

Final Report on the Formative Evaluation of the Violence Prevention Initiative

Prepared for:
Evaluation Advisory Committee
Violence Prevention Initiative

Prepared by:
Goss Gilroy Inc.
in association with:
Institute for Human Resource Development
Bobbie Boland
Don Gallant and Associates

March 28, 2004

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Chapter 1 - Introduction	Page 1
Overview of the Violence Prevention Initiative	Page 1
VPI in context	Page 2
VPI framework	Page 3
Organizational structure	Page 3
Funding	Page 5
Evaluation approach	Page 5
Chapter 2 - Findings	Page 7
Overall assessment	Page 7
VPI Framework	Page 8
VPI structure and roles/relationships	Page 9
Planning and accountability	Page 14
Resources	Page 17
Violence Awareness and Action Training (VAAT)	Page 18
Communications	Page 18
VPI progress to date	Page 20
Violence prevention outcomes	Page 25
Chapter 3 - Research and Data Analysis	Page 27
Chapter 4 - Recommendations	Page 35
Conclusion	Page 40

Annex A:	VPI Guidelines and Terms of Reference
Annex B:	Research Questions
Annex C:	List of Key Informants
Annex D:	Highlights of Accomplishments
Annex E:	Documents Reviewed

Executive Summary

Overview

The evaluation of the Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI) in Newfoundland and Labrador was commissioned by the Women's Policy Office. It was carried out by Goss Gilroy Inc. in association with the Institute for Human Resource Development, Bobbie Boland, and Don Gallant and Associates.

The evaluation is intended to be a midterm study of the design, implementation and activities of the VPI that will assess implementation, identify strengths and areas for improvement. The report focusses on process and organizational issues, with a preliminary look at outputs and short-term outcomes.

VPI is a five-year, multi-departmental, government-community partnership designed to find solutions to the problems of violence against those most at risk in our society - women, children, the elderly, and other vulnerable people who are at risk because of their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability. The initiative's vision is that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will live in safe, caring communities where there is inherent respect for each other and violence is unacceptable. The \$2.5 million funding allocated to the program builds upon the work of the Provincial Strategy Against Violence - Towards the Year 2000.

The initiative is co-ordinated by the Women's Policy Office and its organizational structure consists of a Committee of Ministers, a Provincial Co-ordinating Committee (PCC) and six Regional Co-ordinating Committees (RCCs).

Evaluation approach

Information was gathered through a number of sources, including: key informant interviews with representatives of VPI government and community partners and other stakeholders, which was the key source of information; attendance at selected committee meetings; a document review; and a data and research review.

Findings

Overall Finding

The evaluation found that VPI represents an evolving relationship between government and community on an important and complex societal issue. There is a good deal of effort being expended to develop and implement the VPI; both successes and challenges have been experienced as one would expect in an initiative of this scope.

A number of aspects of VPI have helped with implementation including: the profile attained through the dedicated resources; building on the learnings from the previous Strategy, the establishment of

committee structures and linkages, the expertise brought to the table, commitment and effort of government and community, progress in developing and implementing violence awareness training (VAAT), and early successes in collaboration.

A number of structural and process issues are impeding implementation of VPI, including: differences in perspectives among partners on the issue of violence and its root causes and solutions, lack of senior level leadership, inadequate funding, a collaborative process that is not fully developed, limited integration of the issue in mainstream policy development, and mutual lack of recognition of contributions made by all partners to the Initiative.

VPI Framework

The principles, goals and objectives provide a suitable framework that is more focussed than that of the previous Strategy; collectively, these signal government's commitment to the issue. However, this commitment has not been followed through with government-wide ownership and strategic-level action.

Policy development and action is seen as falling short of the standards set out in the framework. Those key informants who have a long standing involvement in violence prevention see the underlying cause for this as being a relative lack of understanding within government of the root causes of violence. Effective collaboration is being impeded by different perspectives on the grounding of the VPI in a gender-based analysis. Finding common ground on this issue is essential to moving VPI forward.

Structure, roles and relationships

VPI is founded on the principle of collaborative relationships that meet both government and community needs and expectations, and which build on their respective strengths and expertise. These relationships, while improving, are considered to be fragile. Senior level leadership and direction, starting with the Ministers' Committee and trickling down, are perceived as being weak. Additionally, not all members of the VPI partnership bring the required expertise and understanding of the issue that are needed for effective collaboration. Certain vulnerable groups are not included in the VPI process. The role of the Women's Policy Office is considered to be particularly challenging, with responsibility for balancing the government and community interests and facilitating collaboration with limited authority.

The PCC is seen as being helpful for learning the respective roles of community and government, but there are concerns that the collaboration is not yet solution-oriented. Similarly, collaboration between the PCC and RCCs could be improved upon.

Planning and accountability

Early in the development of VPI, an Anti-Violence Policy Framework was developed as the basis for priority setting and action plans. The annual planning process appropriately set out measurable

and doable actions as part of the broader solutions proposed in the framework. However, it appears that the link back to the broad policies is being lost in some of the key departments. There has not been substantial progress in integrating violence prevention into the strategic and operational plans of partner departments (this was a central objective of VPI), nor have mechanisms been established that would allow for community and client input on policy and procedural planning. A lack of resources on the part of both government and community partners is the key constraint to these management mechanisms being implemented.

Resources

Government is recognized for its overall support of the VPI and its commitment to developing a partnership approach with community. However, the goal of large scale social change envisaged far exceeds the modest investment in VPI in terms of human and financial resources. Most RCCs see the expectations of them as being out of proportion to their resources. There are also concerns about inequities in funding among RCCs. The overriding concern is with the sustainability of effort over time.

Violence Awareness and Action Training

This is a key VPI initiative that is supported by a majority of partners. However, there are issues with the current implementation approach that will likely undermine its sustainability and effectiveness. Concerns center on design and implementation, with the major weakness being the absence of a quality assurance role at the provincial level.

Communications

The networking that occurs at the PCC and RCCs has helped with building relationships and linkages, and these have helped improve coordination at the service delivery level. The complexity of the VPI network, and the need to communicate beyond this to partner organizations, requires a finely tuned communications strategy that is not now fully developed.

The VPI has helped with delivery of public awareness activities at the regional level. Province-wide communication activities have been limited due to resource issues and a lack of consensus on actions.

Progress to date

A number of diverse policy initiatives have been implemented by departments that reflect the strategic objectives of VPI to different degrees. One of the most frequently cited initiatives was the policy review conducted by Human Resources and Employment - *Moving Forward: Responding to the Needs of Victims of Violence*. This government-community collaboration was effective and subsequently documented by VPI in *Collaborating with Community*. The intent is that it will inform collaborative practices more widely across government. The *Safe and Caring Schools* initiative of the Department of Education was a second major initiative that has been developed and implemented

since VPI in response to the growing problem of bullying.

On the two main goals of VPI there has been some limited progress. Overall, the VPI process has not addressed coordination of services and programs in any substantial and sustained way. Policy reviews carried out to date have mainly focussed on services to victims, with violence prevention being addressed mainly through public awareness activities.

Research and data analysis

The report recommends diverting any planned funding for a final summative evaluation into finding ways to strengthen the integration of VPI into the planning and accountability process of government. A facilitated reflective process involving partners is recommended at the conclusion of VPI instead of an independent evaluation. The nature and scope of VPI would make it difficult to track and attribute broader societal change to this initiative alone.

Recommendations

The report recommends both immediate actions to take VPI forward and longer-term processes to develop an appropriate policy response and process to succeed VPI when its mandate ends in 2005.

Short-term recommendations focussed on strengthening the collaborative relationships of VPI partners; approaches to include the broader community; capacity building assistance for RCCs; provision of dedicated administrative support resources; strengthening the governance policies of the PCC; and a stocktaking of VAAT.

Longer-term recommendations addressed further enhancements to PCC governance; stronger planning processes; seeking federal partnerships; and examination of the structure and resource levels as part of any post-VPI planning.

Conclusion

Our overall conclusions are that the VPI is an encouraging initiative in that it attempts to bring government departments together, and also to forge meaningful links between government and community in addressing a key social policy issue, namely violence. There are a number of committed individuals and organizations which share a common interest in terms of addressing this issue. The structures have been established to support regional activities as well as to address broad provincial policies and actions.

However, The VPI is in need of reform in order to achieve its aims. To fulfill the long-term vision shared by all informants, an imbedded, ongoing effort is required. To ensure the level of functioning required to sustain this vision, structural enhancements are needed at this time.

C hapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the findings and recommendations from an evaluation of the Violence Prevention Initiative conducted by Goss Gilroy Inc., with the Institute for Human Resource Development, Bobbie Boland and Don Gallant and Associates. The report is organized as follows:

- This introductory chapter which provides an overview of the VPI and the evaluation approach;
- Chapter 2 which contains the qualitative findings organized by key elements of the VPI;
- Chapter 3 which contains what was learned from a review of existing data and research related to violence and violence prevention to inform the current evaluation and provide guidance on data for the summative evaluation.
- Chapter 4 which contains the proposed actions for remainder of the VPI mandate period.

Overview of the Violence Prevention Initiative

VPI is a five-year (April 2000 to March 2005), multi-departmental, government-community partnership designed to find solutions to the problem of violence against those most at risk in our society - women, children, the elderly, and other vulnerable people who are at risk because of their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability. The VPI vision is that the people of our province will live in safe, caring communities where there is an inherent respect for each other and violence is unacceptable. VPI is allocated \$2.25 million in funding over the five-year period.

