

**DSV Joint Commissioning Group [item no 3]**  
**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014**

**GAP ANALYSIS: FINDINGS FROM PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS**

Author of Report: Danielle Roebuck and Sarah Wells

Sponsor of Report: Chris Cutland

**1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Domestic and Sexual Violence (DSV) Joint Commissioning Group (JCG) of the further work undertaken since the initial findings from the gap analysis.

**2.0 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:**

- 2.1 On 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014 the JCG received a report detailing the work undertaken to identify the number of survivors of domestic violence and abuse (DVA) within Nottingham City. The range of survivors in the city who have experienced one or more incident of DVA is between 30,096 and 42,266 for females and 36,355 and 48,525 for females and males.
- 2.2 Specialist DSV services provided 5001 interventions to DV survivors during the year 2013/14 and whilst acknowledging that there may be some double counting because survivors may have accessed more than one service, this indicates that the gap between need and provision is 31,354 and 43,524. From these calculations it can be seen that approximately one in seven of those who experience domestic violence access these services in a year.
- 2.3 Work was also undertaken to try and understand the potential number of perpetrators within Nottingham and this is thought to be in 14,000 people (predominantly males).
- 2.4 The report contained three recommendations which were accepted. These were:
- The contents of the report are noted
  - The findings from the gap analysis are used to inform future domestic violence policy and decision making by the JCG over the next 12 – 18 months
  - Further analysis is undertaken to understand if the needs of survivors with protected characteristics are met.
- 2.5 Since July work has been in progress to further this final recommendation.

### 3.0 PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS WORK:

- 3.1 As outlined above in paragraph 2.2 that there were 5001 interventions by specialist DV services in 2013/14. Information requests were submitted to each of the service providers in order to understand more about the protected characteristic of survivors accessing the services.
- 3.2 The request asked for information about:
- Gender
  - Age
  - Ethnicity
  - Sexual orientation
  - Disability
  - Religion
- 3.3 Information was returned in relation to users of approximately 4700 interventions.
- 3.4 The methodology, limitations and findings from the analysis of protected characteristics are attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
- 3.5 The findings from the analysis and the process undertaken to do this are referred to in more detail overleaf. They highlight the challenges encountered in undertaking a deeper analysis of services users.
- 3.6 In summary, these are;
- It is more likely to be able to get information about gender, age and ethnicity
  - Not all information requested is routinely collected
  - Not all Information was not returned in a useable format
  - Analysis is unable to take account of cultural or demographic factors
  - The methodology outlined overleaf provided some interesting findings about the ethnicity of service users
  - The findings so far cannot be used with confidence
  - Service providers need to be asked to record service user profiles in a uniform way (i.e. there are different ways of recording age)
  - A unified collection of service user profile data needs to be developed and implemented as part of the lead commissioner approach to establish consistent returns, baseline information for comparison with census information or to understand local need in the absence of other sources of comparable data
  - The service user profile is included in the development of a local outcome framework.

### 4.0 SUMMARY

- 4.1 The work undertaken to further a joint understanding of the profiles of survivors accessing specialist DV services has not returned the level of information and analysis that was anticipated.

- 4.2 The findings of this exercise do highlight what needs to be in place to improve our understanding of survivors accessing commissioned specialist services in the future.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 The JCG are asked to agree the following recommendations;
- The contents of this report are noted
  - Work is undertaken as part of the development of the outcome framework to agree a set of criteria for inclusion in service user profile monitoring to ensure that all commissioned service providers are able to provide comparable data.
  - A similar service user analysis is undertaken once there is a year of comparable data available.

## APPENDIX 1

### Domestic violence gap analysis by survivor demographic

#### **Methodology and Limitations**

The estimated volume of domestic violence survivors in each protected characteristic category was calculated using the Census 2011 breakdown of population by ward, gender and protected characteristic. At ward level, the proportion of females in each protected characteristic category was matched against the estimated figure of domestic violence survivors by ward. For example, it was estimated that according to the level of social deprivation in comparison to other wards in the City, 38.4% of females in Aspley suffer domestic violence; therefore, the estimated figure of disabled survivors in Aspley would be 38.4% of the disabled female population according to the Census 2011. The male figure stood at 5% regardless of social deprivation.

The actual number of individuals accessing services for domestic violence in Nottingham City was taken from the monitoring forms provided by each service. These were then aggregated by protected characteristic category and matched against the estimated figure of domestic violence survivors mentioned previously to provide the gap in service provision by demographic/protected characteristic.

Nonetheless, there were several limitations to the gap analysis below. Not all data received from services was in a usable format and as such individuals using certain services will not be represented in the gap analysis. Those not represented accounted for at least 226 service users (victim support and Amber House), and therefore, the gap in service provision is likely to be more pronounced than it actually is. Also, there may be an element of double counting; specifically those who have contacted the 24 hour helpline and been referred to another service.

Additionally, religion is not routinely collected amongst some services and most will have been recorded as religion not stated. Ironically, this is the protected characteristic with the lesser proportional gap; however, it is likely that those recorded as religion not stated in the service monitoring forms would not have provided the same answer when completing the Census 2011.

