these women by keeping them apprised of the alternatives process and what is happening with their partner's situation.

Extra training would also be valuable. There was no project related training given for workers in any of the three participating agencies. Training would have been welcome, specifically in the areas of computer mediated communication and information about the work and process within each of the agencies. Having one individual who was specifically responsible for negotiating the

referral process would have helped to produce a faster turn around time between referral and entry into the program. This individual could coordinate the flow of information and provide a common contact source for all individuals involved in the project. The staff from Evolve felt they did not know enough about how the justice system works and the processes the men went through upon entering this system. This knowledge would have improved the services and information given to the men.

Flexibility was identified as an important component of programming and of piloting or establishing an alternatives program. This project had to change the criteria for men's eligibility for the program to allow the project to serve more men. This type of flexibility must be part of any new endeavour.

A number of suggestions were made in reference to the types of programs offered to men mandated from the criminal justice system. First, the program to which the men are referred have to be credible and would have to have enough counsellors to provide sufficient program space for numerous men to participate, more men than were involved in this pilot study. Different programs for men at different levels of rehabilitation could be offered, for example, groups for men who did and those who did not have prior charges of domestic violence, and groups where mandated men are placed with voluntary participants from the community and groups composed of only mandated men. These would allow observation of how the dynamics of a group change if the men attend for different reasons and different levels of need. Programs established to meet the need of specific groups such as Aboriginal men would provide greater sensitivity to men's needs, decrease their isolation and potentially improve the success of the program. Corresponding with these suggestions, it was believed that means of dealing with language barriers and cultural issues have to be found. The Evolve program was not capable of providing services to men who did not speak English and thus, these men were turned away from the program. The use of translators or other programs equipped to deal with a variety of languages would need to be part of a more comprehensive form of alternatives program.

Those involved in the alternative program would have to be truthful and follow through on options. For example, if the men were guaranteed no criminal record, then that had to be the outcome. Some felt that every effort needed to be made to ensure the men completed the program, suggesting that a stay of proceedings only be granted after program completion, as was done in this program. It was further recommended that a letter confirming completion be sent the Crown prosecutor for effective and official signification of completion.

Learning From Experience: Focus Group With Representatives of Participating Agencies

In the focus group project supervisors from each agency and some representatives from the Evolve program talked about their original expectations for the program, why the program did not go according to expectations, and the advice they would give to other agencies who might implement a similar program or what they would do in the future if they were to implement the program themselves.

Expectations

Among the expectations was the establishment of a template for the characteristics of a credible program. Similarly, it was expected that the pilot project and its final report would be able to quantify the programs' impact on men's behaviour, their partners, and their family life. Its cost effectiveness based on being applied early in the intervention process for these men was also of interest. In addition to these, Klinic anticipated expanding its services to provide comprehensive resources to men who were involved in the legal system as well as to their families. It was believed that providing services to families would make for longer term change in the lives of the men and their families.

Primary Problems Encountered

The full intent of the project was not met and several factors were identified as having interfered with the project's implementation. Some of the problems were related to having an unrealistic plan, given the resources available. For example, Klinic wanted to serve the men and their families, but lacked the resources for this many additional program components. Similarly, the agencies were unprepared for all of the details of this type of project and underestimated the number and type of problems that would arise. Focus group respondents stated that they thought it would be easier to get men into the program that was actually the case. They did not anticipate all of the possible reasons that men would not get into the program, such as being delayed by the time it took to process their case, their recidivism during that process and their being referred to the program when they did not want to be in the program. Victim Services in particular felt overwhelmed by paperwork and consequently only sent out three pre and post program evaluations to the men's partners. It was recognized that many of these issues had been worked out by the time the pilot was ending and so a longer pilot project would have been required to work out problematic areas and fully meet the intent and expectations of the project.

A lack of communication created a host of problems. Initially Klinic was not using email and so had to rely on connecting with the other agencies by phone. At the beginning the supervising Crown prosecutor and the supervisor from Victim Services were the points of contact and because of their schedules, it was difficult to connect with them directly. These factors delayed timely assessing of men and referring them into the program. The fact that there were few meetings among the agencies involved in delivering the program exacerbated communication

problems. Further, issues around disclosure of client information and PHIA created problems with the sharing of information.

Other problems were related to a lack of knowledge about the program within the three participating agencies. The Crown believed that not involving the defense bar at the beginning of the program was a mistake as they could have identified more candidates for the program and advocated for referral to the Alternatives Program for their clients. Victim Services staff were not initially knowledgeable about program details and their role and thus they were not vested in working in coordination with the other agencies.

Finally systemic factors were identified as hindering the efficiency and effective application of the pilot project. At the beginning all referrals and the assessments of the men had to go through the supervising Crown prosecutor, as the other prosecutors did not understand the program and there was concern about confidentiality of client information. The court system created additional delays. When the Alternatives Program began, the typical court procedure was to adjourn until a later time if there were problems with the case. This meant that the referral to the program would sometimes come at the end of the trial, up to 24 months or more after the incident. The system is now such that the case has to be processed within a certain timeline and the accused is now given the opportunity to go into programming within the first 12 weeks after arrest or not at all. Further, the process of entry into the program was too rigid, as the men could only enter the program when a new group began. Problems were greatly lessened when a continuous entry process was adopted and men could enter at different times.

Why a Second Attempt Would be More Successful

The focus group participants felt that a second pilot or attempt to deliver an Alternatives Program would meet with greater success for a number of reasons that speak to the problems they encountered. First, there was greater knowledge about the program process and criteria for eligibility among the Crown prosecutors and the Victim Services staff. The defense bar are also aware of the program and its criteria and would be involved in the process of referral. Second, there would be more preparation at the beginning for example, the supervising Crown prosecutor would plan information sessions for the other prosecutors well ahead of the implementation date.

Many of the communication problems have been resolved. Victim Services and Crown prosecutors better coordinate their services through shared case files and therefore the communication is more efficient. Klinik also has more direct contact with these agencies and messages about the men in the program could be directly entered in the computer files and thus directly shared with Victim Services and the Crown prosecutors. These shared files are secured within a computer mailbox system. Further, communication now occurs with all the staff at Victim Services and all of the Crown prosecutors, not just the supervisors who were initially involved in implementing the program.

