

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND
SOCIAL INDICATORS PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

MONICA LEISEY, PHD, MSW

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, 2008

1. Assessing the state of family violence within the Commonwealth and assessing the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence is needed

The best decisions are made with data that provide insight into the issues being addressed. Virginia currently collects data regarding the state of family violence within the Commonwealth but not in a holistic manner and not at the aggregate level. While some of the data is publicly available, it is not easily combined or compared. Without the integration of this important information, it is impossible to know the state of family violence within the Commonwealth. It is even more difficult to know whether or not our community is responding to the problem in a way that mitigates current problems and prevents future acts of violence.

2. Any assessment of the problem of family violence requires the inclusion of representatives from the 3 response communities: public social services, private, non-profit social services and the criminal justice system.

Virginia responds to the problem of family violence through many different resources which can be categorized into three response communities. Additionally, all three of the response communities collect data. Not incorporating the data collected by all three of these communities would result in a partial understanding of both the problem of family violence and our community's response. Additionally, it is believed that the differences in data collected will facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the inter-connectedness of our response communities.

3. Family violence includes the problems of child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, and elder abuse.

In order to assess the state of family violence within the Commonwealth of Virginia, the term family violence must be defined in a way that is inclusive of the many different types of families as well as the many different types of abuse that are experienced within families. The conceptualization of family violence for this project reflects our understanding that family violence is intergenerational and is experienced at various points throughout an individual's life.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the findings of the Family and Children's Trust Fund of Virginia (FACT) Social Indicator Project (the Project). The Project was designed to explore the logistics and the feasibility of creating a report card for the Commonwealth of Virginia (the Commonwealth) on the state of family violence within the Commonwealth. Work on the Project began in May, 2008 and continued into October, 2008. Information concerning the problem of family violence and the data needed to understand the problem was collected from stakeholders throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia and through the use of professional peer reviewed sources.

The first important development of the Project was the identification of a definition for the term family violence. The term family violence can have numerous definitions, each of which would have influenced the direction of the Project. Based on prior research that FACT supported, and a thorough literature review, family violence was defined as any type of violence or abuse within a close relationship. This comprehensive definition incorporates three major research content areas: child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, and elder abuse.

The second important development was the creation of a conceptual framework upon which the report card can be created. Through interviews with members of the FACT Board and stakeholders within the family violence response community, two distinctive dimensions emerged for inclusion in the framework. The first dimension was the expected need to create a report for the state of family violence in the Commonwealth. This report card would provide an integration of the data available throughout the Commonwealth regarding family violence and assist in the comprehensive understanding of the problem of family violence. The second dimension was the need to assess the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence. Assessing the Commonwealth's response to the problem in a comprehensive format will provide needed information regarding the over-all effectiveness in dealing with the problem. The framework created incorporates both dimensions. It also incorporates the social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors of each of the three research content areas to provide a more complete understanding of the most effective change intervention points.

The future creation of the report card is expected to be completed by a Consortium of community stakeholders (Consortium). The third important development of the Project was a meeting held on September 26, 2008 to assess the interest of and requirements for potential Consortium membership. At this Consortium interest meeting, community stakeholders shared their concerns, questions, and suggestions for how such a Consortium could come together to create the type of report desired by the FACT Board. The potential Consortium members included the three response communities identified in the conceptual framework.

Plan for future project development

Based on the current findings, it is recommended that the creation of a report card moves forward in phases. Because of the current economic situation within the Commonwealth, completing a project as large and complex as this report in the first 18 months may not be feasible at this time. Many service providers are expecting to experience severe funding cuts beginning early in 2009. For many, these may be as high as a 15% reduction in funding. Additionally, much of the information regarding social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors of the state of family violence is already available through other sources. While pulling all the available

data together will be a valuable addition to what is known about family violence within Virginia, no report has been identified that assess the state of the Commonwealth's response to the problem.

It is therefore recommended that the next phase of the FACT Social Indicator Project focus on assessing the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence. Phase two (2), the creation of a report card to assess the Commonwealth's response to the problem, would conclude the summer of 2010 with the presentation of the first report card at the 2010 FACT Biannual Conference. Phase three would conclude the summer of 2012 with the presentation of the first comprehensive report card at that summer's FACT Biannual Conference. This comprehensive report card would provide the second assessment of the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence and provide the first assessment of family violence within the Commonwealth.

