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1. Introduction

1.1 Child to parent violence and abuse

The Responding to Child to Parent Violence (RCPV) study describes children’s violence and abuse to parents (CPVA) as “the most hidden, misunderstood and stigmatised form of family violence. It involves teenage and younger girls and boys who use physical, psychological, emotional and financial abuse over time to the extent that parents/carers live in fear of their child” (RCPV Executive Summary 2015). It is an issue about which little was known in the UK until the last five years.

Piecing together case material, local statistics and knowledge from empirical research (Condry and Miles 2013, Wilcox, Pooley et al. 2015) indicates that CPVA is more widespread than previously thought. Although even now we have a limited picture of prevalence in England. Condry and Miles (2013) found nearly 2,000 incidents of violence by adolescents within the home reported to the London Metropolitan police in one year. Wilcox, Pooley et al. (2015) found that almost all practitioner participant in the RCPV project (n = 320) had encountered CPVA in their case-loads at varying levels. Kennair and Mellor’s review of the international literature (2007) suggests that around 10% of families with adolescents will experience abuse from their children; Gallagher (2008) in Australia estimates a figure of 3% for a significant degree of violence. While the majority of abuse is towards mothers, both young girls (around a third) and boys (around two thirds) are involved with a peak age of 13-15 years (Family Lives 2011). In case studies from the Daphne European funded RCPV programme, children as young as 8 years old were found to be using violent behaviour in the home.

Many parents state that the abuse they suffer feels very similar to intimate partner violence, but support agencies may be unfamiliar with the issues or are not set up to meet the very specific needs of this group of parents and young people (Wilcox and Pooley 2015). Parents may genuinely feel at risk for their lives but have few options available to them as they may have other children to care for, or maintain legal responsibility for the abusive child. Children find it difficult to talk about domestic violence and to seek help from adults (Gadd et al. 2012) and this may well apply in relation to their own violence.

As with domestic violence and abuse, at worst, the outcome of CPVA can be the murder of a mother/father or the suicide of a child. This year on 17 November a 16-year-old boy was charged with murder and remained in custody after his mother’s body was found in Blyth, Northumberland1. In 2012 Daniel Bartlam was 14 when he beat his mother to death and burned her body; he was sentenced to a minimum of 16 years2. At the Standing Together Conference in 2014 a DCI tweeted that 1/3rd of domestic homicides in London are adult sons killing mothers3. On 3 May this year it was reported that a teenager in London killed himself after his mother disconnected his PlayStation4.

---

2 http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/apr/02/teenager-daniel-bartlam-jailed-murder.
3 It has not yet been possible to verify this statistic and so it should be treated with caution.
4 http://metro.co.uk/2015/05/03/teenager-killed-himself-after-his-mother-disconnected-his-playstation-5178915/#ixzz3sPPcReF4
As already stated, these cases illustrate the worst case scenario but equally they highlight the degree of seriousness with which CPVA needs to be tackled. In view of this it was worrying that practitioners participating in the RCPV study felt they were lacking in knowledge and were under-skilled, as they had not received specialised training on CPVA (Wilcox and Pooley 2015).

1.2 The project rationale

As awareness of CPVA has developed, so have bespoke services specialising in responding to this issue, but these are relatively few in number and scattered around the country (see Appendix D), sometimes only catering for small numbers and not always well publicised. Family Lives research (2011) found that 56% of callers to their helpline regarding children’s aggression had never previously sought help, 35% because they did not know where to go. Parents who do seek help may find there is no specialised service in their area to which they can apply, and while practitioners may have some awareness of the issues, they themselves are often unaware of the help that is available. For older children wanting to access help to stop their behaviour they may encounter a similar situation, as safeguarding often deals with children as victims rather than instigators of violence.

Campaigners and specialists, including those working on the RCPV project, started to receive regular requests for advice and signposting from both parents and practitioners at a growing rate, and in mid 2013 a number of individuals separately mooted the idea of mapping CPVA provision around the country for parents experiencing violence and abuse from their children. A number of benefits were identified as deriving from such an exercise:

- Facilitating access to help for parents
- Facilitating access for young people in the older age group
- Offering avenues of referral for practitioners
- The acquisition of data for research and evaluation
- Providing information for commissioners and funders
- Identifying geographical gaps in provision for planning purposes

1.3 Project Beginnings

In January 2014 a small working group, comprising Paula Wilcox (University of Brighton), Michelle Pooley (Brighton and Hove City Council), and Helen Bonnick (Holes in the Wall), began meeting to investigate the possibility of taking this forward under the auspices of the Daphne III funded RCPV Project - Next Steps process. A software package developed by the School of Economic and Community Engagement at Brighton University, called Community21⁵ (which encourages citizen participation and has been piloted for use with neighbourhood planning) was identified for the purpose and a small amount of funding was secured to purchase it.