Finally, the system has changed. The work is distributed among the 17 Crown prosecutors rather than being done by only the supervising prosecutor. Now files are assigned to individual prosecutors and therefore they know the history and background of the client. Because they

would also know about the Alternatives Program they could now make referrals much earlier. In addition, the court's timelines have changed. There are now timelines for the process that must be followed, ensuring a faster processing of the men into the program. If the men take too long to decide whether or not to accept the program their opportunity is lost. Further, there is now a pre-trial coordinator making sure that all information is known by the Crown prosecutors and the defense attorneys about the case including the man's level of participation in the program. Many of these systemic changes were implemented towards the end of the pilot study.

Recommendations for Future Applications of an Alternatives Program

The focus group participants made several suggestions for future implementations of an alternatives program or another pilot of such a program. These suggestions related to issues around the stakeholders involved, the level of their involvement, planning, project management, programming, communication, and funding.

1. Stakeholder Involvement

It was suggested that project partners from a number of different community agencies would have to be involved. These agencies would have to share basic values and beliefs as well as being committed to making a difference. This type of shared perspective works to build a level of tolerance among agencies and committee members, where problems are not taken personally, but rather understood as part of the job or system. Further, these partners must all see each other as credible resources. Each must trust the judgments and perspectives of the others. Preliminary meetings and conversations with potential partners could involve discussions of shared values and beliefs and how these can be applied to working together in an efficient manner. This will not always be easy, as different agencies from different systems often have different visions of prevention and intervention and they are not connected in their work with families affected by violence.

Another part of the commitment of partnering agencies should be their attendance at meetings from the beginning to the end of the project, even if they are not directly involved in program delivery. This did not happen with this pilot project, as everyone except the agencies delivering the program dropped out. Focus group members felt that this was detrimental to the project. They believed this occurred because individuals rather than agencies were involved in the planning of the pilot project. When the agency or department commits to the project, they assign another person to the project when the original representative leaves their position. It was also believed that individuals lost interest due to frustration resulting from a lack of specificity about the project details, the slow progress of the project, and funders' lack of interest in the project. It was suggested that the right leader for the project had to be chosen and that the work had to proceed in a timely manner, with deadlines set and held. Specific descriptions of the projects and the role everyone will play would also promote continued interest. Finally, establishing funding for at least two years was perceived as contributing to the success of the project and maintaining the interest of stakeholders.

A number of stakeholders were identified as important to the success of the project. These included the Crown prosecutors and Victim Services. The necessity for a working partnership

between these two agencies was stressed. Most felt it was important to have representatives from the court operations present on the project, thus providing an opportunity for information about the program to filter through the system. Police and government department support was recommended. It was believed that it would also be important to have the Ministers involved at some level in order to keep them apprised of these types of projects and their need within the community. Involving rural areas in the project was identified as potentially beneficial. Finally, it was stated that the project needs to include practical and detail oriented people as well as idea people.

2. Planning

A significant number of recommendations were made around the issue of planning. Because there is no established strategic plan for this type of project or for diverse community agencies to work together, much time needs to be spent developing a plan of action and communication. It was suggested that all of the partnering agencies be involved in the visioning process so that the project would represent broader interests. In this project, one agency's vision was relayed to the other individuals. This may have reduced their sense of investment in the project and created misunderstandings about the intent and process of the project. Early involvement will also help partners determine each of their roles and how they will be linked in the project.

After the visioning of the project is complete and the goals and plan written out, have an objective reviewer examine the plan to find potential problems and issues that require further detail. This person would force partners to explain the project, the planned procedures and the rationale and to formulate a more specific plan of action. Such a process would circumvent the tendency for partners to make assumptions that everyone shares their understanding or perceptions.

Many of the systems that will be involved need to be established prior to beginning the project. Because Victim Services along with Crown prosecutors are necessary partners in this type of project, and because Victim Services can operate in different ways in different areas, people planning an alternatives project have to spend time at the beginning determining how Victim Services are set up and the role they will play. The contextual factors within the specific area of the program need to be considered as part of the planning process, as these will affect the relationship among participating agencies and departments and the process of their working together.

Establishing a communication system was reported as essential. Communication in this type of project is complicated and a plan must be pre-determined to ensure complete and efficient communication among all partners and among those delivering the program. Part of the communication process will be informing the staff of the agencies involved about the project. For example, information sessions should be done with lawyers and judges to make them aware of the program and its process. Although this type of information sharing is important at the beginning of project, it is also important that it continue throughout the project and that it include all stakeholders, even those not directly active in program delivery. In this way everyone will be aware of the program's progress, any problems that arise, and/or changes that are made.

3. Management

Focus group participants believed that it was essential to have a project manager. This individual would be responsible for organizing meetings, ensuring that all participating agencies and individuals are informed of the project's progress, and facilitating communication among partners. This type of organizational position would alleviate some of the workload from the agencies delivering the program.

4. Program

Because of the delays encountered in this pilot when the men had to wait to begin their programming, it was recommended that the programs to which the men are diverted, have continuous entry. This would allow men to begin their programming as soon as possible. It was also stated that the program had to be inclusive in its approach and make provisions for all men, including Aboriginal and immigrant men. This could be achieved by having a number of community programs make their men's programs available as alternatives to incarceration. Otherwise, the designated alternative community program would have to expand its services to provide translators, incorporate traditional approaches, and/or different groups for immigrant and/or Aboriginal men. It was also stated that ideally, the program would provide couples and parenting groups. Again, this would require additional resources and funding to support these resources. Pre-screening would be required before these men could join these types of non-mandated groups.

5. Need for Program

The focus group participants all felt that the original need for the an alternatives program still existed and that this need has to be addressed. There also remains the need to integrate family violence work among the different community agencies and as this pilot project did, involve agencies that would not have otherwise worked together. All expressed an interest in attempting another pilot project, now that many of the problems had been identified and solved.

Potential Program Impact: Pre and Post Program Surveys and Agency Staff Interviews

1. Changes in Attitudes and Behavior

Examination of responses to abuse scales indicated that the men reported that they rarely used physical and sexual violence in their relationships and consequently there were few reported injuries due to conflicts with partners. The reported use of reasoning and psychological abuse was more common. T-tests were employed to analyze comparisons of pre and post program surveys. Because there were only 19 men who completed the program and also completed a pre and post program survey, the results of the comparisons are tenuous. Given this caution, the results suggested that over the course of the program the men became more satisfied with themselves and their own sex roles (pre-program mean = 4.72; post-program mean = 5.36, $p < .008$). Comparisons of sex role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, sexual conservatism, acceptance of interpersonal violence, use of various conflict tactics, and psychological maltreatment of women showed no significant differences from pre to post program measures. However, the means for the post-program responses for all measures except the dominance-isolation subscale of the psychological maltreatment of women scale, were slightly lower than the pre-program responses. Table 1 below presents means and significance levels for indicators of behavioural change.