Success and limitations of the Consortium

Potential Consortium members identified represented the three response communities identified in the conceptual framework for the Project. Well represented were the public and private, non-profit service providers. There is a need for additional membership from the criminal justice response community. There are also a few other gaps including membership from the Department of Education. It is recognized that data regarding academic achievement, success, and support are imperative to understanding both the state of family violence in the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence. Finding additional resources and stakeholders to round out the Consortium will be one of the very first objectives should this project move forward. Additionally, the Consortium will include two (2) members of the FACT Board and representation from the VCU Advisory Committee.

Value of continuing this project

To date, no comprehensive assessment of a community's response to the problem of family violence has been found. Considering the resources committed to providing services resulting from family violence, it is astonishing that this data does not exist at the aggregate state level. Without this data it is not possible to know whether our responses to this urgent and ubiquitous problem are working. It is also not possible to know what gaps exist in our response. This knowledge is essential if we are to be successful first mitigating and then ending family violence. We know that family violence is an inter-generational problem. Responding effectively and efficiently to a family currently experiencing family violence could result in not needing to provide additional services in the future, especially when there are children involved. Without assessing our community's response to the problem, we cannot make informed decisions that may facilitate effective and efficient system wide change.

Recommend further study on any public policy issues

Beginning this project, it was expected that there would be barriers to accessing meaningful data. Generally that has not been the case; most agencies have been very gracious in their willingness to participate and share the information that they have collected. A major barrier that was not expected that has emerged is the dearth of data collected at the aggregate level by the criminal justice response community. While it seems at this point in time that the data is probably available, collecting court outcomes data as well as law enforcement data as they relate to family violence could facilitate the Commonwealth's understanding of both the issue and our ability to hold individuals accountable for their actions. This data would facilitate the provision of more effective victims services, as systems are made more efficient based on the data collected. While it is hoped that the FACT Social Indicator Project will be able to access some of the data needed to understand these types of concerns, It is expected that continuing the FACT Social Indicator Project will provide insight into additional public policy concerns, beyond the need for additional data collection and analysis

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Taken separately the terms family and violence can have multiple meanings. Together, the terms create a concept that must be clearly defined in order to create an evaluation or assessment tool. In the professional literature, the term family violence dissipates after the early 1990s. The term continues to be used, however, in service provider communities, especially those who seek funding from FACT.

Definition of family violence

Prior to the Project, FACT funded a study of family violence completed by researchers from George Mason University (GMU). In the study (Davis, Ericson, Tompkins, & Raskin, 2005), a comprehensive literature review of the definition of family violence was compared to the findings from a survey conducted within the Commonwealth. The survey asked family violence stakeholders who had received FACT funding about their agencies' definition of family violence. The respondents reported that family included categories such as: marriage, blood relatives, foster families, and gay/lesbian partnerships. Additionally, family violence was reported to mean the abuse of power within relationships with intent to cause harm whether physical, emotional, or psychological. Respondents also identified the intergenerational transmission of violence as an important part of the concept. Examples of the dimensions of violence included: physical, sexual, or emotional maltreatment, a threatened act that causes harm, or the failure to act that causes injury.

Definitional consequences

Although there is not one definition used across the board regarding family violence, the findings of the GMU report indicate that the meaning of the term family violence is relatively consistent among service provider agencies within the Commonwealth, providing an understanding of the term for this project. Based on the definition of family violence identified by the FACT sponsored report (Davis, Ericson, Tompkins, & Raskin, 2005), much of what could be considered family violence is behavior that might never come to the attention of service providers. This creates a problem when trying to identify social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors. Family violence is often considered an iceberg issue; only a small percentage is brought to the attention of service providers. To provide a comprehensive report, it will be important to incorporate this fact in some fashion.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

At its inception, the Project was designed to explore the feasibility of creating a report card on the state of family violence in the Commonwealth. The report card was to be based on the social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors associated with family violence. Members of family violence stakeholder groups were interviewed and professional literature was consulted to determine which social indicators, risk and protective factors were the most salient in understanding the state of family violence. What emerged was the need to expand the scope of the report card. It became apparent that a one dimensional approach to understanding family violence would not provide a comprehensive picture. Service providers reported a plethora of data available at both the national and state level that documents the state of family violence. While this data is not currently available in one comprehensive report, participants reported being confident that they were aware of

the enormity of the problem of family violence. What they did not know, and the data that was not easily available to them, was how, as a community, the Commonwealth is responding to the problem of family violence. Consequently the scope of the Project was expanded to include the state of the Commonwealth's response to family violence.