In March 2014 the group was widened to include other parties with an interest in services for families affected by children’s violence to parents. By December 2014 a Steering Group, including representatives from AVA (Jo Sharpen), Respect (Julia Worms) and the Youth Justice Board (Dunston Patterson) as well as Paula Wilcox, Michelle Pooley and Helen Bonnick, was established, and had met on a number of occasions, agreeing to proceed with the project once funding was secured.

1.4 Project Aims

The overall aim of the pilot project was to meet a perceived need across England and Wales, i.e. a lack of professional knowledge of CPVA in general and of specialised services in particular.

The objectives were to:

1. Map the geographical location of existing CPVA services across England and Wales
2. Assess the practicality, opportunities and difficulties of capturing data from a range of services for this particular community of interest
3. Assess the usefulness of so doing amongst practitioners and policy makers

In the longer term if the pilot project succeeded it was envisaged that future work would assess the usefulness of such a mapping service for wider public use.

2. Methodology

2.1 Methods

As this was a pilot project, and the resources available to the project steering group were limited, it was decided that a survey method of services available would be the most effective approach. The first task therefore was to develop a questionnaire to capture data on each service.

A number of concerns were identified as needing special attention, particularly around quality assurance and sustainability. It was determined that inclusion in the map should not be taken to indicate a specific endorsement of that service. The template (attached, see Appendix A) was devised for the gathering of data, to facilitate later research use.

Sections included on the template captured:

- Information about the delivery agency: contact details and affiliation
- Information about the programme: criteria including age and catchment area, venue, model and style of work
- Suitability and risk assessment process
- Availability of output, evaluation and costing data.

All known agencies were to be contacted over a 6 month period by email, informed about the project and invited to complete the template. Further contacts would be made through a variety of means including by phone and the process repeated.

2.2 Funding

In May 2015 the funding was secured to pay for 100 hours of work at £15/hour, to be spread over 6 months, in order to develop the on-line mapping site and explore the feasibility of maintaining it as a permanent resource. This time scale was chosen to allow for a better response, while ensuring that information remained relevant. It was anticipated that this work would involve a large amount of email and telephone contact, starting with known contacts and building a network through snowballing and cold calling. The project worker was chosen because of her extensive network of contacts in the field, developed over a number of years.

Set up costs of £550 (for purchase of the software and initial support) were met through donations from Community21 and Toucan Computing Ltd. The balance of the initial funding was secured from project partners: Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp UoB), AVA, Brighton & Hove City Council, and Respect. These are all one-off payments. Logos of contributing organisations are displayed on the mapping site.
2.3 Initial weeks

Two CPVA projects were entered at the end of May 2015 as a trial exercise, and it immediately became obvious that a different style of information template was needed to the one originally devised. This was to accommodate the requirements and style of the Community21 website, ease of use by participants, and a broader series of questions. Over the next few weeks the template evolved to its current form (attached, see Appendix B), which is easier for individuals to complete without help, and allows for a narrative style under a series of headings when information is entered. This remains a live document.

In the first weeks all known projects (as at May 2015 n = 22) were contacted and invited to submit data for inclusion on the map. Once data were entered, the projects were invited to check their entry for accuracy. A basic administration system was devised to simplify communication, and to record hours and work undertaken, as well as the findings. A twitter account, @mapping_cpv, was set up and a number of blog posts written.

2.4 Continuing work

An average of 4 hours a week were spent on the project. Work typically included entering data that had come in from the previous week, scoping possible agencies and sending out new emails, chasing up agencies previously contacted, and a small amount of blog and twitter work on the site.

Following the initial round of contacts, a campaign was started to contact all Domestic Violence and Women’s Aid organisations, and all local Youth Offending Team managers. This was done by geographical region, though not completed owing to time constraints. A presentation on CPV to senior managers within the Youth Justice Service also publicised the project. Some contacts were established through items in professional or national media, and via Google alerts. Further contacts were made via recommendation, notably through networking on twitter. Plans to contact Children’s Services Managers were not fulfilled. Research was confined to the area of England and Wales, partly as a response to the time constraints, and partly because different legal frameworks and children’s legislation pertain in Scotland and Ireland.