The VPI Terms of Reference (excerpt included in Annex A) sets out two goals for working towards this vision:

- *Improved co-ordination and delivery of services and programs by government departments and agencies with violence-related mandates.* The intent is to integrate violence prevention into the strategic and operational plans of partner departments, and to establish accountability mechanisms that allow for input by clients and community on policy and procedures related to violence prevention. It is also intended that participation in various committees, i.e., the Provincial Co-ordinating Committee (PCC), the Regional Co-ordinating Committees (RCCs) and other related committees, will improve co-ordination across the various departments and agencies who provide services to victims of violence.
- *Enhanced community and government capacity to co-ordinate and promote violence prevention.* The allocation of financial resources to RCCs is intended to enable them to

build upon their volunteer efforts within the community. These regional committees have the prerogative to establish their own terms of reference and operating guidelines. They are to provide leadership at the regional level on public awareness, needs identification, and community participation in violence prevention.

The expected outcomes of this coordination and promotion of violence prevention are improved services to victims of violence and a reduction in the incidence of violence.

VPI in context

VPI builds upon the work of the *Provincial Strategy Against Violence - Towards the Year 2000*. This was a five-year initiative of the provincial government (April 1995 - March 2000) which had twin goals of prevention and service delivery. This Strategy had been developed following a long period of preliminary discussion and consultation in order to better formulate government's and community's response to violence in Newfoundland and Labrador society.

The Provincial Strategy Against Violence followed almost three decades of developments led by the violence prevention movement across the province. Over this long history, many individuals and organizations worked towards a vision of an equitable and peaceful society. This history is captured in *A Newfoundland and Labrador Legacy, Striving Toward an Equitable and Peaceful Society, Commemorating Thirty Years of Our Endeavours 1972 -2002*. Produced by Health and Community Services with the Women's Policy Office as a VPI initiative, it was intended to harness the lessons learned from the past efforts, and to help build a common understanding of the context for VPI among government and community partners.

At the conclusion of the Provincial Strategy Against Violence, there was recognition of the need for the effort to continue in some form, which was announced by government as VPI. VPI differs from the Strategy in several respects:

- *Focus*: The Strategy focussed on development and delivery of violence prevention and education activities and a wide range of services. VPI is based on a broad vision of improving services and reducing violence, but has adopted a more limited focus on improving coordination of existing programs and services within government and enhancing the capacity of government and community to coordinate services and promote violence prevention. The VPI annual action planning process is designed to focus specific actions towards the broader goals.
- *Engagement of community*: Community organizations were consulted throughout the Strategy and had a link to the WPO through the community liaison coordinator. However, the management committee and coordinating team for the strategy were comprised of government representatives only, and this was noted as a weakness in the evaluation of the

strategy.¹ VPI includes community representatives on both the provincial and regional coordinating committees, and both these committees are tasked with providing leadership for the VPI.

- *Resourcing:* The Strategy called for each department to allocate one quarter of a person year to participate as coordinating team members; the evaluation noted that team members were not freed up as planned. WPO had two full-time staff (who were recognized as having strong roots in the women's community), and a contract position for training development. All regions had coordinating committees in place by 1998, but these received no operating funds for work on the Strategy.

VPI has a full-time provincial manager, with limited research, communications and administrative support being provided by other shared WPO staff. External contractors have been engaged for specific projects, such as training development and this current evaluation. The six regional committees receive an annual grant through an agreement with the provincial government. Each regional committee has hired a coordinator.

VPI framework

The framework for VPI is set out in three key documents:

- *Violence Prevention Initiative - an Anti-Violence Policy Framework* (September 2001), which was started as part of the previous Strategy. This sets out the context for policy development in departments, with a focus on the high level issues/objectives in each of the policy sectors;
- the *Violence Prevention Initiative Guidelines and Terms of Reference* (October 2000), which set out the purpose and structure, as well as the roles of committees and parties;
- *Provincial Coordinating Committee - Violence Prevention Initiative Operating Principles and Guidelines*, which was developed at a PCC planning retreat in March 2002. This documents consensus reached on roles and process to address concerns about the VPI and PCC at that point in development of this partnership.

Organizational structure

Overall co-ordination for VPI is provided by the Women's Policy Office. The VPI organizational structure includes:

Committee of Ministers

¹*Evaluation of the Strategy Against Violence*, Institute for Human Resource Development, Goss Gilroy Inc., Bobbie Boland, June 2000.

- the Ministers of Justice, Education, Human Resources and Employment, Health and Community Services, Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs, Youth Services and Post-Secondary Education, and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women who serves as Chair;
- Secretariat support provided by the Assistant Deputy Minister, Women's Policy Office and the Manager, VPI.

Provincial Co-ordinating Committee

- Manager, VPI who serves as Chair;
- a representative from each of the six regional co-ordinating committees;
- a senior level representative from each of the Departments of Justice, Human Resources and Employment, Health and Community Services, Education, Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs, Youth Services and Post-Secondary Education, Strategic Social Planning Unit, and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation; and Women's Policy Office;
- a representative from the Provincial Association Against Family Violence, the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Citizen's Crime Prevention Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Seniors Resource Centre.

Regional Co-ordinating Committees

Six committees (RCCs) are located in Labrador, Northern, Western, Central, Eastern and St. John's and Eastern Avalon regions. These are incorporated, not-for-profit entities, comprised of government and community representatives. Each committee has an annual agreement with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and receives an annual grant of \$45,000.

These committees existed as autonomous community-based organizations prior to the VPI, and developed uniquely to address local or regional priorities in violence prevention. Since VPI these remain as autonomous entities, with the annual agreement setting out obligations to the VPI, which may be in addition to other activities they undertake. Most have increased their regional 'reach' since VPI, through assisting in the formation of a network of local committees (again, some local committees were in place before VPI).

Five have hired a full-time paid co-ordinator, and one coordinator shares her time between VPI duties and those of executive director of a transition house. To various degrees, RCCs have leveraged resources from government and community, including in kind assistance with space and operations, and funding for specific projects.

Ad hoc committees and departmental sub-committees

- These may be established under the Initiative to deal with specific issues or policy development. These may be established by the ADM, Women's Policy Office or on the recommendation of the PCC.

Funding

The overall five-year budget for VPI is \$2.25 million. \$250,000 was allocated for year one and \$500,000 for each of the four subsequent years.

In the current fiscal year ending March 31, 2004, approximately 60% of the funds are allocated to grants to community agencies, i.e., the six RCCs, the Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre, and the Provincial Association Against Family Violence. The remaining 40% of the budget has been allocated to government salaries, administration, facilitation costs, advertising, evaluation, research projects, PCC meeting expenses, and costs associated with the Violence Awareness and Action Training (VAAT).

Evaluation approach

This evaluation is a mid-term study of the design, implementation and activities of the VPI. The report is intended to provide an assessment of implementation, and to identify strengths and areas for improvement. As identified in the Terms of Reference, the focus is on process and organizational issues, with a preliminary look at outputs and short-term outcomes.

The key sources of information were: a document review, key informant interviews, meetings with committees, and review of VPI data and research, as well as other related research on violence.

Document review - this consisted of a review of relevant VPI material, including policy documents, funding proposals and agreements, workplans, quarterly and year-end reports, documents on data and specific initiatives.

Key informant interviews - this was the key source of information to address the evaluation questions. The evaluation framework set out 28 research questions (see Annex B). Interview questions were developed for each of these, and separate guides developed tailored to five groups: VPI manager and coordinators, Chairs of RCCs, partners, Deputy Ministers, and other community organizations (who were not part of VPI). In all, 78 individuals were interviewed either individually or jointly with another key informant (a total of 69 interviews were conducted). 80% (58) were conducted in person, with the remainder by telephone.

Key informants included:

- Manager, VPI

- RCC co-ordinators
- RCC chairs, co-chairs or members of Executive
- Partners (Members of the PCC and departmental/community representatives on the RCCs)
- Deputy Ministers
- Other community organizations with an interest in violence prevention
- Other government departments and agencies who are not members of VPI

Key informants were selected from among RCCs and other government/community organizations to provide an appropriate cross section of perspectives, with consideration given to the mix of departments/agencies involved, the varied vulnerable groups VPI is designed to address, and geographic dispersion.

The list of key informants is included at Annex C.

Committee meetings - evaluators attended a number of regularly scheduled committee meetings for the purpose of observing the VPI process at work. In total, we observed at a PCC teleconference meeting, three RCC quarterly meetings (Central, Western and Labrador), and one local committee meeting (Grand Falls- Windsor).

Data and research review - The data and research review was intended to provide an assessment of the overall focus of VPI and progress in addressing key issues, as well as to inform the data gathering and analysis approach for the summative evaluation. WPO provided a number of VPI surveys and other research documents, as well as departmental data on violence-related services and specific VPI initiatives. The data and research were reviewed to identify the major violence issues and problems indicated in the data, select baseline indicators for these, determine the extent to which individual VPI initiatives respond to these major issues (and the progress being made), and to propose methods of measuring progress in addressing these major issues in a summative evaluation.

Chapter 2

FINDINGS

In this section, we set out the findings, with each followed by supporting analysis. The findings are organized as follows:

8. An overall assessment
9. VPI policy framework
10. VPI structure and roles / relationships
11. Planning and accountability
12. Resources
13. Violence Awareness and Action Training (VAAT)
14. Communications
15. VPI progress to date
16. VPI outcomes

17. Overall assessment

VPI is the current form of an evolving government-community working relationship on an important and complex societal issue that has implications for many government policy sectors. As an evolving process, there is a good deal of effort being expended to develop and implement VPI, some issues being experienced, and some successes that could inform future actions.

The following summary of the strengths and weaknesses in VPI identified through this review provide a context for considering the more specific findings that follow. The following strengths of VPI have helped with implementation:

- the profile given to this issue through a dedicated initiative with resources;
- building on what was learned from past efforts, in particular the Provincial Strategy Against Violence;
- the structure and process for government and community collaboration through the various VPI committees and linkages among committees;
- the expertise that VPI brings to the table on both violence prevention and the policy development process of government;
- the continued effort and commitment of government and community to develop an approach that will result in meaningful and value-added work being done towards the VPI goals;

- progress made on developing and implementing the VAAT which responds to an identified need in building capacity for violence prevention work;
- some early successes in government-community collaboration, in building community capacity in promotion of violence prevention, and in coordination of communications of the violence prevention message.