The conceptual framework created to facilitate a comprehensive report of the state of family violence in the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence includes two major features: three distinct research content areas and the three communities that respond to the problem of family violence within our community. Assessing the level of family violence and the state of our response requires the inclusion of social indicators, risk and protective factors.

Three Research Content Areas

In the professional literature, the term family violence has been replaced with categories of more specific research content. These distinct areas of study are: child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, and elder abuse. Research in each of these unique content areas has provided information essential to identifying the types of violence and abuse experienced by individuals across the life span. Additionally, this research has helped service providers begin to understand how to respond to those who experience the specific problems within the research areas. While this division has been very helpful, the creation of a report card to holistically assess family violence requires the inclusion of all three content areas.

Three Response Communities

Responding to the problem of family violence has incorporated three separate yet integrated response communities: public social service providers, providers within the criminal justice system, and private non-profit service providers. A comprehensive report card will require the inclusion of data from all three stakeholder groups. Unfortunately, each stakeholder group collects data differently according to different needs, goals, and mandates.

Social service agencies are generally run by the Commonwealth, often within federal guidelines. Most of these services are provided to help those who have been harmed (or are at risk of being harmed). Examples of social service agencies are child protective services, adult protective services, and child welfare and family services. These services are also provided to individuals who experience harm caused by a nonfamily member. Data collected by these stakeholders are publicly available, although accessing the data is often challenging.

For over two decades, the criminal justice system has been how we have chosen to hold those who perpetrate violence within a family accountable for their actions. There are two segments of the criminal justice system that have data important to this project. The first is law enforcement; the second is the court system. While much of this data is public information, unfortunately, the data is not collected or maintained in the aggregate at the state level. Accessing the data also seems to be an issue.

Private community service providers include both non-profit and for profit organizations. Some of the organizations provide services to individuals who have experienced violence or abuse, such as local domestic violence shelters or therapeutic foster care agencies. Other community service providers provide services to individuals who have been accused of hurting others within a relationship. Batterer intervention programs and juvenile detention agencies are examples of this type of organization. Another type of community service provider would include organizations that operate at the state level to prevent violence and abuse. Examples of this type of organization would be the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance (Action Alliance) and Prevent

Child Abuse Now (PCAV). There are also organizations which provide a variety of local services combining prevention and response services, sometimes to the family as a unit such as Stop Child Abuse Now (SCAN).

Many community service provider agencies are often supported at least in part by grant money. This funding stream generally requires the submission of regular reports on the projects funded by the grants. Luckily in the Commonwealth, the Action Alliance already facilitates the collection of much of the data concerning domestic violence. Already in aggregate form, this data should be readily accessible. Additionally, a large funder of violence services, the department of criminal justice services (DCJS) has offered to provide the data collected from their grantees.

While data are available from all three stakeholder groups, it is not expected to be easily combined. A number of complicating factors will have to be dealt with in creating a comprehensive report. There is the potential that each organization within the stakeholder groups collects data that are unique. More likely is the possibility that each stakeholder group collects information deemed conceptually important, and is consequently collected across all stakeholder group members.

Social Indicators

Social indicators are measures of a social condition or behavior. Often reported as rates or percentages, social indicators are often used to describe a problem being targeted, identifying dimensions of the problem such as how many, of what kind, and how often. Once a measured, it is possible to benchmark, or set a level for, the current situation in order to compare it to possible changes over time. Social indicators are often used to monitor situations or problems, identifying trends that may be helpful in policy or funding decisions (GOSAP, 2007).

Social indicators identified through the professional literature and from interviews with stakeholders within the Commonwealth will be used to determine the types of data that should be considered in assessing the state of family violence and the Commonwealth's response. Availability of data will determine which social indicators are most useful to the Project. Additionally, it may be possible to compare the Commonwealth's data, especially prevalence type data, with national statistics to determine possible gaps in violence identified. (Please see appendix A for examples of social indicators within each research content area and for responding to family violence.)