By November 1st 2015, a total of 180 agencies had been contacted and 40 projects entered on the map (see Appendix C). These are clustered mainly in the south-east and north of the country (see Appendix D). A further 15 specialist projects are known to exist but are not yet included. In some cases this is because the project has only recently started. Other agencies have responded to initial enquiries but not yet completed forms.

3. The Website

3.1 Community 21

Mapping CPV has space on the Community 21 website (www.community21.org), and is listed in the Projects Directory as Child to Parent Violence and Abuse Mapping Pilot Project. Unlike most of the other mapping projects, which are based very much in local areas but with the facility to network across the country, Mapping CPV exists as a community of providers around the country, publicly accessible, and searchable by geographical area and name of project. The overall administration is undertaken by Community21 workers. This includes initial setup and any major changes to appearance.
3.2 Appearance and Ease of Use

The front page comprises the map, information about the project, a number of blog posts, a twitter feed, photos of those involved and logos from the contributing organisations. As well as basic information, there are facilities to add video and case studies for an individual project. This has not been taken up by any of the projects to date.

Once the system became familiar, data entry took approximately 30 minutes per project. Other text on the front page was also entered in a straightforward manner, but the inclusion of logos proved more problematic, in terms of positioning, and the absence of hyperlinks. Some users reported problems accessing the site with old versions of Internet Explorer. This impacts a number of Local Authorities and Youth Offending Services.

3.3 “The Map Goes Live”

In October 2015 a decision was taken by the Steering Group to publicise the map, both to make the information more widely accessible and to make possible an assessment of its usefulness. It was launched through the Holes in the Wall website (http://wp.me/p1sWM6-KE), and also via twitter, as well as through contacting all the agencies involved directly; as such it became visible to practitioners and the general public at http://Community21.org/partners/cpv.

4. Findings

4.1 Agencies

The agencies entered onto the map number total 40. Domestic violence and abuse agencies are a significant provider of services for CPVA (N = 16), followed closely by the Youth Offending Service (N = 13). Some multi-agency work takes place across the country (N = 5), whether under the auspices of the Troubled Families agenda, or through local arrangements. There are a small number of independent agencies and groups which have developed (N = 5), some of which offer this support as their only objective. To date, few groups have been found to be situated within Children’s Services (n =1). A “Who’s in Charge?” programme in Bournemouth is the only one entered on the map, while data is still outstanding from a second group in the north of England. While health based services have been approached, and some have expressed an interest in the Mapping project with reference to the work they are undertaking, none have returned data as at December 2015.

The data which was returned suggested that specialist work was to be found located predominantly in the south east and north of the country. The possible reasons for this are discussed later in section 5.3.3.

4.2 Criteria

4.2.1 Catchment area
All services have strict catchment criteria, determined by funding and legal responsibilities. Generally this is the local or regional authority.

4.2.2 Age Range Working with Young People
Age criteria, in contrast, vary tremendously across and within fields of work, ranging from 5 agencies offering services to children and young people of any age, through one offer of work with children aged 5 – 18, to a more restrictive age range of 13 – 16 from one agency.
Table 1: Age Range spread by type of agency

|                      | Any  | 5 - 18 | 8 - 18 | 9 - 18 | Under 16 | From teen age years | 10 - 15 | 10 - 16 | 10 - 17 | 10 - 18 | 11 - 16 | 11 - 17 | 11 - 18 | 13 - 16 | 13 - 17 | 14 - 17 |
|----------------------|------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Youth Offending Service | 1   | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1        | 1                    | 3       | 4       | 1       | 2       | 1       | 2       | 1       | 1       | 1       |
| Domestic Abuse Agency  | 3    | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3        | 7                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Multi-agency service  | 1    |        |        |        |          | 2                    | 1       | 1       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Children’s Services   | 1    |        |        |        |          |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Independent agency    | 2    |        | 1      |        |          |          |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

The vast majority (85%, n = 29) work with secondary school age children and young people only, where this is defined generally as 10 upwards and under 18. Five agencies adopt a much narrower age band, coinciding with the peak age for this form of abuse (13 – 17 years). Even within Youth Offending Teams, seven different age ranges were specified. Similar inconsistencies were noted between domestic abuse agencies, even allowing for multiple venues offered by YUVA. In some cases 1:1 work is offered to individuals outside of the main age range.

4.2.3 Gender
Most agencies (n = 13) offering group work with young people have adopted a mixed gender policy; while three groups are currently working only with boys, there are moves to open up the service to girls as well, at the same time recognising they may have different needs. There are a number of specific considerations around gender when working in this area, but further data was not collected on this occasion.

4.2.4 Other Criteria
The most common other requirements are that there is no ongoing intimate partner violence, or use of violence by the parent towards the child. There may also be requirements of no ongoing contact with an abusive parent. One agency works only with birth parents.