A number of structural and process issues are impeding implementation of the VPI. These include:

- Perception among some partners of a general lack of understanding of the roots of violence, which is seen as impacting on the commitment to act on significant policy development;
- Lack of senior level leadership and engagement in VPI to set the stage for departmental action;
- A funding level for VPI that falls short of the fundamental policy changes needed and desired;
- A bureaucratic process that is not leading to the high level of collaboration intended (particularly at the PCC), and not appropriate to the resources allocated for VPI;
- Government structures and resource allocations that inhibit integration of the violence issue in mainstream policy development;
- Mutual lack of recognition of the contributions by government and community to VPI;
- Weaknesses with the Violence Awareness and Action Training design and implementation.

18. VPI Framework

Overall Finding: The VPI principles, goals, and objectives are generally considered to provide the right framework to reduce violence and improve services to victims, and are seen as an important commitment by government to working with community on a complex societal issue.

The VPI framework, which sets out the principles, goals, objectives and structure is more focussed than that of the previous Strategy. VPI is seen as an important and appropriate commitment by government. The majority of key informants supported this framework as something to work towards. However, almost all noted challenges to implementation that have constrained progress.

Finding: The commitment as set out in the framework has not been followed through with government-wide ownership and action at the strategic level set out in the VPI policy framework. This is perceived to be due to a relative lack of understanding of the roots of violence among policy makers.

The level of policy development and action fall short of the standards set in the framework. This in turn has led to limited priority being placed on resources for the development and implementation of responsive policies, and difficulties in developing the collaborative role with key provincial organizations on this issue. An underlying cause is seen by some key informants who have a long

standing involvement in violence prevention as being due to the relative lack of understanding within government of the causes of violence. We concur with this opinion.

Finding: There are differences in the perspectives of various partners on the ‘grounding’ of violence, which creates a barrier to effective collaboration.

A fundamental issue raised by a number of VPI community partners is the perceived absence of recognition or grounding of the VPI in a gender-based analysis of the issue of violence. This sets the VPI apart from the previous Strategy, which was seen to have this grounding. Other key informants from within community and government felt that there is too much emphasis on gender inequality, to the exclusion of other vulnerable groups. This difference in perspectives is creating an undercurrent to the relationships among parties. It will be important to bridge this fundamental gap and find common ground in order to move the VPI process forward.

19. VPI structure and roles/relationships

VPI is essentially a process of developing collaborative relationships among the various partners to ensure that policies and programs are the right ones delivered in the right way, for violence prevention and services to survivors of violence. The VPI structure is important to developing these relationships. We have noted a number of weaknesses in the current structure that impede collaboration. The findings on structure and roles/relationships together are inter-related, and presented below.

Finding: The VPI structure at the provincial level is not providing the leadership needed for the complex policy issues to be addressed.

Senior level leadership and direction on VPI are missing. The ministers’ committee does not meet regularly. The meetings, when they do occur, are internal to government with no community representation, even for part of the meetings. There is no VPI forum to engage Deputy Ministers with community representatives.

A majority of key informants felt this leadership gap weakens the direction being provided to departments on the priority to be given to the VPI. This in turn is weakening the level of action by departments.

Finding: The selection process for PCC members has not always resulted in representatives with the expertise and authority to carry out the work of this committee. It is our conclusion that this undermines the committee’s effectiveness in collaborating on complex policy issues.

Ideally, the PCC would bring together representatives of departments and community organizations with expertise in violence prevention and the decision-making authority to play the leadership role required. In short, the committee *form* would follow the intended *function*. Not all members of the PCC bring the expertise and understanding of the violence prevention issue required to carry out the

high level leadership, policy development, and critical analysis roles set out for this committee. This makes it difficult to develop the mutually respectful working relationships that are needed to move the process from accounting and critique to collaboration. There is an underlying challenge to selecting members with both the competency and level of authority desired, from government and from community. There is a similar challenge at the RCC level.

Weaknesses in the selection process for PCC members contributes to this situation. Selection criteria for this committee have not been developed, although these have been discussed. Guidance on the competencies and authority that individuals should bring to this committee, and the role they will be expected to perform at the committee and within their organizations would be helpful. (Examples of competencies could include knowledge of violence issues and their root causes, interest in the policy area, understanding of the policy development process.)

Finding: The VPI is not inclusive of all the groups that experience violence.

VPI brings community organizations to the table, and provides funding for capacity building - both were recommended in the evaluation of the forerunner Strategy.

The initial design of VPI did not include provincial level organizations in the PCC. This was a major weakness in the VPI design, as it excluded the expertise of a number of key groups that deal with vulnerable populations, and which have shown leadership on violence prevention in the past. This exclusion is an indication of the relative lack of understanding of the violence prevention issue and its solutions within government. In some respects, the development of mutual trust has been hampered by this initial decision. While four such groups are now members of the PCC, it was noted by several key informants that their role has not yet been clarified - in terms of responsibilities and accountabilities.

There are other groups who are not at the table. Key informants identified children, seniors, persons with disabilities, gays and lesbians, aboriginals, those with mental health concerns, immigrants and abusers as groups whose needs are not well met through the VPI (although seniors do have representation at the PCC). A number of organizations representing vulnerable groups who are not on the PCC were interviewed; they were either unfamiliar with VPI or were more familiar with the previous Strategy. WPO had written letters of invitation to the VPI process to some provincial organizations with limited response and has made efforts to keep them informed about progress. A different approach to engaging them is warranted.

Finding: The role of the Women's Policy Office is particularly challenging, with responsibility for balancing the government and community interests and facilitating collaboration with limited authority. The current structure and resource level does not match the expectations for this role.

Many key informants noted the complex and often conflicting responsibilities of the WPO as the coordinating organization for the VPI. The WPO does not have line authority over departments, rather their authority stems from their capacity to influence. The role of the provincial manager is

seen by most VPI partners as having diverse responsibilities that are a challenge for one person to perform. These include representing government to community and community to government in advocating for action on issues; being a facilitator of collaboration among partners, while also playing a challenge role in ensuring accountability. A further constraint is the lack of dedicated administrative resources which detracts from the manager's time spent on strategic work. It is conceded that this role is virtually impossible for one person, and replaces the work of three positions under the Strategy. Overall, the role of WPO and the manager is constrained on two levels - conflicting expectations due to structure and the level of resources allocated.

A few key informants from government suggested that a more appropriate placement for this role would be with the Strategic Social Plan office, with the intent of giving the role more authority and integration with this parallel process.

Finding: The PCC process is generally not engaging the parties in dynamic, solution-oriented collaboration.

There is a general consensus that the PCC is not engaging parties. Meetings are described as detailed bureaucratic exercises in accountability and critique - mostly from government to community or to WPO in the central agency role. The accountability of community partners under VPI is not clear. The need for accountability and a process for ensuring progress is tracked and communicated is accepted. However, the perception at this point is that the reporting process is not productive.

The committee is not perceived by most partners as a catalyst for collaboration with community on the cross-cutting and fundamental violence prevention issues that were set out in the Anti-Violence Policy Framework.

The PCC is not seen as addressing concerns with progress in a problem-solving way. The PCC has developed a policy escalation process for resolving issues at the regional and provincial levels, but it is not evident that this has been used as intended or useful.

PCC meetings are seen by most key informants as a series of events. Community representatives perceive limited action by government departments between meetings. Most departmental representatives feel that the level of effort required in moving policy changes and VPI related activities through the government system is not well recognized by community. The frequency of meetings diminishes their value-added in focussing on issues and moving the process forward, since there is simply not that much change to report on in major initiatives from month to month.

Few PCC government representatives saw the VPI process as being of value-added in any efforts they currently make to coordinate within departments and across government, with the exception of the contacts made from attending meetings. The sharing of information has helped in learning the respective roles of departments and community organizations.

There are indicators of this frustration. Some departments have changed their representatives, resulting in a move from the policy to program branches, which is seen by some key informants

from community and government as inappropriate for the focus of VPI. Some members are ‘dropping off’ or not attending regularly.

In summary, there are a number of issues with the PCC process that are hampering progress. It is evident from minutes of meetings and from the input of key informants that there have been several attempts to resolve these issues and make the meeting process more effective. However, the general feeling among partners interviewed was that the problems continue.

Finding: The general perception is that the relationship between government and community is fragile, and there are mixed views on the potential to develop this into a partnership as envisaged in the VPI.

All key informants desired an open, honest and respectful relationship. Some key informants, from both government and community noted that relationships are improving, and that there is now more openness and less defensiveness at the PCC and RCC meetings. A few key informants noted that healthy tension will occur when government and community deal with complex issues within limited resources, but that this is not well accepted, and continues to create an undercurrent of unease.

From a women’s community perspective, there have been shortcomings in terms of engagement, structure of the PCC and its meetings, and mutual accountability measures. While there is some sense of recent improvement, there is a clear message from these informants that the issues are not just developmental in nature.

Key informants from both government and community observed that collaboration is a relatively new practice, and partners are on a learning curve. They noted that several supports are needed: strong senior direction within government, strong facilitation of the VPI process, acknowledgement within community of the limitations of government, including the complexities and pace of policy change, and reasonable yet innovative goals for VPI as a modestly funded initiative.

Finding: The linkages and relationship between the PCC and RCCs could be improved to provide for more collaboration.

The purpose of the linkage between the PCC and RCCs is not sufficiently clear and evidenced in practice. It appears to have taken on a hierarchical structure. RCCs send in their annual action plans for review in relation to contract accountability. There is limited collaboration on how the provincial and regional plans might complement each other. RCCs refer issues to the PCC that they cannot resolve. Information sharing, in the format of a round table, is an agenda item at each PCC. However, the linkage is not resulting in the kind of guidance the RCCs need, nor is it providing the opportunity for them to make informed contribution to discussions.