2. Changes in Use of Services

Assessments of services used by the men indicated that medical and social services were the most often used by the men. T-tests were used to compare pre and post program use of legal and social services. Although results were not significant, the mean use of medical services, legal services, and social services was slightly less after the program. Table 1 presents the means and significant levels for use of services.

Table 1: Means and Significance Levels for Behavioural and Service Use Indicators

Measure	Pre-Program Mean	Post-Program Mean	P<
Behavioural Indicators			
Satisfaction with Own Sex Role	4.72	5.36	.008
Sex Role Stereotyping	3.35	3.18	.402
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs	2.71	2.29	.198
Sexual Conservatism	2.98	2.65	.110
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence	2.32	2.24	.692
Use of Reasoning in Conflicts	4.37	4.57	.584
Use of Psychological Abuse in Conflicts	2.29	2.02	.243
Use of Physical Violence in Conflicts	.63	.41	.109
Injuries that Occurred in Conflicts	.46	.33	.413
Use of Sexual Violence in Conflicts	.25	.22	.730
Dominance-Isolation Maltreatment	.27	.29	.839
Emotional-Verbal Maltreatment	.98	.88	.546

Services Used			
Child and Family Services*	----	----	----
Medical Services	10.59	6.06	.133
Police Services	1.53	1.65	.773
Legal Services	1.94	1.41	.188
Social Services	5.18	3.71	.659

*A comparison of the use of child and family services could not be calculated because all participants either answered that they did not use this services or did not answer at all.

These results should only be taken as the potential for and not proof of behavioural improvement or change in service use, or program effectiveness. With only 19 participants, conclusive results were not possible. However, results suggest that an assessment of a larger sample might prove worthwhile, particularly for sexual conservatism, use of physical violence in relationships, and accessing of medical services, as these came near to changing significantly from pre to post program.

Witnessing Violence During Childhood

The majority of the men (68%) reported witnessing violence while growing up. This violence was primarily between their parents or their mother and her boyfriend, or their father and his girlfriend. Two of the men indicated that because they witnessed their father abusing their mother while growing up, they came to see the abuse of women as acceptable. Table 2 itemizes the type of violence the men reported witnessing while growing up.

Table 2: Type of Violence Witnessed

Type of Violence	Frequency	Percentage
Verbal insults	12	92%
Verbal threats	11	85%
Slapped	10	77%
Thrown against a wall	9	69%
Punched	6	46%
Beaten	6	46%
Choked	6	46%
Kicked	6	46%
Hit with an object	6	46%
Scratched or having hair pulled	5	39%
Grabbing and/or twisting of limbs	4	31%
Threatened with a weapon or use of a weapon	4	31%
Burned or scalded	1	8%

* Note: Percentages total to more than 100%, as many most men reported witnessing more than one type of violence.

Reactions to Having Been Arrested

The men's reactions to being arrested were compared before and after being in the program. Most of the men had more than one type of reaction both before and after programming. Most men had negative reactions to being arrested both before (17 men) and after the program (11 men). The types of negative reactions were similar and included a number of emotional reactions, the most common being embarrassment. Frustration at the waste of personal time and the time it took for the issue to be dealt with in the justice system was another common response. Other emotional reactions included fear, sadness, anger, and general upset. A significant number of men denied their responsibility, by citing a misuse of the law or the over-reaction of the police and justice system. This denial was common both before and after the program. The following are examples of the men's negative responses.

"I'm also sad that I assaulted my wife, and have cost her trust, and I'm not certain that I will get it back."

"I was mad at first because I didn't do anything and zero tolerance lost me a lawyer bill for a reason that only my spouse could tell you."

"I felt ashamed and embarrassed, but knew I needed help because this was scary and couldn't have it happen again."

"Thought it was unjust and uncalled for."

"You are guilty until proven innocent."

Before the program five men had positive reactions, while nine had positive reactions after the program. Most of these reactions however were of a similar nature. For some of the men their arrest made them realize they had a problem and that they had to deal with it. Some saw the arrest as an opportunity for change, learning, and a better understanding of self and family. Examples of the men's responses are:

"Happy that I must now deal with my anger."

"Makes me realize that I do have a problem that I need help for before it gets worse than it already is. Made me realize that I don't want to go to jail and how much I would miss my family. Makes you value freedom."

"Made me realize my anger problem, and that I need to get some help for myself."

"It was needed and now I am in better control and have a better understanding of my wife and family relationships."

Reactions to Participating in the Alternatives Program

Almost all of the men's reactions to participating in the program were positive both before and after their participation. Before the program the men felt enthusiastic and happy about being given the opportunity to change and make their life better. After the program many of the men reported that the program was generally helpful and changed their lives. Many also made specific mention of the things that had changed in their lives due to the program. For the most part, these included helping them effectively deal with anger and other problems, helping them be more open and honest, making them better listeners, and learning about themselves and their feelings. A few mentioned that they really enjoyed the program. The only negative reactions were feeling fearful, not feeling like he belonged in the group, and resentful that he felt he had no choice. Thus, it seems that although most felt that arrest was unwarranted, they did realize that they needed to change their behaviour. Below are examples of the positive responses given.

Pre-Program Reactions:

"I find it's an opportunity to learn more and better ways to deal with life's problems and to be more in tune with the people around you, and to update techniques in dealing the family problems such as raising two children."

"Very happy to be able to work with people to try to help me with my anger and to try to change the way I used to be."

"I'm very excited - I believe this is an opportunity for me to get my life in order before it gets totally out of hand."

Post-Program Reactions:

"I like what the Crown did by recommending the program because I found it to be very helpful and is way better than other programs available for men."

"It is bar none the best thing that has happened to me in many years. I wish for a multitude of reasons I would have known about Evolve many years ago."

"At first I didn't want to participate. After a few sessions and getting to know the people, I enjoyed it very much and found it to be very helpful in understanding my anger and myself more."

Program Participant Feedback

Below are examples of some of the feedback provided by the men and/or their family members to service providers.

"We have him back. He'd turned into such a bear over the past couple of years, and whatever you do down there, he's back. He laughs with us again. When she calls and yells, he's able to stay calm. Thank you." (From the mother of one of the participants).

“Everybody has noticed a difference. Not only am I different at home, but I’m not yelling at everyone at work. My boss is amazed at how I’m handling things.”

“When I came here I expected a class that I would sit through, but the way you’ve done this, made me look at myself.”

“I have a better understanding of how I’ve hurt her.”