Also, the gap analysis does not take into account factors other than geography and deprivation (ward and IMD score), and as such is missing any cultural or demographic factors which may make individuals of a certain protected characteristic less likely to experience domestic violence. These factors could make the gap identified in certain protected characteristics higher or lower than when calculated using deprivation.

The estimated volume of domestic violence survivors is based on the social deprivation of each ward compared to the other wards in the City. Therefore, the level of social deprivation in Nottingham as a whole has not been taken into account; such that Nottingham may be more deprived than other cities nationally which would force more of Nottingham City Wards into the top decile for social deprivation which would cause the estimated figure to increase.

Providing a gap analysis based on the type of service provision would not be possible at this stage due to some services not being required by all survivors. For example not all survivors will require refuge as a service need and as such calculating a gap in service provision would look more pronounced since it is not possible to specifically calculate an estimated figure of survivors requiring this service.

Protected Characteristics		Estimated DV Survivors		Actual Number Accessing Services		Gap Between Actual and Estimated Figures		% of Estimated Survivors using Services	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Disability	Disability to Limit Daily Activity a Little or a Lot	1,222	7,146	36	956	1,186	6,190	2.9%	13.4%
Age	16-17	175	845	0	38	175	807	0.0%	4.5%
	18-24	1,475	6,648	6	443	1,469	6,205	0.4%	6.7%
	25-34	1,299	5,632	8	450	1,291	5,182	0.6%	8.0%
	35-44	999	4,478	7	716	992	3,762	0.7%	16.0%
	45-54	869	4,189	12	0	857	4,189	1.4%	0.0%
	55-65	673	3,053	1	0	672	3,053	0.1%	0.0%
	65+	770	4,846	2	0	768	4,846	0.3%	0.0%
Ethnicity	White British	4,000	20,033	20	585	3,980	19,448	0.5%	2.9%
	White Irish	61	257	0	0	61	257	0.0%	0.0%
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	7	33	0	27	7	6	0.0%	81.8%
	Other White	322	1,500	6	68	316	1,432	1.9%	4.5%
	White and Black Caribbean	255	1,264	0	96	255	1,168	0.0%	7.6%
	White and Black African	46	188	1	36	45	152	2.2%	19.1%
	White and Asian	81	261	0	19	81	242	0.0%	7.3%
	Other Mixed	58	279	0	1	58	278	0.0%	0.4%
	Indian	214	831	0	54	214	777	0.0%	6.5%
	Pakistani	353	1,474	2	189	351	1,285	0.6%	12.8%
	Bangladeshi	23	97	0	15	23	82	0.0%	15.5%
	Chinese	133	539	0	2	133	537	0.0%	0.4%
	Other Asian	143	523	0	4	143	519	0.0%	0.8%
	African	215	988	0	247	215	741	0.0%	25.0%
	Caribbean	177	1,069	0	111	177	958	0.0%	10.4%
	Other Black	57	326	1	66	56	260	1.8%	20.2%
Arab	62	155	0	19	62	136	0.0%	12.3%	
Other Ethnic Group	54	159	0	8	54	151	0.0%	5.0%	
Religion	Christian	2,680	15,270	0	363	2,680	14,907	0.0%	2.4%
	Buddhist	47	199	0	0	47	199	0.0%	0.0%
	Hindu	107	373	0	0	107	373	0.0%	0.0%
	Jewish	27	84	0	0	27	84	0.0%	0.0%
	Muslim	505	1,842	0	186	505	1,656	0.0%	10.1%
	Sikh	86	394	0	21	86	373	0.0%	5.3%
	Other Religion	37	148	0	19	37	129	0.0%	12.8%
	No Religion	2,282	9,543	0	493	2,282	9,050	0.0%	5.2%
	Not Stated	488	2,110	36	923	452	1,187	7.4%	43.7%

Those female survivors aged between 35 and 44 accounted for the greatest proportion of estimated survivors to be using the domestic violence services in Nottingham City.

The highest proportion of service users by ethnicity was females self-reporting to be of White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller ethnicity; such that only 18.2% of the estimated volume of these female domestic violence survivors did not access services in Nottingham City (81.8% were using services). Nevertheless, this could be due to an underestimate in the volume of survivors as this group is unlikely to be affected by social deprivation at ward level.

Those female survivors of African ethnicity saw the second highest proportion of service users; such that 25% of the estimated volume of female survivors of African ethnicity were engaging with services.

As mentioned previously, those with no stated religion accounted for the highest proportion of service users. This is not likely to correlate with the Census 2011 category and thus may not be representative of the estimated survivors in this category of religion.

Due to the limitations mentioned above and the crude methodology used in calculating the gap in service provision, this gap analysis cannot be used with confidence. Nonetheless, this does identify the need for a unified service monitoring form amongst all domestic violence service providers in Nottingham City. This will provide the opportunity for comparative and aggregated analysis of service user data.