4.3 Referral Systems
Thirty of the programmes mapped accept referrals from either agencies or families, three only from other professionals and seven (all Youth Offending Teams) accept only internal referrals. In these last cases, young people will already be engaged in the YOS and work may continue until the statutory order is completed.

4.4 Assessment
A question was posed about the types of assessment undertaken. Not everyone completed this section of the form and in some cases answers were unspecific, eg “risk assessments”; but only one agency (working only with parents) stated specifically that they have no assessment process. All the others operate a system of assessing i) whether families meet the specific criteria of that agency, ii) whether they are able to commit to completing the course, and iii) implement some form of risk assessment. For Youth Offending Teams the ASSET form, already in use, fulfills this purpose. Some Domestic Violence agencies use the DASH assessment. Some concerns have been expressed by specialists within the field as to the suitability and appropriateness of these assessments for work with children and young people. The Break4Change programme have developed a bespoke risk assessment – an
adaptation of DASH and Living Without Violence, along with learning from Break4Change and the Step Up model. Agencies offering the RYPP make use of the Respect APV risk assessment tool. Other assessment tools mentioned include SDQ questionnaires, behaviour questionnaires looking at severity and prevalence, and parenting questionnaires. These last tools serve a double purpose, being referred to again later as part of the evaluation process. While assessments will mainly be conducted in a pre-engagement home visit, one agency specified that these might be completed over the phone. The pre-engagement visit also offers an opportunity (informally or formally) to assess family dynamics and home environment.

4.5 Waiting Lists
Funding issues restrict the number of families who can be seen at any one time and there may be waiting lists, particularly where a group is offered as a rolling programme, or where a pilot project is still in development. Waiting times were mentioned ranging from a matter of weeks, up to six months in length and this has been acknowledged as a significant problem. In these cases there is generally some sort of “holding” process, where families may be offered telephone support or 1:1 intervention until the next group programme begins. There is often a requirement that referring agencies maintain contact throughout this waiting time and through the programme itself.

4.6 Programmes
There are many models of working on CPVA and agencies were asked which model of work their programme followed. The study found that a range of different programmes are offered, with almost half of agencies (43%) developing their own adapted model of work, often integrating elements of other schemes to meet local needs.

*Figure 1: Programme model offered*
Systemic work, restorative justice, strength based work, solution-focused work, motivational interviewing, narrative work and anger management all feature strongly as elements of these programmes.

Most of the work is with both parents and young people (N = 32). In 6 cases work is with parents only and in 2 cases with young people only. In both of these cases there would be an assumption or requirement that parents received support elsewhere. Agencies were asked whether they offered group or 1:1 work. It was clear that this aspect of the work could be quite fluid. While 33 programmes are run offering group work as a feature of the programme, a significant number of services (N = 30) provide a one-to-one service, either in addition to group work or as their main offer. Difficulty for some parents in travelling, or in timings was often cited as a reason for offering one to one work, as was the severity of the abuse and the complex nature of the family situation and help needed. Some programmes offer parallel groups for parents and young people in line with the Break4Change and Step Up models.

4.7 Length of involvement

Some agencies responded in terms of the number of sessions, some in terms of weeks and some with regard to months, so it is not always possible to offer direct comparisons. The period of involvement varies from 6 weeks to “as long as needed”, though it should be noted that even with the shortest programme there will be a number of introductory assessments or pre-programme meetings. The vast majority of programmes run for up to 3 months.

**Figure 2: Length of involvement**

With manualised programmes such as Who’s in Charge? Break4Change and RYPP there is usually a requirement for strict fidelity to the manual, and so these programmes might be expected to be the same length wherever offered. Indeed, in the case of RYPP there is an evaluation currently underway. Where these programmes report a large range of lengths of engagement, this can be accounted for by different local lead-in and follow-up times, additional work to support engagement, and the counting of sessions versus weeks⁶. In other cases there is an open acknowledgement of adaptation of a

⁶ Personal communication with Respect, December 2015.
programme to fit local needs and this may apply particularly where 1:1 work is offered as opposed to, or in addition to, group work.