“I get it now. I didn’t understand what she was talking about before and how I was hurting her. I get it now.”

Agency Perceptions of Program Effects

1. Satisfaction

The agencies involved in the delivery of the program were moderately satisfied with the program. Although they appreciated the attempt to have these different systems working together, the communication problems and lengthy referral process negatively affected its efficiency. The inability to determine the actual effectiveness of the program was disappointing to some. Further, there was some concern that for some of the men, the alternatives program may not have been the best solution.

2. Program Intent

There was general consensus about the intent of the program from the agencies involved in its delivery. They saw the program as an alternative to the justice system for men with first time charges of domestic violence. All believed that these men needed treatment and not just jail time for a faster resolution to the problem. The counselling program dealt with the issues underlying the violence and helped the men to better understand their behaviour and its consequences. It aimed to reinforce men for taking responsibility for their actions and control of their behaviour by diverting them from criminal conviction. It was believed that if this counselling was effective, men would be less likely to recidivate thereby helping them, their families, and preventing further violence. Many mentioned that additional goals of the program were to streamline the treatment process, reduce the workload and backlog within the Crown prosecutor offices, and to reduce court costs.

Most of the respondents from the Crown prosecutors offices and Victim Services felt that the program had met its intended goals. Victim Services only knew of one individual who re-offended and still felt there was improvement in his behaviour. The Crown prosecutors believed, from their records, that there was a very low rate of re-involvement with the criminal justice system from the men who attended the program and that recidivism tended to occur when men were waiting for their program to begin. Evolve staff felt that goal of treatment was met and that the program reduced the time and cost resources for the justice system. However, the goal of streamlining the process was not met. Other areas where the program was perceived as failing to meet its intent was that not enough men were allowed to access the program and that it often took

a long time for them to be admitted into the program, as noted by Victim Services. The Crown prosecutors reported that some form of follow-up would have been needed to determine if the program had indeed met its intent to change men's behaviour, improve their relationships, and keep them out of the criminal justice system.

3. Potential Program Benefits

Respondents from the three agencies delivering the program were asked what the beneficial impacts of the program was and/or would be if all of the problems were adequately addressed. The benefits to the men, their partners, their children, the community, and the justice system were specifically requested. A number of responses were given for each of these.

a. Benefits to the Men

Among the benefits to men was that they would get into programming much sooner than if they had to go through the criminal justice system. Further, they would avoid getting a criminal record which could interfere with their building a healthier and more productive life. For example, a criminal record can lead to problems gaining employment and cause other social stigma. The program itself was intensive and worked to help the men understand the underlying issues of domestic violence, their violent and abusive actions, and the consequences of those actions. They also learned to deal with their problems in more realistic and proactive ways that led to resolution rather than exacerbation and perpetuation of problems. The knowledge and skills obtained through the program would help them develop respect for their partners and an understanding of the components of healthy relationships. Through the program the men gained a larger support system that they could access even after they had completed the program. Successful completion of the program would rehabilitate the men and help them reintegrate into their families and society by making them better partners, parents and more productive members of society.

b. Benefits to Men's Partners

The program provided women with an additional resource to help reduce their isolation and build their self-esteem. They were given information that would help them recognize situations of escalating violence and develop a protections plan. Further, it gave women who were not willing to testify or who wanted help for their partner a viable alternative to involvement in the justice system. This may have lead to an increase in their satisfaction with the justice system. In addition, if the program was successful the men's partners would be less at risk of harm and thus their fears would be lessened.

c. Benefits to Men's Children

The benefits to the men's children would primarily come from being better parented. The men would have more realistic expectations of their children, more effective communication with them, be better role models and have healthier relationships with their children. Children would become safer and more families would remain intact, limiting the amount of disruption for children. These positive effects would lead to others such as increasing children's capacity for

education, social relationships, coping with conflict, and thus increasing their likelihood of leading a successful life. It was also suggested that this type of program would eventually lead to programming resources that would help children talk about the abuse, identify patterns of abuse and develop a protection plan.

d. Benefits to the Community

For the community, the program presents a means of addressing a social problem by reducing the incidence of domestic violence. It has the potential to educate the community as to the seriousness of this social problem and the need to work together to eliminate it. The program's closing the gap between the legal and social services demonstrates the benefits of community agency cooperation to address these types of social problems. The men that are assisted by the program to become less violent could become mentors and role models to other men in society. They would be more likely to remain or become productive members of society as they would not be impeded from obtaining employment due to having a criminal record. By reducing men's violence, the program would minimize the drain on community resources such as the child welfare system and women's shelters.

e. Benefits to the Justice System

It was believed that the justice system benefited from the program by having cases dealt with more efficiently and effectively. Respondents from the Crown prosecutors offices stated that it reduced the backlog within the system, the Crown prosecutors' workload, and future court costs by reducing recidivism rates. The program also gives Crown prosecutors an option when there is little chance of conviction because the victims will not testify. This option works to make the men take responsibility for their actions and provides a more positive and suitable outcome for some men than jail. They get treatment, support, and learn more effective behaviours rather than just punishment. Crown prosecutors felt more comfortable issuing a stay of proceedings knowing the men were getting quality counselling.

Victim Services also claim benefits. They believed that it gave clients more faith in treatment and a greater sense of support. The women were relieved to know that their partners would not have criminal records. It allowed for better protection and safety planning and the Victim Services staff felt it gave them a better relationship with their clients. Among the positive benefits for Victim Services was the partnership they formed with other community agencies to make more extensive and inclusive solutions to domestic violence.

Conclusions

Meeting Project Objectives

Although not all, many of the project objectives were achieved. The objectives of the project and how they have been addressed are presented below.

1. Reduce recidivism for domestic abuse cases and reduce the backlog of cases reappearing in the family violence court.

The rate of recidivism was not assessed, however, the Crown prosecutors believed, from their records, that there was a very low rate of re-involvement with the criminal justice system from the men who attended the Alternatives Program, and recidivism tended to occur when men were waiting for their program to begin. Victim Services only knew of one individual who re-offended and still felt that there was improvement in his behaviour. Although not proved, it was believed that the program may have also minimized the time and cost spent in the criminal justice system on domestic abuse cases. Specific tracking of re-involvement in the justice system for the men would have been required to fully meet this objective. Follow-up assessments would have greatly helped in the evaluation of recidivism rates.