Risk and Protective Factors

Risk factors are those things that increase the likelihood of a social problem. Protective factors are those that decrease the likelihood of social problem. Combining risk and protective factors with social indicators provides a richer more comprehensive understanding of social problems. Because of the division of family violence into the three research areas of child abuse/neglect, domestic violence, and elder abuse, there are different amounts of data concerning the identification of risk and protective factors for each category. A great deal of literature has been produced describing the risk and protective factors for child abuse/neglect. In stark contrast, very little research has been done identifying the risk and protective factors for domestic violence and elder abuse.

In the research content area of child abuse and neglect, the risk and protective factors are generally opposite experiences of the same event. For instance, education is considered both a risk and a protective factor depending on how it is experienced. For those who experience educational success, the event is considered a protective factor, for those who do not education (or the lack thereof) is a risk factor. It will be important for the

creation of the report card to identify which risk and protective factor data are available at the aggregate level for inclusion into the report card report.

Currently, work is being done to identify risk and protective factors for domestic violence. One challenge in identifying risk and protective factors is the concern among domestic violence service providers that such correlations may be used to blame victims. The World Health Organization (Harvey, Garcia-Moreno, Buchart, 2007) and the Center for Disease Control and prevention (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, n. d.) have begun to identify risk and protective factors associated with the perpetration of domestic violence. It is believed that shifting the focus from risk and protective factors for being harmed to those for committing the harm will facilitate more effective responses. Because this is new research, it is possible that the report card may be the first operationalization of these new ideas.

Concurrently, there is very little literature identifying risk and protective factors for elder abuse. The small amount of data that exists corresponds with the information provided by the participants regarding risk and protective factors for both experiencing and perpetrating elder abuse. Some of the risk and protective factors regarding both the experiencing and perpetrating elder abuse are very similar. These are generally linked to the intergenerational nature of the problem of family violence. Not much data is expected to be available, however the report card may be able to begin identifying areas where the collection of data could facilitate a better understanding of this research content area; an important dimension of the problem of family violence.

Identifying the risk and protective factors related to our communities' response has been relatively easy from the participants' vantage point. Likewise, current research identifies system level response risk and protective factors that seem to be very similar across the life span, incorporating all three of the research areas. Items suggested generally focus on policy issues regarding family violence response, integrated services, funding, and training for providers and policy makers. (Please see Appendix B for examples of risk and protective factors associated with responding to family violence.)

CONSORTIUM

While the planning and exploration phase of the Project identified social indicators, risk and protective factors that seem to be the most salient, the actual creation of the report card will be the responsibility of the Consortium. Members of this group are to be stakeholders in the family violence community, members of the academic advisory committee, and two FACT Board members. Because of the complexity of the conceptual framework that undergirds the Project, it is important to have members from all three response communities. It is also important to have members of the Consortium who are comfortable with interpreting data. As this first phase of the Project progressed, potential Consortium members were identified by the researcher according to expertise, interest, and critical thinking ability. These individuals were invited to a Consortium interest meeting in order to assess their interest, willingness, and requirements for being part of this important group. No members of the academic advising committee or FACT Board members were invited to the group in order to provide a safe space for open communication regarding the Project. This confidentiality was based on the potential for conflicts of interest between possible Consortium members, the academic advisory committee, and the FACT Board.

Membership

At the Consortium interest meeting, potential Consortium stakeholder members represented the Virginia Department of Social Services, The Central Virginia Task Force on Domestic Violence in Later Life, the Department of Criminal Justice Services, the Governor's Office on Substance Abuse Prevention and a few community service providers invited because of their expertise and interest in the Project. Two important stakeholders were, because of last minute conflicts, not able to attend the meeting. These stakeholders, the Virginia Domestic and Sexual Violence Action Alliance and the Child Advocacy Center, are still very interested in partnering with the other Consortium members to work on the Project. While multiple disciplines and response communities attended the Consortium interest meeting in September, there are still additional partners who should be added. One specific example is the Department of Education. There is the potential for the identification of other potential Consortium members as the Project moves forward. Additionally, all of the attendees at the September meeting were female. While this does represent the majority of service providers in the family violence response community, the inclusion of male perspectives is thought to be important to the final project.

Requirements

Most of the attendees at the September meeting were concerned about the amount of work involved in such a complex project. While they were all interested in being a part of the Project and in being members of the Consortium, there were concerns about agreeing to such an extensive endeavor. Specifically, one concern was the amount of time required to complete such a complex task. Participants shared that with the current economic situation, they were not sure how much time and resources they would be able to commit. Concurrently, other participants shared that if they, and their organization, committed to such a project, they would need to be assured that FACT would be consistent in their support of the Project. All of the participants agreed that creating a report card once or twice would not be a good use of resources, however continuing the process over a long period of time could provide some very important information. While recognizing that FACT is a quasi-governmental organization, having signed memos of understanding and written letters of the Board's intention would make a difference to those considering participation in the Project.