4.8 Evaluation

Evaluation is a costly business, and with so many programmes in the early stages, most have only internal feedback or evaluation for funders. This generally comprises pre and post-programme assessment and questionnaires, testimony from families, staff and referring agencies. Follow up meetings may also serve to monitor continued progress and change. Nevertheless, many providers express a hope to complete an external evaluation at some point, and significantly 17 of the 40 either already have (N = 3), are in the midst of (N = 9) or anticipate a full external evaluation within the next year (N = 5). Break4Change (Brighton and Hove) and Respect (the RYPP) also have very comprehensive calculations available, showing unit costs and potential cash savings from their respective programmes. Building Respectful Relationships (Oxford) has just completed a pilot programme and has produced a business plan in a bid for continued funding. This considers the projected costs of not supporting a family, alongside the actual costs of continuing with the project.

4.9 Other Information

All contributors were invited to offer other information about their programme or service. Eight of the services have been featured in local or national media, including BBC radio programmes, My Violent Child for Channel 5, and magazine features. YUVA have contributed a chapter to a recent book edited by Amanda Holt, in which the Who’s in Charge? programme also features; and Break4Change is part of a chapter in a recent book edited by Nicky Stanley and Cathy Humphreys. While a significant number of the services are in the early stages, four organisations specifically mentioned the “pilot” status of the programme, with obvious uncertainties about future provision. Some offer training to other professionals as part of their offer. One practitioner leads a unit on child to parent violence for social work students studying at the local university.

Other comments included: “This work is crucial in work with families post domestic violence”; “We have noticed an increase in referrals”; “We are in the early stages of delivery but we are hopeful”; “We are trying to develop a service that meets the needs of the Criminal Justice System as well as the families”; and “We believe the programme works for the majority of families, but where the abuse is severe, then 3 months is not long enough and more specialised intervention is needed.”

5. Discussion

5.1 Response rate

Obtaining responses from agencies proved to be rather more difficult than had been initially anticipated. In the early stages, a reliance on personal connections and networking was fruitful; but a poor response to “cold-calling” emails had always been expected and this was certainly the case, with 106 out of 180 contacts unanswered. A further 9 emails were “undeliverable”. Where “out of office” replies were received (N = 6), there was limited time to follow these up. Some individuals responded positively to the initial approach, but then did not complete a template. While it was encouraging that so many new services were located and entered (N= 17), there was disappointment almost as many again (N=15) are still missing from the map.

A number of reasons for the response rates are supposed:

- The overwhelming amount of work faced by many agencies
• The project timescale coincided with the summer holidays, when many practitioners were away
• The impact of austerity makes other issues more important to address
• Ongoing funding issues for some agencies
• Some agency leaders did not identify the mapping project as relevant to their service because of restrictive criteria
• Working from old contact lists
• Emails being lost in the system
• Lack of administrative time

Some of these were addressed by restyling emails, inviting the support of steering group members to encourage response, follow up with additional messages and phone calls, all of which brought in some further completed forms. It is likely that some will be returned after the end date of the project.

In retrospect, plans to contact all Youth Offending Teams, Domestic Violence agencies, Child and Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Children's Services as well as independent agencies and spin off contacts was overly ambitious for the 6 month timescale, even with the support of national coordinators. As a result, significant areas remain untapped and it is not possible to state either way whether services are to be found in these locations. For example, no London YOTs were contacted, only a small number of CAMHS teams, and almost no Children's Services.

5.2 “The Natural Home”

A regular discourse in work with child to parent violence and abuse is with regards to the “natural home” for a specialist service. The findings of this project suggest that there is no “natural” place as such, but that agencies of whatever flavour have developed work as a specific response to a problem identified within their client group. As such, specialist projects are to be found located within domestic violence agencies, youth offending teams, CAMHS, Children's Services, community enterprises, and indeed multi-agency partnerships, as well as other agencies not yet included on the map. Even where the work has been specifically encouraged, such as within the Youth Justice Service where case audits have found as many as 3 out of 4 frequent offenders exhibiting CPVA, not all teams offer a specialised response and some are open only to internal referrals leaving other local families without help.

Where a service is positioned can also impact on the age range for which help is offered. It is interesting that the only Children's Service response so far located uses the Early Help service to offer support to families, recognising the need for intervention before the violence and abuse escalates to a dangerous level. Research has tended to suggest that some families experience violence and abuse “out of the blue” as a child hits adolescence, whereas in other families, where there is experience of early trauma or diagnosis of ASD or FASD for instance, the child may show signs of abuse and aggression from a very young age (Selwyn, Wijedasa and Meakings, 2014). Independent agencies offering help are able to recognise this and work accordingly. Where there is a specific age criteria attached it may be that some families are left floundering for years while desperately trying to seek support.