2. Offer therapeutic intervention to men who had been charged with domestic abuse and had no previous convictions.

One of the criteria for inclusion in the Alternatives Program was that the men had no prior convictions for domestic violence or other violent offenses. Originally, the criteria stipulated that the men had to have no previous charges of any kind, but this was bringing too few men into the program. Thus the criteria were reviewed and adjusted to make the program available to men who had no previous convictions but who may have had previous charges. The men were provided with a therapeutic long term treatment through the Alternatives Program. This program dealt with the issues underlying the men's violence and helped them to understand their behaviour and its consequences. The men learned to deal with problems in realistic ways, to develop respect for their partner, and to identify the characteristics of healthy and unhealthy relationships. They also gained a larger social support system. After completing the Stage One Group as part of their mandated treatment, the men had the option of accessing other services such as the Stage Two Group, the parenting group, or the couples group.

3. Reduce the risk of violence to the partners and families of men who had been charged with domestic abuse.

Researchers in men's programming have suggested that longer term and more intensive programs, as is the case with the Evolve program, may affect more immediate and long lasting reductions in violence (Gondolf, 2002), and thus lessen or eliminate the risk of violence to their partners or families. The program offered a positive opportunity for behavioural change for men where there was little chance of victims testifying and thus little chance of conviction.

4. Provide the partners and children of men who had been charged with domestic violence with the opportunity for service.

The men's partners were given the opportunity to talk with a counsellor from Evolve or to be referred to counselling at another agency of their choice. They were given information that

would help them recognize situations of escalating violence and to develop a protection plan. They were also informed about the program and their partner's attendance. The agencies involved in delivering the program believed that it increased awareness of family violence issues in the community and of services for victims and offenders. Thus, it may have encouraged other women to seek services related to family violence.

5. Evaluate the success of the project in increasing knowledge about domestic abuse and its prevention, changing attitudes that were supportive of violence, and reduce violent behaviour in offenders.

This objective coincides with the Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group Reviewing Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation's (2003) recommendation that alternative measures have ongoing evaluations. The initial plan was to have an outcome evaluation of the pilot project of the Alternatives Program. However, due to the difficulty in obtaining a control group, a sufficiently large sample of men who went through the program who also completed both pre and post program assessments, and a reliable indication of recidivism, an outcome evaluation was not possible. The evaluation that was completed and is represented in this report is a process evaluation and provides information on the issues faced in delivering this type of program and the resolution of potential problems. However, the need for an outcome evaluation along with follow-ups on recidivism for a future pilot of the program and the need for ongoing evaluation of a fully implemented program is recognized by all of the agencies involved. Outcome evaluations would meet the goal of adding to the literature on effective intervention programs and provide evidence to support the implementation of a full alternatives program.

6. Form cooperative partnerships among service providers working with violent men and their families.

The agencies delivering the program formed a solid partnership, worked together cooperatively and supported each other. They believed that a willingness to take a teamwork approach was essential to developing and delivering an alternatives program. This required a respect and understanding of other agencies' perspectives, agendas, workload and processes. They reported that working in these types of partnerships provided an opportunity for learning how other agencies function and increased their communication with other social systems. However, the other individuals originally involved in the project eventually left. Project supervisors felt that this occurred because the individuals rather than the agencies were involved in the program, and when they left their positions or lost interest, the agencies did not send replacement representatives.

Some researchers have stated that treatment is most effective when offered through a coordinated community response (MacRae, 2003; Marshall, 2001), and that coordination must occur at all levels and must be supported by the senior management of each participating agency (Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group, 2003; Marshall, 2001). This need was also identified by the representatives of the agencies involved in the Alternatives Program. They felt that an advisory committee made up of a number of community agencies with a vested interest in this type of program should be part of the next piloting of this type of project or the full implementation of an alternatives program. Further, they strongly recommended that the agencies become involved, rather than just individuals, as this would ensure that if agency representatives left their position, they would be replaced on the advisory committee.

7. Work towards establishing some standards for providing services to men charged and/or convicted with a domestic violence offence.

Currently there are no standards in Manitoba as to what is considered an appropriate referral or service to men who have been charged or convicted. The process evaluation of this project has provided guidelines that others can follow for another pilot or a full implementation of an alternatives measures program. These guidelines were derived from the recommendations of the people involved in the delivery of program and include: the need for rapid processing of the men through the courts and into the program; the need to involve community stakeholders throughout the program; the need to take a team approach; the need for an efficient system of communication among participating agencies; and the need to evaluate program outcomes. A second piloting of the program would help to more firmly establish these and other guidelines for referral or service to men who have been charged or convicted.

Meeting Recommended Criteria for Alternative Measures

In 2003 the Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group Reviewing Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation made recommendations regarding alternative justice measures in the case of partner abuse. The conditions within which the Working Group felt that alternative measures would be acceptable were nearly all met by the Alternative Program. These conditions were and how they were addressed are outlined below.:

1. The alternative justice measure be made available for low risk cases (as determined by validated risk assessment instruments) after charges were laid and be approved by the Crown and by the Attorney General.

Although a risk assessment instrument was not used, the Alternatives Program was made available to men with no prior convictions for violence, who did not use weapons during the commission of the offence, who did not have other outstanding criminal charges, and where there was no serious physical injury sustained by the victim. These and other criteria for admissions were approved by the Crown prosecutors and Victim Services. As a pilot project, formal approval from the Attorney General was not sought. If the program were ever to be officially implemented, official approval by all of the systems involved would be obtained.

2. The alternative measure offers the same or increased safety for the victim as the traditional criminal justice process, and that the victim be informed of the alternative measure and that her wishes be considered.

Through the involvement of Victim Services the victims were all informed about the Alternatives Program option and their wishes concerning their partner's participation were considered in Victim Services recommendation of the men to the program. Victims were given information that would help them recognize situations of escalating violence and develop a protection plan. The program made them aware of the community services available to them. Further, it gave women who were not willing to testify or who wanted help for their partner a viable alternative to involvement in the justice system. When women are not willing to testify, there is little chance of conviction, therefore in these cases, rather than receiving nothing, the men obtained long term, intensive treatment. Long term treatment would have a greater

likelihood of reducing violent behaviour in men (Gondolf, 2002) and thus would increase the safety of these women.