A number of RCC representatives identified that more timely briefing notes before PCC meetings would help them consult with members and prepare for the meetings. Several expressed concern about their opportunity to contribute to the discussion at the PCC meetings - with its emphasis on reporting from departments on progress with their plans, they did not feel there was sufficient

attention to regional concerns and developments, or they felt they were observers of a process that was 'making the simple complex'.

More guidance and feedback from the PCC would be welcome to help them focus their work in the regions. One RCC chair felt that there is expertise in the RCCs that PCC members could reach out to when dealing with specific issues - more awareness of who's who would help in making these connections.

It is recognized that the development of effective linkages among committees is a complex process that is still a work in progress and efforts are continuing on this. While work has been done to develop this relationship, the above feedback is an indication of areas needing further development.

Finding: Senior managers of departments are involved in or accessible to RCCs to varied degrees. Different organizational structures across government contribute to this. The variation impacts on RCCs capacity to carry out its role.

Many RCC key informants noted difficulties in engaging senior managers in health and education boards in VPI at the regional level, and difficulties in having clear lines of influence with them given the complexity of board structures. Justice lacks a management structure at the regional level and this places constraints on the access to decision-makers; however, the involvement of Victims' Services staff in the RCCs is seen as very positive. In comparison, HRE, with its more traditional hierarchical structure, either has managers as RCC representatives or the representatives have more ready access to management. HRE regions also have a stronger link and regular communication with headquarters.

The impact of this is that RCCs are comprised mainly of front line staff, committed to and informed in the issues, who flag areas to be addressed but with no place to take them. Key informants had no ready solutions for improving this linkage. The structural issue goes beyond VPI, and is compounded by competing demands for time and resources. As noted earlier, the PCC has developed an issue escalation process but this has not proved useful. It may be that committee representatives are hesitant about raising issues in a formal way to the next level.

Finding: The RCC role and authority in formal coordination of services is not clear, but informal linkages are being made.

RCCs are largely comprised of front line professionals in government departments and agencies. These people see first hand and articulate the strengths and weaknesses in the system. However, the RCC role, authority and mechanism for improving coordination (beyond informal arrangements within provincial level policy), is not well defined, and in most cases RCCs do not see it as their role to tackle issues with the service delivery system (i.e. they do not feel empowered to do this). It was suggested by some key informants that the issues escalator process should assist with this, but as noted earlier it is not evident this is useful, and representatives appear hesitant to use it. Terms of Reference for the RCCs are the ones that were developed in 1997 as part of the previous strategy. It may be that these need to be revisited to bring them up to date with current needs.

Some RCCs have built trust among partners which has enabled them to work out appropriate local approaches to service delivery for victims. Most felt that the networking that has resulted from VPI is helpful. Relationships among RCC members are more collaborative than at the PCC, in part due to the more limited community involvement, and lesser focus on complex policy issues.

Finding: In Labrador, the issues and environment are so complex that VPI is not functioning well, and requires concerted attention.

Several factors are contributing to this situation: the vast geography and travel costs that make it impossible to service as a region; complacency and mistrust of initiatives that are seen as being imposed from outside the community to “save the communities from themselves;” partners who are involved in overlapping social issues; aboriginal communities that have their own links to government. Indian and Northern Affairs funds violence prevention initiatives, but they are not part of VPI. Overall, the Labrador RCC, which also struggled under the previous Strategy, has not yet found a productive role and process in a region facing some complex issues.

4. Planning and accountability

The planning and accountability process of VPI is the core activity that drives the initiative. VPI has an annual planning process which starts with a meeting at which the PCC collaborates on identifying priority issues and potential responses (a form of environmental scan). Departments then consider this input and bring back to the PCC the initiatives they will undertake in the coming year. WPO also facilitates identification of cross-cutting VPI initiatives. RCCs prepare action plans that are submitted to the manager of the VPI for review of compliance with the agreement and to identify any supports needed from the PCC or elsewhere.

Finding: The VPI priority setting has inappropriately moved away from the strategic focus intended in the framework.

Over time, the VPI action plan has moved from the broad policy objectives set out in the initial policy framework, to more specific and doable actions developed on an annual basis, with an understanding that unfinished actions from the previous year will carry forward. This approach is appropriate in order to set out measurable and doable actions as part of broader solutions. A review of documents shows that actions have become more discrete, but in departments with a major role to play, these have become less substantive than what would be expected given the range of policies and programs involved. It appears that the link back to the broad policies is being lost.

There are a number of conflicting expectations at play. Departments are constrained in how far they can commit to specific action given the range of policies that relate to violence and the diverse structure through which these are managed. Resources further limit action. Most are frustrated with the focus on detail. WPO needs assurances of action in order to fulfill their role in managing the accountability for the strategy. And community representatives, recognizing the many issues in the system, are also seeking concrete, substantive action, and some level of involvement in the process. There is a need to ensure that the broad policy issues identified in the early days of VPI (and

documented in the Anti-Violence Policy Framework) are kept in view as the basis for annual priorities and initiatives.

A potential solution would be to enhance the annual environmental scanning process. This could start with a sub-committee researching major policy developments and plans in each department/sector, and the research on trends in violence, and bringing this to the PCC as a planning background document. Such a process, involving government and community, would set the context for identifying and finetuning the specific actions proposed by departments. It would also make better use of the expertise at the PCC table in formulating issues and questions to inform policy initiatives through a ‘violence lens’ and help move the process from criticism to critical analysis. The process would still leave the specific actions with departments to carry out, in collaboration with community as appropriate, but with the benefit of more informed PCC advice.

As an example of the potential for this approach, we reviewed several policy papers and study frameworks issued recently by government and found that violence prevention was not well articulated in these. In only one (the current Mental Health review) had the topic been discussed at PCC, but no formal input provided.

Finding: VPI has not made substantial progress on integration of violence prevention into planning and accountability processes.

A central objective of VPI was to integrate violence prevention into the strategic and operational plans of partner departments, and to establish accountability mechanisms that allow for input by clients and community on policies and procedures related to violence prevention. There have been weaknesses on the part of both government and community in following through on this objective. As a result, the intended focus on high level issues has not always been as productive as intended. Departmental reports on progress have not always demonstrated substantial progress, and community partners have not always been prepared to provide informed feedback on government plans and progress. Both government and community representatives cite a lack of resources as a key constraint to achieving this objective.

Finding: Departments are at varying stages of developing effective internal processes for keeping violence prevention at top of mind in their respective departments and tracking progress on actions.

Departments gather data on services to victims of violence in varied forms as part of their program management information systems that may be retrieved as needed, or produce ad hoc reports and studies. Most have periodic discussions with management on the state of services. Evaluations related to violence services and policies have been done by Justice and NLHC.

None of the major studies completed since VPI were accompanied by an action plan, showing plans and target dates. This would have been helpful in moving findings and recommendations to action. (The *HRE Moving Forward* report included a useful management response for each

recommendation, and regional managers held sessions with their staff to introduce the report and the policy changes. Justice has recently approved the recommendations in the *Strengthening the Voice of Children* report. We were informed that the study on Labrador transition houses commissioned by Health and Community Services was intended to inform and assist communities rather than government policy - this appears to be a weakness in the process for this review as the report identified a number of recommendations that required government support, and likely set up expectations of action.)

At the mid point of this fiscal year, only one department had completed an action plan to show how activities would be implemented; this is an indicator of the concern among a number of key informants about slow pace of VPI.

Finding: At both the RCC and PCC levels, departmental representatives have varied capacities for promoting violence prevention in their departments. Being a senior manager, or being in a supportive department, are success factors.

The majority of departmental representatives on the PCC and RCCs rated relatively highly their capacity to influence change to violence prevention policies. These were in senior management positions or in departments that are supportive of VPI. The few representatives who gave a low rating to their capacity felt that inhibitors were the lack of understanding among staff of violence issues and their personal lack of authority to affect change.

Finding: The current RCC reporting approach is seen by most as being excessive for the funding provided, and could be more helpful in developing VPI at the regional level.

RCCs had a number of concerns with the usefulness of current plans and reporting. Some RCCs have difficulty relating to all the VPI objectives categories in their activities, and have difficulty planning and reporting in this framework. In particular, research and policy development is not a major focus for most RCCs (Avalon region has done some useful work in this area). There has been discussion at some RCCs on the appropriateness of their involvement in advocacy to government on issues, since this could potentially create a conflict situation for government representatives.

The frequency and detail of reports are seen as being too much for the funding level. Reports have been changed from quarterly to semi-annual in an effort to make these more useful. At the same time, there is an interest in seeing a reporting process that leads to feedback that would help with development of RCCs - perhaps one that involved more of an exchange of information and issues with the PCC and other RCCs, rather than a simple accounting of activities. There have been recent efforts on this approach.

Finding: RCCs vary in their planning processes, and there is a need for capacity building in this activity.

We noted some variation among RCCs in the involvement of members in developing plans, and sharing of plans and reports with local committees. There is an opportunity for sharing of good

practices in this area in order to maximize the value of plans at the regional level. This could be done through meetings of RCC coordinators (annual at least), an Internet discussion forum for sharing information, professional development opportunities, a rolling inventory of things that have worked. This will take some central organization but also the initiative of coordinators.

5. Resources

Finding: Government is recognized for its overall support of the VPI and commitment to developing a partnership approach with community. However, the goal of large scale social change envisaged far exceeds the modest investment in VPI.

The \$2.5 million investment is seen as a tangible recognition of the need to develop violence prevention capacity. However, this investment does not match the need for reform and capacity building across the system and within community for real and sustained progress towards the goals and objectives of VPI.