5.3 The Development of Services

5.3.1 Theories

Agencies were asked specifically about the theories influencing models of intervention used and most chose to answer this very briefly. Nevertheless, it was clear that there is no one theory in the

---

7 Personal communication with the Youth Justice Board, September 2015.
ascendancy and that most groups draw on a range of approaches according to their agency roots and preference, and individual skills and experience. There is on the whole an emphasis on understanding the issue as family based, not as located within one member in particular, and on restoring healthy family relationships and as such it ideally demands a whole family response.

5.3.2 Programme Models, Assessment and Evaluation
Organised work with families experiencing child to parent violence and abuse in the UK is relatively new. With little involvement documented apart from the PEACE group operating in the Wirral for a number of years from 2000, and family work based within CAMHS teams, practitioners have looked elsewhere for guidance in developing interventions and have been influenced by ongoing work in Australia and the USA, which has been established for more than twenty years. While there appears to be a vast array of different programmes on offer, they draw significantly from two specific models: Step Up (Routt and Anderson 2015) and Who’s in Charge? (Gallagher 2008). The first, a group programme for both parents and young people was designed to divert young people away from the criminal justice system and, drawing on the Duluth model of abuse, to bring about the restoration of healthy family relationships and the cessation of violence in the home. Gallagher’s programme was designed to support parents only, recognising that it was not always possible to persuade young people to engage in work, and that much good could be achieved by supporting parents to consider their situation and to regain a personal sense of power and wellbeing.

Over the years practitioners have visited these programmes or learnt from them, found some elements useful, and then “anglicised” them or adapted the models to suit more local needs, learning and skills. (The Step-Up programme is freely available on the internet, and as a result has been a significant influence, although there are concerns among specialists about the adoption of manualised programmes without ongoing training, mentoring and supervision.) Although the Youth Offending Service, for instance, has worked hard to raise awareness of the issues, there has not been consistency in the promotion of one particular model of work, with the consequent use of worker/manager time developing individual programmes. There are a number of models of work in use across the country, with many similarities in their core offer and theoretical basis. The majority offer work for both parent and child, while a significant minority work only with the parents.

A third distinctive model, Non-Violent Resistance, was developed by Haim Omer in Israel and also contributes elements to some of the programmes now being offered. Training in NVR has been delivered in Ireland; and in the UK it has been taken up and promoted by Peter Jak amongst others, particularly within the adoption community but also by CAMHS teams. While it is known to be in use around the country it is not specifically offered by any of the agencies so far on the map.

There is a lack of standardisation in terms of the assessment tools being used and no consensus amongst practitioners on this issue (see section 4.4). In some cases tools are being used which are seen by some as inappropriate eg the DASH. This project has nevertheless proved very useful in terms of initiating a discussion about the appropriateness and usability of different tools and it is important that this work is taken forward.

Cross-fertilisation, and constant adaptation of models of work on CPVA, can be seen as positive in meeting a changing situation and growing understanding, but in itself such proliferation creates issues around the evaluation of such models and the development of an evidence base for this work. To an extent the model used may not be of ultimate importance in terms of how successful the outcomes of a project are as in many ways it is the quality of those working with such models that affects outcomes but what this does indicate the huge importance of specialised training on working in CPVA and the need for a good system for mentoring practitioners post-training. There needs to be management commitment to providing workers with well-structured and ongoing support in this important work.
5.3.3 Clustering
Clustering of services in particular areas seems to have occurred through local networking and training of peers and other contacts, for instance the Who’s in Charge? groups running in the Suffolk area, and the preponderance of work in the north east of England. In addition, the RYPP work has clustered in the north of the country through an action research funding bid. Break4Change is clustered in the South East of the country through the RCPV programme. This is to be applauded for the elements of ongoing training and support it makes possible for practitioners, but further disadvantages those families in other areas so far without a service. Within the limitations of this small survey it is not possible to state that these are the only services available. Nevertheless, the difficulty faced by the project worker in locating services for the map is likely to be multiplied many times for families seeking help for themselves.

5.3.4 Other support identified
Some practitioners have acknowledged that they recognise the phenomenon of child to parent violence as a significant issue for the families they work with, and stated that they offer support as part of a general counseling service, rather than a specialist programme. These have been in the main from agencies working with autism or disability, or individual counsellors. As this project was concerned specifically with specialist services, it has not been appropriate to explore more about the nature of this work, nor yet to capture the work on the map.

The alcohol and substance misuse organisation, Adfam, has a network of peer support groups, which regularly address children’s violence and abuse, and is in the process of negotiating a training programme for these groups. They have drawn on many of the CPV programmes mentioned in their development of this network. In addition advertising is currently taking place nationally to recruit counsellors to work with adoptive families experiencing violence and abuse from children through the adoption support charity, Adoption UK. At present these types of support are also not captured on the map.