3. The offender takes responsibility for his behaviour.

It has been suggested that mandated programs may lead the accused to more readily accept responsibility for his violence (MacRae, 2003). One of the criteria for inclusion in the program was that the man had to have a desire to change his behaviour and be willing to attend and participate in group counselling, both of which suggest a degree of acceptance of responsibility for his behaviour. However, respondents from all three agencies felt that it took a long time to get men to accept responsibility for their actions because in their fear of conviction, they did not want to be seen as admitting their guilt. This was reflected in some of the men's responses to being arrested. It was suggested that this may have occurred because of the time between the man's being charged, his evaluation, referral, and then beginning the program and indeed some men were frustrated at the length of this process. The eventual streamlining of this process towards the end of the pilot would likely have addressed this issue. There was also concern that the men were admitting responsibility solely to get into the program and avoid conviction. Further, some service providers worried that some of the men did not understand the point of the Alternatives Program and this exacerbated their reluctance to see their abuse and violence as wrong. On the other hand, several of the men's response to arrest reflected a recognition of their responsibility, most of their responses to being in the program were positive, and their reactions to being given this opportunity were indicative of remorse for their behaviour and an identified need for change. Thus, even if the reaction to arrest was not always in line with taking responsibility for behaviour, the reaction to being in the program was commensurate with acceptance of responsibility.

4. The alternative measure maintains formal records of actions and is provided in a timely manner.

The agencies delivering the Alternatives Program all kept records of program participants. However, the communication of information about the men, their eligibility for the program, the referral process, and entry into the program were not always done in a timely manner. Primarily it was the lack of coordinated communication and the initial set times for entry into the program that cause the majority of the delays. Although the original court system timelines that could delay processing for up to two years, and that only one prosecutor was making referrals at first, also created delays in getting men into programming. All of these problems were resolved by the end of the pilot and consequently the men were being referred and getting into the program in a timely manner.

5. The alternative measure is delivered and supervised by trained and qualified individuals.

All of the staff from each of the three agencies involved in the delivery were trained and qualified for the positions they held in their respective agencies. However, it was felt by some that training in the delivery of the Alternatives Program, or at least more information about the program, would have been required for a more efficient delivery right from the beginning.

6. The possibility of criminal conviction remains if the process fails.

In this program, if the men did not take the Alternatives Program option or failed to complete the program, their charges would be reinstated and they did face the possibility of criminal conviction.

The social demand that the criminal justice system find alternative ways of dealing with domestic violence, and bridge the gap between legal and social services, (Ad Hoc Working Group on Spousal Abuse Policies and Legislation, 2003) were addressed through the Alternatives Program. The agencies worked cooperatively together to conduct this pilot with little guidance and they learned a great deal from their experience. Based on this experience they were ready to implement a second piloting of the program. Their willingness to apply what they learned in a second pilot and to see the process as developmental in nature, speaks to their commitment to adding this type of program to their repertoire of services. It also places them in a position of leadership in producing quality and innovative programming. Because of their experience and characteristics, these agencies are in the best position to implement a second pilot and it is recommended that they do so with the intent of establishing a plan and means of eventually introducing the Alternatives Program as a permanent part of the services they provide to the Winnipeg community.

References

- Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group (2003). *Spousal abuse policies and legislation*. Ottawa, ON: Government Canada.
- Babcock, L., Greene, C. & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytical review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23 (8), 1023-1053.
- Babcock, J.C. & Steiner, R. (1999). The relationship between treatment, incarceration, and recidivism of battering: A program evaluation of Seattle's coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 13 (1), 46-59.
- Buzawa, E.S. & Buzawa, C.G. (1993). The scientific evidence is not conclusive: Arrest is no panacea. In R.J. Gelles & B.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*, (pp. 237-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Davis, R. & Taylor, B. (1999). Does batterer treatment reduce violence? A synthesis of the literature. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 10, 69-93.
- Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P., Cavanagh, K. & Lewis, R. (2000). *Changing violent men*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dutton, D.G. & McGregor, B. M. S. (1991). The symbiosis of arrest and treatment for wife assault: The case for combined intervention. In M. Steinman (Ed.), *Woman battering: Policy responses*, (pp. 131-154). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Gamache, D.J., Edleson, J.L. & Schock, M.D. (1988). Coordinated police, judicial, and social service response to woman battering: A multiple-baseline evaluation across three communities. In G.R. Hotaling et.al. (Eds.), *Coping with family violence*, (pp. 193-209). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gondolf, E. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems: Issues, outcomes, and recommendations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gwinn, C.G. & O'Dell, A. (1993). Stopping the violence: The role of the police officer and the prosecutor. *Western State University Law Review*, 20, 297-317.
- MacRae, J. (2003). *Relationship violence and diversion: A literature review on pro-charge policies and Crown discretion*. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Institute Against Family Violence.
- Marshall, C. (2001). *Nova Scotia family violence framework for action review: Interjurisdictional comparison and literature review*. Halifax, NS: Nova Scotia Department of Justice.
- Moyer, S. (2000). *Alternatives to prosecution in domestic violence cases: An overview of the research literature*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Justice.
- Rondeau, G., Brodeur, N., Brochu, S. & Lemire, G. (2001). Dropout and completion of treatment among spouse abusers. *Violence and Victims*, 16(2), 127-142.
- Russell, M. (2001). *Measures of empowerment for women who are victims of violence and use the justice system*. Unpublished report prepared for the Victim Services Division, BC Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General.
- Russell, M. (2002). *Pro-arrest, vigorous prosecution and coordinated functioning: Three elements of an effective criminal justice system response to violence against women, an annotated bibliography*. Unpublished report prepared for the Victim Services Division, BC Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General.

Steinman, M. (1991). Coordinated criminal justice intervention and recidivism among batterers.
In M. Steinman (Ed.), *Woman battering: Policy responses*, (pp.221-236). Cincinnati,
OH: Anderson.

Ursel, E.J. & Gorkoff, K. (1996). *The impact of Manitoba corrections short term intervention program on recidivism rates*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba.

Appendix A: Evolve Confidentiality Policy

CONFIDENTIALITY EVOLVE MEN'S SERVICES

We take your right to privacy seriously. Evolve endeavours to work cooperatively with any helper you might have in order to support your efforts at change. We will not share other personal information about you or your partner unless you give us specific permission to do so. We cannot offer any opinion on how your involvement in the program might change your behaviour now or in the future. No one will be given your name or any information about you without your written permission, except when there is reason to believe that there is a risk to you or another person's safety. The Court can subpoena Klinik records and counselors.

CHILD ABUSE

Like everyone, we are required by law to report child abuse or neglect. If we believe that a child is in need of protection we will ask child and Family Services for help in protecting the child. We will attempt to give you the opportunity to call Child and Family Service first yourself if you need help with stopping child abuse.

PARTNERS

Partners will be given the opportunity to talk to us and to attend our program or receive other suitable services. We will encourage them to call us if they continue to be abused or are afraid. We attempt to maintain regular contact with partners while you receive services at Klinik. We will tell your partner whether you attend the program, but what you say here is confidential. What your partner says to us is also confidential.