Beyond the financial resources, partner departments do not devote dedicated staff time to coordinate the VPI related work within departments. In the previous Strategy, departments had committed 25% of a staff position to this work, but in practice this was not achieved. Community partners see this lack of dedicated resources as a sign of limited commitment and a constraint to following through on planned actions.

The VPI manager operates with limited administrative support and this reduces her capacity to stay focussed on the strategic work that is needed.

Finding: Most RCCs see the expectations of them as being out of proportion to the contribution made by government. There are also concerns about inequities in funding among RCCs.

Most RCCs have concerns about their capacity to carry out their role within the resources provided by government. The agreements between government and RCCs set out the areas of activity to be carried out, but government does not specify expectations of levels of activity. However, most RCCs felt that the resources are inadequate for the work to be done in building a regional structure and addressing the needs across each region.

The allocation of the same level of resources to each RCC has caused concerns of inequitable treatment, given the varied size of regions and costs of travel. RCCs, as separate not-for-profit organizations, are each required to pay board insurance and audit fees, which eats further into their discretionary funds. Each also sets their salary rates, and as a consequence there is variation in the salaries paid to coordinators, which is causing concerns with inequity.

The scope of the contract with VPI, the additional work and time commitments for government representatives and community volunteers, all add up to expectations that most feel are beyond their capacity given the VPI funding, even with the other supports and funding they have been able to

leverage.

While the VPI manager is seen as being supportive in helping them grow into their role, the overriding concern is with the sustainability of effort over time.

6. Violence Awareness and Action Training (VAAT)

Finding: The concept of VAAT training is supported by a majority of partners. However, there are issues with the current implementation approach that will likely undermine its sustainability and effectiveness.

Most of those interviewed supported the concept of VAAT training, but most also had concerns with the design and implementation.

The major weakness is that the VAAT train the trainer model is missing the quality assurance role that is important to the integrity of this model. This role is falling to the VPI manager, when a dedicated training expert, working within a structured quality assurance process, is required.

Beyond quality assurance, there are a number of other operational design concerns. The approach to VAAT delivery has community via the RCC spending considerable effort to organize the training of (mainly) government staff. While this is included in the agreements between government and

RCCs, it is not seen by RCCs as an appropriate role for them. Government commitment to providing resources and ensuring participants is also questioned.

The regional planning teams for VAAT were required to leverage resources such as space, materials and refreshments (which is viewed as doing things cheaply, rather than an expression of partnership) is an irritant and detracts from promoting VAAT as a worthwhile training initiative. There are concerns that the format is not sufficiently flexible to include staff who cannot be easily freed up - teachers and institutional health staff in particular cannot easily be accommodated in the training.

Overall, the sustainability of VAAT in its present form and as currently resourced was questioned by many of those interviewed. There is an urgent need for the PCC to carry out a stocktaking of VAAT and to develop a process for moving the program forward. Action has begun on this - no sessions are to be held after December 2003 in order to assess progress, and an evaluation of VAAT is being developed.

7. Communications

Finding: The networking that occurs at the PCC and RCCs has helped with building relationships and linkages, and a few key informants indicate that this has helped improve coordination of services. The complexity of the VPI network and the need to communicate beyond this to partner organizations requires a fine tuned

communications strategy that is not now fully developed.

A majority of key informants felt that the committee structure does help with getting to know others, their roles and mutual understanding of perspectives. A few RCCs cited examples of coordinated activities(particularly public awareness) that came as a result of being at the RCC table. However, none indicated that these linkages have led to work on improved coordination of services in any formalized way.

The onus is on the individual PCC and RCC members to communicate back to their respective committees and departments on the results of meetings. This is a fairly significant role for the

members and there are challenges in reaching everyone who needs to know with the right message and context.

It is recognized that the environment in which VPI has to communicate is challenging, and that this combined with the varied authority levels and existing networks of the ‘messengers’ makes it difficult to ensure that VPI messages are shared in a way that will inform and lead to the action desired. In this situation, a well thought out communications strategy is needed to ensure VPI partners have succinct yet informative records of decisions to support their work, and that the broader audiences within departments and the community have ready access to this information directly from WPO.

Finding: VPI has helped with the delivery of public awareness activities at the regional level. Province wide activities have been more limited due to the resources allocated and a lack of consensus on actions.

VPI funding to regions has enabled RCCs and local committees to carry out diverse public awareness activities about violence prevention. This community-based activity was recognized as a strength of the previous Strategy and the additional funding through VPI has helped enhance this work.

A provincial communications plan was developed but only individual pieces of this have been implemented, and not in a sustained way that would build a province-wide profile to support regional and local activities. The resources allocated for communications limit the scope of what is possible. While a social marketing campaign might be desirable to address public awareness, this is not feasible. There have been some common communication materials on VPI developed, but government partners indicate that difficulties in achieving consensus on communications tools has hampered progress.

Finding: The strategy for informing the community at large about VPI is not fully developed.

A number of RCCs indicated that they have expended less effort in informing the community at large about VPI, and that this is an area where more work is needed. At the provincial level, some of the key informants we interviewed from the community (not VPI partners) who would be

important to have on side with VPI did not know what was being done through this initiative.

A small number of key informants flagged the need to clarify the intent and key messages of any communication with the broader community. Some felt that the key audience really is decision makers in government, while others saw the value in profiling VPI as a government funded initiative with community to give it credibility, and in being a catalyst to encourage other groups to take ownership of the issue. In reality, there is a need to build awareness of VPI among both government and the community.

8. VPI progress to date

Finding: A number of diverse policy initiatives have been implemented by departments, which reflect the strategic objectives of VPI to different degrees. Overall, the VPI process has not addressed coordination of services and programs in any substantial and sustained way.

Improving the coordination and delivery of services and programs is at the heart of VPI.

Two initiatives carried out since VPI were cited most frequently as relevant to this objective - the Human Resources and Employment (HRE) collaboration with community on the *Moving Forward: Responding to the Needs of Victims of Violence* policy review, and the Department of Education Safe and Caring Schools Initiative. The HRE-community process was cited by government and community people as an effective process for collaborative policy review and then follow through implementation.

VPI documented this process in the *Collaborating with Community* paper. WPO is now promoting use of this document in professional development of a broader group of government employees, and in the development of government policy on consultation with community. It is an exemplar of the kind of government-community policy work envisaged for VPI.

The Safe and Caring Schools Initiative was developed through a collaborative process with school boards and parents, and has been implemented through a policy and tools, including a provision in collective agreements requiring school policies on violence. It is now being followed up with a monitoring process. It is an exemplar of a collaborative process within the school system. The process has not, however, engaged the broader community as the HRE process did to inform the design. Most RCCs indicated they do not have a good sense of what the program is doing in their areas at this point.

Other reviews that were encouraged by VPI (the Justice Issues Committee and HCS-VPI funded study on Labrador shelters) have been less successful in actually moving to implementation; neither of these had a clear plan for the intent or ownership of the report. The Justice Issues Committee was not led by a department and has faced the problem of ownership, although there has been a departmental response from Justice.

A few formal protocols for coordination of violence related services were identified by key informants, including one between HRE and transition houses on authorizing transportation, the NLHC housing policy, and the police responsibility for reporting of violence incidences, as opposed to the victim.

The above examples of actions indicate that VPI partners are focussing, in a limited way, on the fundamental and important policy areas that were intended to be at the core of this kind of initiative. The broader issues related to the justice system (e.g. policies related to enforcement and sentencing, access to health, supports to families, building of a respectful society through the education system) that are fundamental to the root causes of violence have not been the prime focus of VPI.

Finding: At the provincial level, VPI has influenced the internal networks within departments to coordinate and integrate work on violence prevention in a limited way. Informal linkages among departments are helped by PCC participation, but this has not led to increased inter-departmental coordination and promotion.

Departmental representatives bring information from their sector to the VPI tables, and are able to take back information gained at the PCC and RCCs to their organizations, and this is helpful in developing a common understanding of VPI. Few departments indicated they had a well defined process and network internally for integrating violence prevention in the planning and decision-making within their departments, or for ensuring it is considered in major mainstream policy developments. Justice conducted a public consultation in developing their strategic plan, and NLHC and HRE have structured management committees where VPI is raised.

There is limited evidence that the VPI process has been helpful in developing these networks or 'policy monitoring' processes. A few departments felt that the emphasis on specific actions in VPI is a hindrance to promoting violence prevention. No key informants noted changes in inter-departmental coordination resulting from PCC work. Effective collaboration with community has not been significantly enhanced through VPI.

Finding: To date, policy reviews have mainly focussed on services to victims. Violence prevention has primarily been addressed through the public awareness activities.

The two primary goals of VPI are coordination of services and prevention. Several key informants observed that the research and policy development work so far has been on services to victims and not on violence prevention, noting that there has been insufficient effort to build a shared understanding of prevention and how it should look in policies and programs. There was significant work done at the outset of VPI on the development of the Anti-Violence Policy Framework, which set out the broad road map for VPI and for each partner department. This has been used by the WPO and PCC as the framework for planning and tracking of progress. However, as stated earlier, the shift to specific actions by departments has resulted in less attention to the fundamental economic and social policies that affect equality and that in turn contribute to violence prevention.

As a transition measure in moving VPI forward, a mix of attention to the 'doables' as well as broader

and more complex policy issues would help in giving prevention the needed attention. Ideally, the main focus of VPI would be on the more fundamental policies, where a broad range of expertise and perspectives is needed. The more specific actions likely have less need of the VPI process and expertise to be achieved.

Finding: At the provincial level, the various policy reviews and developments carried out by departments should, with appropriate follow through and implementation, enhance capacity to provide services.

The policy reviews implemented by various departments should contribute to capacity building. It is important that reviews follow the practices of including implementation plans on any recommendations (including a rationale for those where no action is planned), appropriate communication and supports to management and staff, and monitoring processes to determine if the desired results are achieved. We suggest a strengthening of these aspects so that reviews are followed by a road map to ensure appropriate action, or at least closure if no action is planned.