6. Conclusions
The objectives were to:

1. Map the geographical location of existing CPVA services across England and Wales
2. Assess the practicality, opportunities and difficulties of capturing data from a range of services for this particular community of interest
3. Assess the usefulness of so doing amongst practitioners and policy makers

6.1 Postcode Lottery

Specialist services for families experiencing violence and abuse from their children remain few and scattered unevenly around the country though there are clearly more than had been originally known about at the start of this research in 2013, reflecting the growing awareness of the issue and determination to support families as a means of preventing further breakdown. Difficulties in identifying agencies for this project may be mirrored in some areas by the efforts to secure help for affected families, although some providers have made good use of training and of social and broadcast media to publicise their work. The majority of providers are affiliates or members of larger organisations providing support, training and encouragement and so in time it is to be hoped that there will be a natural expansion of services around the country.
6.2 Mapping Specialist Provision

In all, 40 services have been identified and located on the map, more than twice as many as were known about at the start; with a further twenty not yet returning all their data. Results have tended to show that it is possible, but not without difficulty, to map the specialist provision for this issue, whether with regards to small and independent agencies or nationally linked organisations; a task which in itself requires the establishment of trust and cooperation, which can only come through personal efforts or greater publicity and support at higher managerial level; and a belief that the map is worthwhile. Whole sectors are currently not represented. The method chosen whereby individual agencies completed their own data capture form meant that some data was missing on the returns, but the alternatives would be significantly more time-consuming. For data to be of use in the long term it will need to be regularly reviewed and revised.

6.3 Raising Awareness

The development of the map has in itself brought new understanding to the table, in terms of which agencies are providing specialist help, how different models are emerging, and the role of gender and age in determining what help is available; and it has generated debate and awareness of this hidden problem, which must of itself be applauded. Of some surprise was the assertion made from time to time that a particular service was “the only one of its kind”, suggesting that these agencies and programmes still remain hidden largely from each other as well as from the public. Individual practitioners continue to report difficulties in researching work prior to developing a service, though it is also the case that a significant number of approaches are made on a regular basis to members of the steering group for guidance in this area.

Agencies and practitioners were invited to make formal responses to a series of questions about the usefulness of the map and sadly none did so, perhaps again because of the time consuming nature of this; though informally it was received with encouragement and praise.

I hope the mapping project goes well it's really needed as I can direct families who enquire from all over the country.

I think it’s an excellent plan to map services that are available.

This is a topic that we are coming a bit later to so we do not have anything yet but we are looking at various options and considering what we might want to do. As part of that I came across your web site which I found very useful so thank you for that. I have passed on the link to relevant colleagues across the authority.

It will be welcomed by a large number of families and practitioners I think.

Thank you for sharing this and I will forward to relevant colleagues.

Congratulations on putting this living resource together! Thanks for involving us in this.

6.4 The Future of Digital Mapping

It is clear that digital mapping is of growing importance in many fields with social policy and science no exception and this project has demonstrated that it is possible to map service provision and that such mapping has the potential to become a helpful aide for practitioners. However, in order for this to be achieved there is a need for ongoing financial commitment to provide such a valuable service.
7. The Future

Designed as a pilot project, the mapping exercise has fulfilled most of the original aims while simultaneously creating a life of its own and proving hard to “let go”. For it to be of long-term value it would seem important to continue and develop the work in some form, adding further services as they are developed and located; and so enquiries are under way to establish an individual or organisation prepared and skilled to take this on within their existing remit.

While the Community21 website provided a useful platform on which to trial this project, and it is particularly easy to locate projects by geographical area, a number of factors militate against its ongoing use in the long term:

- Dependence on external website administrators for some functions.
- Some issues with appearance.
- The need for a “snappy name” to aid searchability.
- Problems in navigating the system for some users.

Discussions are ongoing to move the information across to a different platform if and when an alternative “owner” can be found.

A permanent home and ease of searchability will also assist with wider publicising of the map, of great importance if the work is to have value for the future.