EVALUATION

You and your partner may be contacted during the program or in the future to help evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Results of research and evaluation will describe the group or program as a whole. Reports will never identify the names or opinions of individuals.

I understand and accept this confidentiality policy.

Client's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Counsellor's Signature: _____ Date: _____

March 2002

Appendix B: Consent Forms

Consent Form for Program Participants

Research Project Title: Alternatives for First Time Family Violence Offenders: Evaluation Project

Researchers: Jocelyn Proulx (ph:474-7410)

Approved by: The University of Manitoba Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board

Complaints: Jane Ursel, Director of RESOLVE (ph:474-8979) or Human Ethics

Secretariat (ph: 474-7122)

We are requesting your help in mapping out the process of the alternatives program, to determine the extent of the work involved in such a program, and to provide suggestions for others who may be planning to establish a similar program. These interviews are being conducted by RESOLVE Manitoba in conjunction with Evolve. If you have any questions about the interviews and the report that will be produced from these interviews and the data collected from the program participants you can contact Dr. J. Proulx at 474-7410. You can also contact Tim Wall at Evolve 784-4061. The research has been approved by the Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board at the University of Manitoba. Complaints about the research can be reported to the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122 or to the Director of RESOLVE, Jane Ursel at 474-8979 who will direct you to the appropriate Research Ethics Board. You may keep a copy of this consent form for your records.

Participation involves taking part in a 1 hour interview with a researcher from RESOLVE. In this interview you will be asked questions about your role on the project, the impact your involvement had on your job and for the agency at which you work, the impact of the program itself on individuals and on the community and your experiences in delivering the program. Your participation is voluntary so you may stop at anytime or choose not to answer certain questions. We will not be asking any personal questions.

All of the responses will be considered as general comments and no specific person will be identified with specific statements. All information will be kept confidential. Only the interviewer and Dr. Proulx from RESOLVE will ever have access to your responses. Neither other individuals involved in this alternatives program or any staff at EVOLVE will have access to information you provide. However, since there are only a few individuals from your agency being interviewed and your agency had a specific role to play in the program, there is the possibility that, even using averaged results from all respondents for the report, others involved in the project may be able to reason out or guess at your responses. If you feel any concern over this possibility please feel free not to participate in this interview.

The completed interviews will be kept in a locked cabinet at the RESOLVE office. After the interviews and the analysis of the pre and post program assessments have been completed, the information will be summarized in a report. No individual respondent will be identified in this report. You will be sent a copy of this report at your work address. If you prefer an alternate address be used, please provide it below.

If anything is not clear please ask the interviewer to explain further. We thank you for your participation in this evaluation. If you agree to participate in the interview place your name and signature in the appropriate spaces below.

I _____ (print name) understand what the study is about and what is involved in participation. The signature below indicates that I consent to participate in this interview.

(signature)

(date)

Alternate address:

Consent Form for Interviews with Agency Staff

Project Title: Alternatives for First Time Family Violence Offenders: Evaluation Project
Researchers: Jocelyn Proulx (ph:474-7410)
Approved by: The University of Manitoba Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board
Complaints: Jane Ursel, Director of RESOLVE (ph:474-8979) or Human Ethics Secretariat (ph: 474-7122)

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you to keep, is part of the informed consent process. It provides a basic idea of the purpose of the research and what participation entails. Please feel free to ask the interviewer for more detail. Please take the time to read this form and understand the information before you sign.

The purpose of this research is to map the process of the alternatives program, to determine the extent of the work involved in such a program, and to provide suggestions for others who may be planning to establish a similar program. Participation involves taking part in a 1 hour interview with a researcher from RESOLVE. In this interview you will be asked questions about your role on the project, the impact your involvement had on your job and for the agency at which you work, the impact of the program itself on individuals and on the community and your experiences in delivering the program. Your participation is voluntary and there will be no negative repercussions if you decide not to participate. You may stop at anytime or choose not to answer certain questions. We will not be asking any personal questions.

All of the responses will be considered as general comments and no specific person will be identified with specific statements. All information will be kept confidential. Only the interviewer and Dr. Proulx from RESOLVE will ever have access to your responses. Neither other individuals involved in this alternatives program or any staff at EVOLVE will have access to information you provide. However, since there are only a few individuals from your agency being interviewed and your agency had a specific role to play in the program, there is the possibility that, even using averaged results from all respondents for the report, others involved in the project may be able to reason out or guess at your responses. If you feel any concern over this possibility please feel free not to participate in this interview.

The completed interviews will be kept in a locked cabinet at the RESOLVE office and will be destroyed (shredded and burned) by November 2005. A report that describes the results of this study will be produced by September 2005. No individual respondent will be identified in this report. In the space provided below please indicate the method and means that you would prefer to receive this report (mail, email; provide address).

If anything is not clear please ask the interviewer to explain further. We thank you for your participation in this evaluation. If you agree to participate in the interview place your name and signature in the appropriate spaces below.

I _____ (print name) understand what the study is about and what is involved in participation. The signature below indicates that I consent to participate in this interview.

(signature)

(date)

(interviewer)

Alternate address:

Appendix C: Pre and Post Program Survey

**Alternatives Program
Pre and Post Program Questions**

Note to Participants:

There are six separate sets of questions. Please fill these out as honestly as possible. Be assured that your name will not appear on this form and that no one other than the people from University of Manitoba who will combining and summarizing the information will have access to your responses.

Please read all instructions carefully. If you have any questions you may ask the person administering this form.

Form # 1

For this first set of questions please indicate how satisfied you are with each of the following activities/behaviors.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
extremely dissatisfied						extremely satisfied	
1. Your sympathy and understanding of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Your competence and skillfulness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The amount of socializing you do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The amount of money you earn.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Your independence and ability to make decisions by yourself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Your participation in sports and athletic activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Your ability to express your emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Your initiative or “get-up-and-go”.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Your dependability in times of crisis.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Your attractiveness to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements by circling the appropriate number

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree						Strongly agree

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. It is acceptable for the woman to pay for the date. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. A woman should be a virgin when she marries. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. There is something wrong with a woman who does not want to marry and raise a family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. A wife should never contradict her husband in public. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. It is better for a woman to use her feminine charm to get what she wants rather than ask for it outright. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. It looks worse for a woman to be drunk than for a man to be drunk. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. There is nothing wrong with a woman going to a bar alone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just Can't satisfy them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start or he'll end up henpecked. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. Women are usually sweet until they've caught a man, but then they let their true self show. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can't perform well sexually. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. Men are out for only one thing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	strongly disagree					Strongly agree	
18. A lot of women seem to get pleasure in putting men down.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. A woman who initiates a sexual encounter will probably have sex with anybody.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. A woman shouldn't give in sexually to a man too easily or he'll think she's loose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Men have a biologically stronger sex drive than women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. A nice woman will be offended or embarrassed by dirty jokes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Masturbation is a normal sexual activity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. People should not have oral sex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. The primary goal of sexual intercourse should be to have children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Women have the same needs for a sexual outlet as men.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. People today should not use "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a rule for living.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Many times a woman will pretend she doesn't want to have intercourse because she doesn't want to seem loose, but she's really hoping the man will force her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. A man is never justified in hitting his wife.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Form # 2

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times you did each of these things in the past year. If you did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle "7".