Finding: The Regional Coordinating Committees have built on the previously existing networks of service providers and local committees in most regions.

The funding provided to RCCs has contributed to building networks of local committees and enabled regional support to these local committees, as well as development of the RCC as a coordinating body. The RCCs have developed their capacity and networks to different levels.

Most RCCs have put their efforts into organizing public awareness activities or supported local committees in public awareness activities. Some have focussed on research or coordination/leadership. RCCs are in varied stages of development. Some are actively examining their role and focus in order to move the next level. In other cases, there is a sense of lack of cohesion and limited impetus to address this. A number indicated they are learning that it is important to be selective in the issues they address and to stay with the issue over time in order to enhance the impact, as opposed to tackling all the issues VPI was to address.

Local community-based committees are where much of the community-level work is happening. Some of these existed prior to VPI and some have been facilitated through RCCs as part of their effort to provide regional coordination of activities. These local committees face the challenges of sustaining effort and participation without member burnout. A number are having trouble engaging the community at large while others are more representative.

There are apparent weaknesses in the strategies to engage community at both the RCC and community levels. For example, only two RCCs were identified to us as having representatives from the local crime prevention committees, yet these are widely represented across the province and could provide access to community resources with an interest in this issue. Seniors is another group that most identified they want to engage, but have no specific ideas on how to do this.

The local committees are the least resourced level of VPI, yet the small VPI grants provided through the RCCs are seen by most as being the appropriate amount of help for their current activities. Some

local committees have taken on more substantial projects through other funding and face the challenges of managing these with volunteers.

Opportunities to network with other RCCs to help with capacity building would be welcomed, and some of this is happening now. There are a number of successful practices and initiatives that have been well received in individual regions that could be shared.

Finding: A review of achievements for each of the VPI objectives shows progress in most objectives. As intended, there have been initiatives by individual departments and RCCs, as well as VPI initiatives led by Women's Policy. Highlights of the achievements cited by key informants are shown below. (Annex D includes highlights for each department and RCC).

Co-ordination and leadership

- Design and implementation of the VPI committee structures.
- VPI action planning and tracking process.
- VPI funded development of a model for government-community collaboration, based on the HRE-community policy work. This has relevance across government.
- HRE-HCS have a committee working on gaps in client service delivery, including to victims of violence.
- Education collaborating with school districts on implementing the Safe and Caring Schools Initiative.
- Phase II of VAAT involved collaboration WPO, RCCs, government departments and agencies to establish regional planning teams and organization/delivery of training.
- HCS conducted a comprehensive review of activities in the health and community services system that address various aspects of violence. This formed the basis for further guidance to regional boards on any gaps.
- Invitation of guest speakers at PCC for mutual sharing of views and knowledge (e.g. Tom Mahoney with John Howard Society presented to PCC on National Judicial Institute's training for Supreme Court Justices)

Research and policy development

- Human Resources and Employment: Developed the "*Moving Forward: Responding to the Needs of the Victims of Violence.*"
- Education: Developed and now implementing the *Safe and Caring Schools* policy through school districts.
- Justice: Plans to update family violence protocols and publish for public distribution
- LAA: Has established links with other departments and community partners to ensure policy development includes analysis of the needs and perspectives of Aboriginal people, through a number of government processes, and agreements.
- VPI funded an evaluation of Victims' Services and NLHC evaluated their victims of family

violence policy.

Public awareness and education - regional level activities

Education and awareness are a primary focus of RCCs and local committees throughout the province. The VPI has provided resources that enabled development of presentation materials and packages. Examples of initiatives:

- Two projects of the Avalon RCC have achieved a high degree of profile in the media: the *Bars, Booze and Sexual Violence* project and the *Experiencing Violence through Gender Lens Inclusive conference*. Both of these projects were well promoted throughout the province.
- Drama groups (in particular the West Coast *Ecstasy* group) have been funded to develop and mount plays in communities and schools on violence issues.
- Several local committees have obtained funding to deliver various relationship focussed programs in schools - Roots of Empathy, Lions Quest, Respectful Relationships, Making Waves.
- Promotional materials such as placemats, calendars
- Central region produced a book on bullying “Trevor the Bully” that has been purchased by the Department of Education for use in Grade 2 classrooms
- The “Hand in Hand Against Bullying” project has extended to entire community in Twillingate, New World Island area.
- Regional forums and conferences have been held by several RCCs.

Public awareness and education -provincial level activities

- WPO co-ordinates internal and external promotion of Violence Prevention month in February, produced the first issue of the VPI newsletter, and produced and distributed a VPI information kit.
- VPI Web site and periodic advertising.
- Some departments are undertaking initiatives that will help increase public awareness and education:
 - Justice is redesigning their web site, producing maps identifying the nature and location of justice services in the province.
 - HCS hosted December 6 events at Confederation Building.
 - The Department of Education sponsored a provincial forum on bullying in May 2002 with community partners, students, parents and school board representatives participating. Follow up consultations in October 2002 resulted in a Safe and Caring Schools Provincial Action Plan.

Training

- 145 individuals received the train the trainer sessions.
- Six regional planning teams were established with representation from RCCs, Justice,

- Education, HRE, HCS, College of the North Atlantic and NLHC.
- 30 VAAT sessions were planned for 2003 to involve 420 participants. As of December 2003, 408 individuals received training.

Advocacy

- VPI as an initiative is largely advocacy - both within government in moving issues forward and within the larger community.
- Expansion of PCC to include additional community organizations and departments.
- YSPSE and the Women's Policy Office have made presentations to public and private colleges to increase education on violence prevention through the Council on Higher Education.

9. Violence prevention outcomes

Finding: The major outcome of the several decades of community and government work on violence and violence prevention is that the issue is now on the agenda of government. There have been some significant legislative, policy and program initiatives over the years. However services have not measurably improved in relation to the scope of the problem.; adequate resourcing is a constraint.

The contributions of VPI have been in formalizing the government-community consultation and helping build capacity for community-based initiatives. These are seen as important in the process of moving the work on this issue forward. Partners to VPI are committed to developing the VPI process and collaborative relationships.

The Child, Youth and Family Services Act, the Child Youth Advocate legislation, along with the federal Youth Justice Act were cited as important legislative advances over the longer term.. The establishment of Victims Services, and funding of transition houses were seen as positive program developments. Currently, there are a number of policy reviews under way as part of the provincial Strategic Health Plan that are relevant to vulnerable groups.

The Strategic Social Plan, the Model for Service Coordination for Children and Youth, and the Violence Prevention Initiative were cited by several senior managers as the three pillars of social policy in the province.

These are evidence that the policy capacity of government is being developed; the overriding concern is that the pace and scope of change is not matching the problem and are not sufficient to make advances in violence prevention at a fundamental societal level.

C

hapter 3

RESEARCH AND DATA ANALYSIS

The previous findings presented what was learned from the qualitative work in this evaluation - from interviews and program documents. In this section, we set out what was learned from a review of existing data and research related to violence and violence prevention. This analysis was conducted to inform both the current evaluation and to provide guidance on data for the summative evaluation. It was designed to:

- identify the major violence issues/problems that the data point to;
- select baseline indicators for key issues/problems and methods to be used in the summative evaluation to assess progress (e.g. use of existing data or generation of data through a repeat of surveys);
- help assess whether key individual initiatives in the VPI are designed to respond to these key problems/issues and whether these initiatives are being implemented (based on what is learned from the document review and interviews);
- where available from the data (i.e. the surveys of public attitudes), provide an assessment of broad progress being made towards the goals of the VPI.

The chart that follows sets out the data and research that was reviewed, the key learnings in relation to VPI and implications for use in monitoring and evaluating VPI.

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
Quality of School Life Survey (Department of Education)	<p><i>Responses to safety and security questions indicate there is continued concern among many students about their personal safety. (Data from 2001-02)</i></p> <p>Grade 8 students in Newfoundland and Labrador feel less safe from personal harm in 2002 than they did in 1995 (68% vs. 73% seven years earlier) with males being more concerned about their personal safety than females. Newfoundland and Labrador figures are now on par with the Atlantic average.</p>	<p>Good baseline data is available from the Quality of School Life survey which was first administered in NL in 1989. Since 1995, it has been administered in all Atlantic provinces on four occasions to every student in a selected grade, i.e., Grades 8 - 1995-96; Grades 6 and 12 in 1998-99 and 2000-01; and Grades 8 and 9 in 2001-02.</p> <p>One of the dimensions to the survey is the extent to which students feel safe and secure in school. There are plans to continue this survey and there are no plans to drop questions dealing with</p>

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
	<p>The percentage who feel that students pick on each other all the time has risen by 10% since the 1995 study (from 48% to 58%). The Atlantic average is 60%.</p> <p>Most disturbing is the high number of Grade 8 students in this province - 18% - who reported they were afraid they might be hurt, just slightly under the Atlantic average of 18.9%. This represents in excess of 1000 students in the Grade 8 population alone. As well, high numbers of NL students (45%) felt that students seemed to hurt each other a lot, slightly higher than the Atlantic average of 43.5%</p>	<p>safety and security (Q's 45-49).</p> <p>DOE is planning to assist schools with tracking incident reports, referrals to the office, playground incidents, suspensions, academic measures. However, the QSL survey is probably as useful a tool as any to provide insight into student school life and their feelings on safety and security.</p>
SSP Community Accounts	Data reported in the "Safe Communities" section of "From the Ground Up" is derived from other sources, e.g., Crime statistics from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, the Quality of School Life survey.	Useful for identifying indicators, but data should be accessed through original sources.
Provincial Survey of Attitudes Toward Violence, March 2002, MarketQuest Research Group Inc.	<p><i>Public awareness of the Violence Prevention Initiative is low (only 15% had heard of the Violence Prevention Initiative with actual numbers likely much lower.)</i></p>	<p>Survey data is intended to provide an assessment of the broad progress being made towards the goals of VPI.</p> <p>The 2002 report provides useful baseline data on awareness.</p> <p>Our recommendation is not to repeat this survey for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It is extremely difficult to change public attitudes and since VPI has not made major investment, we can be quite sure that attitudes will not change by conclusion of the VPI. - measuring attitudes does not contribute to identifying and focusing on major violence issues and program responses. <p>For example, the general public in</p>