Additionally, concerns were voiced about the role of facilitator. While the researcher shared with the group that the recommendation would include a facilitator role, it was possible that the facilitator could be someone other than the researcher. An important aspect of the role of facilitator for the potential Consortium members was open and continuous communication between the FACT Board, the facilitator, and the Consortium. Although it is anticipated that two (2) members of the FACT Board will be part of the Consortium, it was important to those present at the meeting to know that the facilitator would also work to keep communication between the FACT Board and the Consortium open. This could be facilitated through bi-monthly update email or short update presentations to the FACT Board each quarter and to the Consortium after each FACT Board meeting.

One last area of concern raised was the use of the final report card. Participants wanted reassurance that the report card would be used for more than simply the Board's internal strategic planning. Although this was understood as an important aspect of the Project, potential members believed that this report would be very useful for both public awareness and policy advocacy work. Providing the report card report electronically, perhaps through the FACT Website would be one way to encourage the use of the findings. It seemed to be the opinion of the potential members that the amount of time and resources required for creating a quality project would only be worth-while if the report would be used to advocate for more resources to prevent and respond to the social problem of family violence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognizing the difficult economic situations that many family violence community response stakeholders are now facing within their agencies, it is recommended that this project moves forward incrementally. Phase two of the Project will result in the completion and presentation of a report card that assesses the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence. The third stage of the Project will result in the completion and presentation of a comprehensive report card including both the assessment of the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence and an assessment of the state of family violence within the Commonwealth.

It is recommended that assessing the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence is completed first as the social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors transcend the three research content areas. Because the data is at the systems level, it is believed that this data will be more accessible. Additionally, in order to work together well, time will be necessary for the creation and cohesion of the Consortium. Requiring the completion of this less complicated stage before moving to more challenging work may facilitate the Consortium's development. It may also provide the Consortium an opportunity to cultivate mechanisms for making difficult decisions.

Consortium Plan

Phase two should begin as early in January, 2009 as possible, and will end the summer of 2010 with the presentation of the first report card at the FACT Biannual Conference. The Consortium should meet every other month for at least 3 hours. The meetings should be facilitated by a paid consultant, who will be responsible for maintaining communication between the Consortium and the FACT Board, preparing agendas, taking notes, and completing tasks as identified by the Consortium. This facilitator will also be responsible for Consortium group process and the creation of the report card based on decisions and input from the Consortium.

The first six months of phase 2 will include the creation of the Consortium. It is recommended that individuals and agencies that have already participated in the planning stage be contacted and invited to the first Consortium meeting. Additional participation and memberships should be determined based on project need. Consortium membership should be finalized no later than the second meeting of the Consortium in March, 2009.

After the completion of Consortium membership, social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors will need to be identified and agreed upon based on the conceptual framework and the accessibility of data. Additionally, a report card structure will have to be agreed upon by the Consortium. These two processes are not expected to be completed before December, 2009. The last six months of phase 2 will include the creation of the first report card report. This report will be presented at the FACT Conference the summer of 2010.

Phase three of the FACT Social Indicator Project is expected to begin immediately after the presentation of the first report card report and end with the presentation of the first comprehensive report card report. This report will include an assessment of the Commonwealth's response to family violence as well as an assessment of the state of family violence within the Commonwealth. It is expected that the identification of social indicators, risk factors and protective factors along with access the available data will require a full year of Consortium work; primarily because of the complexity of the conceptual framework. This process should be completed by December 2011. Because the structure of the report will already have been created, the first comprehensive report card report should be available by the summer of 2012, being presented at the FACT Biannual Conference. This comprehensive report will include both the assessments of both the state of family violence within the Commonwealth and the state of the Commonwealth's response to the problem of family violence.

After the presentation of the comprehensive report, the Consortium can begin to meet once a quarter, as the groundwork will already exist for the continued updating of the report card. It is expected that the report card can be presented every two years at the FACT Biannual Conference, providing a state-of-the-art look at family violence within the Commonwealth. (Please see Appendix C for the plan timeline.)