How often did this happen?

0 = this never happened

4 = 6 - 10 times in the past year

1 = once in the past year

5 = 11 - 20 times in the past year

2 = twice in the past year

6 = more than 20 times in the past year

3 = 3-5 times in the past year

7 = not in the past year, but it did happen before

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. I insulted or swore at my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. I threw something at my partner that could hurt. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. I twisted my partner's arm or hair. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. I made my partner have sex without a condom. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. I pushed or shoved my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. I used a knife or gun on my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. I called my partner fat or ugly. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

How often did this happen?

0 = this never happened

1 = once in the past year

2 = twice in the past year

3 = 3-5 times in the past year

4 = 6 - 10 times in the past year

5 = 11 - 20 times in the past year

6 = more than 20 times in the past year

7 = not in the past year, but it did happen before

14. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I destroyed something belonging to my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I choked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I shouted or yelled at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I slammed my partner against a wall.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I said I was sure we could work out a problem.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I beat up my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I grabbed my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I slapped my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I burned or scalded by partner on purpose.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I did something to spite my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How often did this happen?

0 = this never happened

1 = once in the past year

2 = twice in the past year

3 = 3-5 times in the past year

4 = 6 - 10 times in the past year

5 = 11 - 20 times in the past year

6 = more than 20 times in the past year

7 = not in the past year, but it did happen before

35. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. I kicked my partner. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. I used threats to make my partner have sex. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Form # 3

For each of the following statements please indicate how frequently you did this to your partner during the last year by circling the appropriate number.

0	1	2	3	4	5
not applicable	never	rarely	occasionally	frequently	very frequently

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I put down my partner's physical appearance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I insulted my partner or shamed her in front of others. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I treated my partner like she was stupid. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I was insensitive to my partner's feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I told my partner she couldn't manage or take care of herself without me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I put down my partner's care of the children. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I criticized the way my partner took care of the house. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I said something to spite my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I brought up something from the past to hurt my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I called my partner names. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I swore at my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I yelled and screamed at my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I treated my partner like an inferior. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I sulked or refused to talk about a problem. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I stomped out of the house or yard during a disagreement. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I gave my partner the silent treatment or acted as if she wasn't there. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I withheld affection from my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I did not talk to my partner about my feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I was insensitive to my partner's sexual needs and desires. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. I demanded obedience to my whims. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I became upset if the house work was not done when I thought it should be. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

0	1	2	3	4	5
not applicable	never	rarely	occasionally	frequently	very frequently

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. I acted like my partner was my personal servant. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. I did not do a fair share of household tasks. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. I did not do a fair share of child care. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. I ordered my partner around. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. I monitored my partner's time and made her account for where she was. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. I was stingy in giving my partner money. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. I acted irresponsibly with our financial resources. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. I did not contribute enough to supporting our family. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. I used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to my partner about it. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. I kept my partner from getting the medical care she needed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. I was jealous or suspicious of my partner's friends. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. I was jealous of my partner's male friends. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. I did not want my partner to go to school or other self-improvement activities. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. I did not want my partner to socialize with her female friends. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. I accused my partner of having an affair with another man/woman. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. I demanded that my partner stay home and take care of the children. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. I tried to keep my partner from seeing or talking to her family. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. I interfered with my partner's relationships with other family members. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. I tried to keep my partner from doing things to help herself. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 41. I restricted my partner's use of the car. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 42. I restricted my partner's use of the telephone. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43. I did not allow my partner to go out of the house when she wanted to go. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

0	1	2	3	4	5
not applicable	never	rarely	occasionally	frequently	very frequently

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44. I refused to let my partner work outside the home. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45. I told my partner her feelings were irrational or crazy. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46. I blamed my partner for my problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 47. I tried to turn our family, friends, and/or children against my partner. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48. I blamed my partner for causing my violent behavior | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. I tried to make my partner feel like she was crazy. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. My moods changed radically, from very calm to very angry or vice versa. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. I blamed my partner when I was upset about something, even when it had nothing to do with her. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. I tried to convince my partner's friends, family, or children that she was crazy. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53. I threatened to hurt myself if my partner left me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54. I threatened to hurt myself if my partner didn't do what I wanted her to do. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55. I threatened to have an affair with someone else. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56. I threatened to leave the relationship. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57. I threatened to take the children away from my partner | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 58. I threatened to have my partner committed to a mental institution. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Form # 4

Please indicate how many times you or your family have used the following services within the past year. If you are not sure please estimate as closely as possible.

- 1. Child and Family Services _____
- 2. Medical Services
 - Hospital _____
 - Emergency _____
 - Family Physician _____
 - Walk in Clinic _____
 - Other _____
- 3. Police Services _____
- 4. Legal Services
 - Legal aid _____
 - Lawyer (fee for service) _____
- 5. Social Services
 - Crisis Line _____
 - Self Help/Support Group _____
 - Community Mental Health Worker _____
 - Addictions Services _____
 - Counselling Services (specify)

Form # 5

1. a. While you were growing up did you observe physical violence between your parents, a parent and their partner, or other guardians in the home you grew up in?

Yes _____ No _____

b. If yes, please indicate which of the following you observed. (check all that apply).

_____ someone being verbally put down, belittled or berated

_____ someone being verbally threatened

_____ someone being slapped

_____ someone being punched

_____ someone being beaten

_____ someone being choked

_____ someone being kicked

_____ someone being hit with an object

_____ someone being burned or scalded

_____ someone being thrown against a wall

_____ someone being scratched and/or having their hair pulled

_____ grabbing and/or twisting of someone's limbs

_____ someone being threatened with a weapon or having a weapon used on them

c. If yes, please explain who was being violent (violence between parents, between mother and her boyfriend, between father and his girlfriend etc.)