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
		<p>surveys has been found to think youth crime is rising, when it is actually reduced.</p>
	<p><i>The majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians (99%) feel safe and comfortable in their community and surrounding area. This is remarkable given that violent crime is reasonably prevalent.</i></p> <p>Results from the 2002 Public Attitudes survey state that, while most respondents believe that society in general has become more violent over the past ten years, this increase has had little impact on their community. This is somewhat remarkable given a review of statistics that verify that violent crime is reasonably prevalent.</p>	
<p>Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (annual Juristat report)</p> <p>Source: The Daily, Statistics Canada http://www.statcan.ca/english/dai-quo</p>	<p>A review of crime statistics for four years observe that, overall the rate of violent crime in this province corresponds to the Canadian average; however this varies by type of crime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sexual assault is more prevalent in Newfoundland and Labrador by a substantial margin - about 50% higher than the Canadian average. Conversely, violent robbery is much less common in this province than the Canadian average. Property crime and other types of crime are lower in Newfoundland and Labrador than elsewhere in Canada. 	<p>Continue to use this data in both VPI public awareness and in building awareness of the importance of a gender-based grounding for VPI and prioritization of initiatives.</p> <p>Track and share the data annually with VPI partners.</p>
<p>Survey of Service Providers to Victims of Violence, May 2002, Women's Policy Office</p>	<p><i>High numbers of front-line service providers across the province are unable to rate the adequacy of services available for the particular client group with whom they deal.</i></p>	<p>Although the report provides good baseline data, it would only be worthwhile to repeat this if the VPI makes informing service providers of current services a significant priority.</p> <p>Since this is unlikely, a repeat of the</p>

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
		<p>survey would not provide useful comparative information for assessing VPI impacts.</p>
	<p><i>Low proportion of service providers rated the available services to victims as excellent.</i></p> <p>For all services rated, almost no one rated the service as excellent (typically 1% to 5%). One would expect there to be at least some excellent services available (e.g. Victims Services), but these do not appear to be well known. Again, focussing on improving awareness is necessary.</p> <p>Three types of services were rated:</p> <p><i>Prevention services:</i> education and awareness for the general community as well as specific target groups</p> <p><i>Crisis services:</i> Support and assistance during an actual crisis or immediately following a critical incident</p> <p><i>Recovery services:</i> the provision of support groups and other interventions to assist in the trauma and grief experienced by victims of violence.</p> <p>Prevention services which are more closely linked to the VPI ranked lower than did ratings for crisis services which are, by their very nature, reactive. Also rated less highly were recovery services. As for groups, ratings were low for seniors, gays and lesbians and immigrants.</p> <p><i>Data confirm relevance of improving coordination goal</i></p> <p>Only one in three service providers ranked co-ordination of services between agencies as very good or adequate. Interagency co-ordination was ranked as inadequate by 41% of service providers.</p>	

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
Bi-annual Report, Division of Corrections & Community Services, Department of Justice (1999-2000 and 2000-2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referrals to the Victims Services Program have steadily increased each year since inception in 1991 • Average caseloads have increased significantly in the last two years. • In 2000-01, there was a substantial increase (more than 100%) in total number of referrals from previous year, largely due to Bill C-79 which came into effect December 1, 1999. Victims must now be advised of opportunity to prepare a Victim Impact Statement and this has resulted in an increased volume of victims who had not been victimized through personal violent offences (e.g., business and property). Victims of violence had historically been given priority. • Expenditures have increased in contracted services which provide counselling to severely traumatized victims. • Females still constitute largest client group and the 16-40 age group continued to constitute largest age group of referrals. 	<p>Program data could be used to track any changes over the remaining period of VPI.</p> <p>If changes are made as a result of the recent evaluation of Victim Services the impact on service levels could also be tracked; however it is unlikely that significant change will occur in that period.</p>
<i>Summary report on other sources of data to be provided by Women's Policy Office - Annex C of the Evaluation Framework</i>	The Women's Policy Office provided some sources of data as the evaluation progressed, however a summary report on other sources of information was not produced as, for the most part, information is limited or is not being reported systematically.	N/A
A report comparing 1997 and 2002 public	The Women's Policy Office determined that the data from the first survey did not lend itself to	N/A

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
<p>attitude surveys</p> <p>VPI Initiatives - Monitoring by departments of VPI initiatives and violence prevention services in general</p>	<p>comparison.</p> <p>Indicators are currently activities based and report of progress to VPI is also activities based.</p> <p><i>LAA</i> - initiatives are tracked but not in terms of reduced violence</p> <p><i>Education</i> - some monitoring at school and board level, e.g. inservices for schools, incidents reports, altercations, etc.</p> <p><i>YSPSE</i> - Minutes of meetings document their activities. Mechanism for measuring progress is through Council on Higher Education to engage public institutions and private institutions are monitored through Division of Institutional and Industrial Education.</p> <p><i>NLHC</i> - they do internal evaluations and there are measures and indicators within their operating plan to gauge the victims of violence</p> <p><i>Justice</i> - measurement is difficult and activities based now. New case management system for Victim Services and systems people are looking at more integrated data with a common system for victim services, police and probation</p> <p><i>HRE</i> - no indicators. Looking at outputs, but have not formally approached looking at outcomes.</p> <p><i>SSP</i> - monitoring through Community Accounts (has no programs to track)</p> <p><i>HCS</i> - HCS/HRE liaison committee is in place for all issues. Violence comes up infrequently as an issue.</p> <p>Client service data is captured on various systems for a variety of community services for various groups but no specific violence related indicators are developed from this on a routine basis -custom reports could be requested.</p>	<p>Future initiatives of a significant policy nature should be proposed based on: evidence of a need for reform (issues/gaps to be addressed) evidence-based approach to formulating recommendations for changes specification of the changes to occur in service delivery and outcomes support and monitoring process in place for tracking of implementation of actions</p> <p>Education, with Safe and Caring Schools is in a position to apply this approach within remaining VPI mandate.</p> <p>HRE also could track the take up of start up allowances implemented since VPI, as well as review the extent that changes in policies made through Moving Forward reflect what was recommended.</p>
Community	RCC activities at the regional level	Focus should be on regular monitoring

Data Reviewed	Potential indicators	Implications for VPI monitoring and evaluation
initiatives - monitoring by RCCs	<p>focus on building the network of local committees, public awareness/education, and in one region research has been done. VAAT is also being organized by all committees.</p> <p>Data is not collected systematically on outputs (e.g. number of participants). Measuring outcomes (impacts on awareness/attitudes) would not be feasible.</p>	progress of RCCs, identifying and sharing best practices, and assisting with any challenges.
VAAT	Carry out the planned evaluation as soon as possible and make this a collaborative review by VPI partners with assistance of an independent consultant.	

The following summarizes our recommendations from the above analysis on the four objectives of the data and research review:

Task	Recommendation
Identify the major violence issues / problems that the data point to	<p>Perceptions of unsafe schools</p> <p>Low public awareness of actual levels of violence</p> <p>Sexual assault more prevalent in NL</p> <p>Limited awareness among service providers of services available</p> <p>High proportion of service providers perceive coordination of services as inadequate</p>
Select baseline indicators for key issues/problems and methods to be used in the summative evaluation to assess progress , e.g., use of existing data or generation of data through a repeat of surveys;	As per the above chart

<p>Help assess whether key individual initiatives in the VPI are designed to respond to these key problems/issues and whether these initiatives are being implemented (based on what is learned from the document review and interviews);</p>	<p>Safe and Caring Schools Initiative related to school safety concerns</p> <p>The HRE <i>Moving Forward</i> policy changes are designed to better serve victims of violence, including domestic violence</p> <p>VAAT training may contribute to awareness of some services for various groups</p>
<p>Where available from the data (i.e. the surveys of public attitudes), provide an assessment of broad progress being made towards the goals of the VPI.</p>	<p>Comparative data on issues was not available</p> <p>Even if data were available, it is unlikely that VPI could be attributed as a factor in public attitudes, given the relatively limited level of public awareness activity possible through VPI in relation to the total population.</p>

Recommendations for the summative evaluation

Our conclusion is that a summative evaluation not be done.

Taking into consideration the focus of VPI (improving coordination with limited actual impact on the design and delivery of services and programs) and scope (overall level of resources and effort in relation to the complexity and scope of the issue and the range of services and programs that are relevant to victims of violence), an evaluation of outcomes is likely to produce little learning about differences in coordination and quality of services. Attribution of any differences to VPI would be problematic.

A summative could examine the collaborative process and the extent this has contributed to policy development. It is unlikely that measurement of the impact of this collaboration on quality of services could be done. This aspect would best be done through a facilitated reflective process involving partners as opposed to an independent evaluation.

Our suggestion is that the funding designated for evaluation be diverted to:

- find ways of strengthening the integration of VPI into the planning and accountability process of government;
- develop best practices for the implementation of the results of any program and service reviews, including monitoring of progress, so that there is a framework for follow through to action. This would build on the paper *Collaborating with Community*;
- assist RCCs to develop strategies for community awareness and education;
- fund an annual forum on VPI for partners and other interested groups to discuss and share progress, and focus the action for the next year.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions are suggested to build on the strengths of VPI and address areas that are less effective. Each of the key issues identified in the findings is presented, along with recommended action.