Selection of social indicators/ Risk & Protective Factors

While some social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors have already been identified by the researcher, it should be left to the Consortium to determine the final data used for the report card report. Choosing the data to be used in the report should be based on both the conceptual framework provided to the Consortium as well as on the data available. Additionally, the Consortium facilitator should stay current on the professional literature regarding social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors. Significant changes in the professional literature should be represented.

Availability of data

Much of the data identified through the exploration process of this project is publically available, although not necessarily accessible. Many of the stakeholders contacted for this project were willing to share data if they are able to access their organization's data, which is often a challenge. There are some community stakeholders who are very willing to share any and all data that they collect. In many instances, their data collection tool has been provided to the researcher so that items can be identified and requested. Some of the data explored are available in published reports. Those data are readily accessible, but may not be exactly what the Consortium prefers. It may be that decisions regarding social indicators, risk factors, and protective factors are influenced by what is available.

Even under these conditions, there is value in compiling the data for one report, and in assessing both the state of family violence in the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth's response to the problem. This process will provide needed information to service providers as well as to policy makers and grant funders. It is impossible to make informed decisions without data. Currently, at least at the aggregate state level, there is a dearth of information on which to base policy, funding, and strategic decisions.

Gaps in data

Surprisingly, there is a lot of data not collected at the aggregate level at this time. If it is collected, however, it is often not made public. It may be that the most important finding of the report card will be a lot of incomplete grades – we don't know and can't tell how well we are responding as a community because the data is not collected in a way that helps us to know. Concurrently, it may be that the dearth of aggregate data in regards to the state of family violence in the Commonwealth points to a gap in identifying family violence that occurs.

Use of the report card reports

Making the report card report available at the FACT biannual conference will accomplish a number of important objectives. First the presentation of the report will bring needed awareness to both the problem of family violence in the Commonwealth and the importance of FACT. The report itself will be useful in the promotion of public policies based on real data. More directly, the reports will provide insight and clarity for funding decisions made by the FACT Board and other funding organizations. The data provided will make possible strategic decisions based on the identification of what services are making a difference, what information is still not available, and the gaps in our service provision community.

CONCLUSION

Importance of project

It is important to note that an assessment of a community's response to the problem of family violence has not been found elsewhere. While there are numerous report card reports available, they are generally focused on one of the research content areas identified in this conceptual model. The integration of the three research content areas is a logical framework considering the inter-generational nature of this problem. Research conducted in the three content areas individually has provided important insight and knowledge about responding at the individual level. Research that crosses the content area boundaries will be able to provide a more holistic understanding of ways to mitigate the current problem as well as ways to intervene to prevent future family violence.

What is currently needed is research conducted at the systems level to demonstrate the deficiencies of our system. Especially in difficult economic times, data regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the system can facilitate wise strategic spending and policy advocacy. Only when we become aware of the gaps within our system will it be possible to work towards closing them.

REFERENCES

- Center for Disease Control and Prevention (n.d.). *Intimate Partner Violence Prevention Scientific Information: Risk and Protective Factors*. Retrieved July 13, 2008, from: http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/dvp/IPV/ipv-risk_protective.htm
- Davis, M.E., Ericson, C., Tompkins, C., Raskin, M. (2005). *Family Violence Social Indicators Project*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Governor's Office for Substance Abuse Prevention (2007). *The GOSAP social indicator project: Collaborating with Data to Enhance Virginia's Prevention Efforts*. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://www.gosap.governor.virginia.gov/Powerpoint/The_GOSAP_Social_Indicators_Project.ppt
- Harvey, A., Garcia-Moreno, C., Buchart, A. (2007). *Primary Prevention of Intimate-Partner Violence and Sexual Violence: Background Paper for WHO Expert Meeting*. World Health Organization. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from: http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/violence/IPV-SV.pdf

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL INDICATORS *(BEGINNING LIST)*

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

- Number of runaways
- Number of founded CPS reports
- Founded cases of child abuse/neglect
- Number of infant deaths as related to family violence
- Suicide rates as related to family violence

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

- Reports of domestic violence
- Suicide rates as related to family violence
- Murder rates as related to family violence
- Number of domestic calls to police

ELDER ABUSE

- Founded cases of elder abuse as related to family violence
- Murder rates as related to family violence
- Suicide as related to family violence