It is to be hoped that the information gained will now assist families in finding help, as well as feeding into future research into this important issue.
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Appendices
1. Name of programme: ……………………………… Year programme originated: ………………………………

Voluntary Sector  Δ
Statutory Sector  Δ
Multi-agency Partnership  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)

2. Are you part of a national body?

Respect  Δ
Barnardos  Δ
NSPCC  Δ
AVA  Δ
Women’s Aid  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)

3. Address ………………………………………………
………………………………………………
………………………………………………
Post Code ………………………………………………

4. Contact Details for programme/service …………………………………………………………………

5. Catchment area served by project/service:

Town/City  Δ
County  Δ
Region  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)

6. Where does the programme/service take place?

Residential centre  Δ
Youth Offending  Δ
Community centre  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)

7. How do you work in the programme/service? (tick as many as apply)

With parents  Δ
With children  Δ
The family  Δ
One to one  Δ
Groupwork  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)

8. What main model of intervention do you use? (please tick one only)

Cognitive Behavioural  Δ
Systemic Family  Δ
Psychoanalytic  Δ
Ecological  Δ
Combination of models  Δ
Other………………………………… (please specify)
9. Further details on the programme/service (tick as many as apply)
Mentoring
Manual used
Follows Step Up model
Follows Break4Change model
Follows NVR model
VAWG approach
Challenges gender stereotypes
Addresses DV and SV
Other………………………………
(please specify)

10. Fill in other important details of your service not covered in 7 and 8 below (such as age criteria, how long the programme runs for etc.):
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Referral route/criteria (please specify how this happens/signposting)
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. What assessment measures and risk assessment tools do you use to assess client suitability for your programme/service?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Has your programme/service been evaluated?
Yes
No
If yes, is there data / a report available? (please specify)
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. Do you have cost of service data available?
Yes
No

15. What output date is available on your programme/service? (please specify)
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
## APPENDIX B. CPV/APV Mapping Template Version 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the project / programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and title for contact (eg director, project manager, family worker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address for contact / referral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address for contact / referral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number for contact / referral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you part of the voluntary or statutory sector?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a multi-agency partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you part of a national body? (eg Respect, Women's Aid, Barnardos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been offering this service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the funding for this project time limited?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your catchment area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have an age limit? (higher and lower)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you require attendance at other programmes? (eg YOT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything that would make you refuse a referral? (eg ongoing IPV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other criteria for referral?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral and assessment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can refer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take phone / personal referrals or do you require a form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you require any assessment from the referrer? (eg CAF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a waiting list? How long approximately?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sort of assessment of suitability to you undertake?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sort of risk assessment do you undertake?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you work with parents, children or both?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you offer group work or one to one, or both?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does the programme take place? (eg in homes, in a meeting room in an agency, in a community venue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you follow a particular manual or recognised programme? (eg Step Up, Who’s in Charge? NVR, PACT, mentoring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have your own manual? Is it available to others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you follow a particular model of intervention? (eg systemic family therapy, CBT, solution focused work, psychotherapeutic work) Or perhaps a combination of approaches?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you work with families for a fixed length of time? How long?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you offer training to individuals or other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been an evaluation of your project? (eg internal for funders, external, is there output data) Is it available for others to see?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any cost/benefit analysis available which might be useful for research purposes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the programme featured in the media in any way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should any of this information be kept confidential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there anything else you would like to add about the service?

Many thanks for your time.

Helen Bonnick
September 2015
Appendix C. Agencies Contacted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th June</td>
<td>Board meeting - Regulatory</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th June</td>
<td>Staff meeting - Project</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th June</td>
<td>Departmental meeting - Budget</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st June</td>
<td>External speaker on project</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th June</td>
<td>Site inspection by project team</td>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th June</td>
<td>Monthly report meeting</td>
<td>Boardroom</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on project performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th June</td>
<td>Annual review meeting</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of project performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd July</td>
<td>Project kick-off meeting</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for new initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th July</td>
<td>Team training session</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th July</td>
<td>Site inspection by project team</td>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th July</td>
<td>Monthly report meeting</td>
<td>Boardroom</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on project performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th July</td>
<td>Project status meeting</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th July</td>
<td>Staff meeting - Project</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July</td>
<td>Departmental meeting - Budget</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th July</td>
<td>Site inspection by project team</td>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th July</td>
<td>Final review meeting</td>
<td>Boardroom</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of project performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th July</td>
<td>Project closure meeting</td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August</td>
<td>Meet with Mr. Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August</td>
<td>Office Clean-up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August</td>
<td>Team Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August</td>
<td>Project Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 August</td>
<td>Training Session</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August</td>
<td>Day Off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August</td>
<td>Meeting with Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August</td>
<td>On-Site Inspection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August</td>
<td>Quarterly Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 August</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 August</td>
<td>Site Inspection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August</td>
<td>Meeting with Vendor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August</td>
<td>Final Review of Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 August</td>
<td>Project Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August</td>
<td>Final Review of Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August</td>
<td>Project Launch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table is a sample and may not reflect the actual content of the document.*
Appendix D. Screen shot of Map as at December 2015