RESPONDING TO FAMILY VIOLENCE

- Foster care placements
- Domestic violence shelter beds provided
- Certified Nursing Assistants for older adults
- Number of protective orders issued
- Number of supervised parental visitations
- Current numbers vs. national rates of service provision

APPENDIX B

RISK AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS *(BEGINNING LIST)*

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Poverty

Parental employment

Substance abuse education/prevention

Adequate housing

Single parent households

Exposure to violence

Substance misuse

Poor family connectedness

Age of mother at birth

Age of child

Homelessness

Adult supervision

Academic achievement

Social support

Safe & supportive Schools

Dropout prevention programs

Substance abuse prevention programs

Parenting knowledge

Mentoring relationships

Adult role models

Continues

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

- Feelings of entitlement
- Rigid gender roles
- Exposure to violence
- Lack of empathy
- Inconsistent community sanctions
- Depression
- Social promotion of violence
- Poverty
- Poor school performance
- Academic achievement
- Power differentials within community (isms)
- Poor family functioning

ELDER ABUSE

- Behavior Problems
- Financial dependence
- Emotional difficulties
- Substance abuse
- Family conflict
- Mental/emotional difficulties
- History of abuse
- Social isolation
- Gaps in available care
- Poor past relationship with care giver or care recipient
- No consistent health care provider

Continues

RESPONDING TO FAMILY VIOLENCE

- Lack of or inadequate social policies
- Lack of integrated services
- Lack of or inadequate funding
- Lack of or inadequate training for service providers/policy makers
- Prevention programs
- Coordinated response
- No wrong door policies
- Collaborative meetings and events across stakeholder disciplines
- Cross-training between disciplines and stakeholder groups
- Relationship building exercises between service providers
- Policy maker training
- Collaborated data collection and dissemination

APPENDIX C

PHASE 2

JANUARY 2009

- ❖ Consortium bi-monthly meetings begin
 - Quarterly meetings scheduled
 - Goals/objectives identified
 - Group process addressed
 - Decision making process
 - Communication process
 - Roles/expectations discussed
 - Membership gaps identified
 - Research content areas represented
 - Community and agency stakeholders identified for invitation

MARCH 2009

- ❖ Second bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Finalization of membership
 - Group process re-addressed (new members)
 - Goals/objectives identified
 - Discussion of types of data to be used as related to response to family violence
 - Social indicators
 - Risk/Protective factors

MAY 2009

- ❖ Third bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Continued discussion re: social indicators, risk factors, protective factors
 - Discussion of data availability
 - What data are available where

Continues

JULY 2009

- ❖ Fourth bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Identification of response factors
 - Discussion re: how data will be collated
 - Continued discussion re: social indicators, risk factors, protective factors
 - Discussion of data availability
 - What data are available where
 - Who can access

SEPTEMBER 2009

- ❖ Fifth bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Identification of data accessed
 - Identification of what is still needed – who can help
 - Report Card style discussed
 - Assessment process
 - Presentation style

NOVEMBER 2009

- ❖ Sixth bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Identification of data accessed
 - Identification of what is still needed – who can help
 - Continued discussion re: report card style
 - Assessment process
 - Presentation style

JANUARY 2010

- ❖ Seventh bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Identification of data accessed
 - Working session: creating the report card

Continues

MARCH 2010

- ❖ Eighth bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Identification of data accessed
 - Working session: creating the report card

MAY 2010

- ❖ Tenth bi-monthly Consortium meeting
 - Completion of report card report
 - Drafts shared for revision

SUMMER 2010

- ❖ Presentation of first FACT Report Card of the Commonwealth's Response to Family Violence

Continues

PHASE 3

AUGUST 2010

- ❖ First bi-monthly meeting of phase 2
 - Discussion of Report Card Presentation
 - Discussion/planning for second phase
 - Meetings scheduled, etc

OCTOBER 2010 – DECEMBER 2011

- ❖ Continued bi-monthly meetings
 - Identification of social indicators, risk and protective factors for all 3 research content areas
 - Accessing available data

JANUARY 2012 – MAY 2010

- ❖ Continued bi-monthly meetings
 - Creation of comprehensive report card

SUMMER 2012

- ❖ Presentation of first comprehensive FACT Report Card

SUMMER 2012

- ❖ Presentation of first comprehensive FACT Report Card

SEPTEMBER 2012 - ONGOING

- ❖ Quarterly meetings to continue updating data