Issue	Recommended immediate actions	Recommended longer term actions
<i>VPI FRAMEWORK</i>		
The need for a shared understanding of roots of violence among policy makers and VPI partners	PCC to develop an appropriate reflective or education process to develop a shared understanding of the gender-based grounding of violence issues, and how this informs actions focussed on all groups and policy areas. PCC to attend VAAT as a group	Develop criteria for membership on PCC, including issues of demonstrated knowledge and commitment to gender-based awareness, and /or an orientation package / process for PCC members
The need for stronger senior level leadership	Ministers committee meetings to include a portion with PCC community representatives Seek funding for a forum to be held in mid 2004 to discuss the progress made through VPI and to plan for longer term actions. Include in this a meeting with Ministers and Deputy Ministers, as well as a professional development component. Include all partners to VPI at the PCC and RCC levels as well as other key groups that are not now partners.	As part of planning for post-VPI, consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• replacing Ministers Committee with the Social Planning Committee of Cabinet• Implement a Deputy Ministers Committee
Limited focus of VPI on high level policy development	For the current action plan, departments to collaborate with community on initiatives as appropriate.	Strengthen the annual PCC-led environmental scanning process. Time this to inform the planning cycle of government. Appoint a government-community sub-group to prepare an environmental scan

Issue	Recommended immediate actions	Recommended longer term actions
		<p>document as background for the PCC discussion and decision on priority initiatives.</p> <p>Seek Ministers / DMs commitment to undertake a select number of major collaborative processes (with funding implications) as a result of the planning process.</p>
Inadequate resources for the scope of the violence related issues being addressed	<p>Continue to acknowledge the gap between available resources and those required to make a substantial impact on violence prevention.</p> <p>Continue to use VPI funds to lever funding from other levels of government, foundations, etc.</p>	<p>Ensure that the goals and particularly the objectives of VPI are linked to realistic funding levels</p> <p>Seek some partnerships with federal government on moving the anti-violence agenda</p>
<i>ROLES</i>		
WPO role - conflicting responsibilities for interests of community and government	<p>See recommendation below re RCCs:</p> <p>The contract coordinator position would work closely with RCCs and community representatives on PCC to develop their role and accountabilities, and liaise with VPI manager.</p> <p>This will free up WPO from the direct community liaison role</p>	
VPI manager role - too many conflicting responsibilities and under-resourced	<p>With additional contract coordinator for RCCs, focus will be on developing the internal government work on VPI, and liaising with community contract coordinator.</p> <p>Provide additional dedicated administrative support resources for VPI.</p>	<p>As part of planning for post-VPI, plan for the appropriate structure for central coordination of any follow up initiative.</p>
PCC - limited inclusion/role for community	<p>PCC to select co-chairs from government departmental and community representatives.</p> <p>Co-chairs to set agenda/process for</p>	<p>Identify a core group of provincial organizations to be represented on PCC.</p>

Issue	Recommended immediate actions	Recommended longer term actions
	<p>meetings. Along with VPI manager, they could form a group to champion VPI within and outside government</p> <p>Reach consensus on any outstanding issues regarding the role and accountability of community members.</p> <p>Include other community groups not now part of PCC in the forum to be held in fall/2004</p>	
Selection process for PCC/RCC members is weak	<p>Develop a description of the authority level and competencies members will be expected to bring to the committee, based on the defined role.</p> <p>Share this with current members for voluntary self-assessment.</p> <p>Implement a process for committee development to address any gaps identified (e.g. understanding of roots of violence and implications for policies). This might be done through a regular presentation/discussion at PCC.</p> <p>Organize a VAAT session for PCC to attend as a group.</p>	As turnover occurs, ask organizations to apply these standards in new appointments
Collaboration - promotion of use of the model developed via HRE/community work	<p>Engage the team who did the HRE-community work on Moving Forward policy in sessions with RCCs on their process to reinforce the learning from this (similar to the session held with PCC).</p> <p>Consider funding a video presentation by this team for wider use in community and government - as a complement to the document <i>Collaborating with Community</i> produced by VPI</p>	Continue with the current work to inject use of this model in government policy development work more broadly.
RCCs - support in developing their role	Establish a contract coordinator position for a specific period of time (to fall 2004) to work with RCCs in	Continue position assuming there is a continuing need and evidence of usefulness to RCCs.

Issue	Recommended immediate actions	Recommended longer term actions
	<p>helping them focus their work, share lessons learned among committees, and to focus their support to local committees. The lead for defining the role and contracting should be delegated to RCCs.</p> <p>This coordinator would be based in community (not WPO) and bring community facilitation expertise as well as understanding of the issue of violence and violence prevention. This coordinator would work closely with the manager of VPI to link with government and expedite response to issues and opportunities identified in this report and in via RCCs directly. This position will also participate in PCC meetings and activities, and serve as a resource at that level.</p>	
RCCs - concerns with inadequate resourcing for expectations	Coordinator to work with RCCs in identifying other sources of project funds	Examine the structure and resource levels as part of any post-VPI planning
Labrador RCC - help needed with development of regional role and process		
	Coordinator to work with RCC and WPO on reviewing the situation and making recommendations for action to develop the role appropriately	
VPI PROCESS		
PCC meeting schedules/process	Hold quarterly PCC meetings.	
	Examine the purpose of the monthly conference calls in light of findings from this evaluation.	
	Develop briefing note (one pager) for discussion items for circulation before meetings, and one pager for the record of decisions from meetings.	
	Distribute minutes directly from WPO	

Issue	Recommended immediate actions	Recommended longer term actions
	through an email to all PCC and RCC members.	
RCCs - need for links with senior management	Proceed with direction to RCCs/SSP regions on presence of RCC at SSP management committees	
Monitoring of progress on initiatives	Any processes that result in research or recommendations should include a management response and action plan, as well as a follow through process to support actions.	
VAAT	<p>Establish a provincial implementation committee to take stock of all aspects of VAAT, including issues identified in this report.</p> <p>Ensure that the planned evaluation of VAAT is carried out as quickly as possible, and use the collaborative model approach developed through VPI to do this evaluation - bring together a group who have been involved in design and implementation to carry out this evaluation, complemented by independent consultant resources as needed.</p>	Implement the plan
Post-VPI planning		Reallocate some of the funds planned for a summative evaluation to a facilitated process to plan for a longer term collaborative structure and process on violence prevention.
Evaluation		Do not conduct a summative evaluation - rather focus on collaborative government-community reporting on the results of work on key issues.

Conclusion

The VPI is an encouraging initiative in that it attempts to bring government departments together, and also to forge meaningful links between government and community, in addressing a key social policy issue, namely violence. There are a number of committed individuals and organizations which share a common interest in terms of addressing this issue. The structures have been established to support regional activities as well as to address broad provincial policies and actions.

However, The VPI is in need of reform in order to achieve its aims. To fulfill the long-term vision shared by all informants, an imbedded, ongoing effort is required. To ensure the level of functioning required to sustain this vision, structural enhancements are needed at this time.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A

VPI GUIDELINES AND TERMS OF REFERENCE (EXCERPT)

Introduction

The Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI) of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador reflects government's commitment to addressing the problem of violence in this province. The Initiative is a five year, multi-departmental, government-community partnership to find long term solutions to the problem of violence against those most at risk in our society - women, children, the elderly, and others who are victims of violence because of their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability. The Government partners include: the Women's Policy Office, which coordinates the VPI, the Departments of Justice, Human Resources and Employment, Health and Community Services, and the Strategic Social Planning Unit. The VPI builds upon the work of the Provincial Strategy Against Violence (1995-2000).

Vision

The vision of the Violence Prevention Initiative is that the people of our province will live in safe, caring communities where there is an inherent respect for each other and violence is unacceptable.

Guiding Principles

The Initiative is based on a number of guiding principles.

- People have a right to a safe and secure environment.
- The social and cultural roots of violence are based on inequality. While women, children and the elderly are more likely to be victims of violence, factors such as disability, sexual orientation, economic status or racial origin can put them at even higher risk.
- Society reinforces violence through expressions of sexism, ageism, classism, heterosexism, racism and other biased attitudes.
- Health, well-being and productivity are enhanced in a violence-free environment.
- Criminal and other acts of violence and abuse require effective consequences including punishment under the law.
- Violence is a choice and is preventable. There is strong evidence that effective intervention can reduce and prevent violence.
- Prevention of violence is everybody's responsibility.
- The elimination of violence requires a comprehensive response including prevention, public education , services and enforcement of the law.

Community Partnerships

Recognizing that violence is rooted in inequality, and that violence prevention is everybody's responsibility, the VPI supports a wide range of prevention and education

activities to promote long term social change. In this regard the VPI is directly tied to the Province's Strategic Social Plan and has a strong emphasis on building partnerships between government and community.

The VPI fosters partnerships through collaboration with a Provincial Coordinating Committee and Regional Coordinating Committees. These committees encourage an integrated approach to violence prevention leading to early identification of needs, improved communication between service providers and service recipients, greater public awareness and accountability, opportunity for information sharing on best practices, and overall improved efficiencies in service delivery.

Goals

The VPI has two main goals:

- To improve the coordination and delivery of services and programs by government departments and agencies with violence related mandates, and
- To enhance the community and government's capacity to coordinate and promote violence prevention.

The goal of coordination and delivery of services will be accomplished through the integration of violence prevention into partner departments' strategic and operational plans. An important component of this integration is the establishment of mechanisms for accountability within the key government departments. These mechanisms will provide a process for continuous input from the community and clients on policy and procedures related to violence prevention. This approach will ensure that the needs of survivors of violence will be addressed on a continuous basis.

In addition, the goal of coordination will be achieved through improved coordination across government departments and agencies providing services to survivors of violence. This will occur through participation in the provincial coordinating committee of the Violence Prevention Initiative, the regional coordinating committees, and other related committees.

The goal of enhancement of the community and government's capacity to coordinate and promote violence prevention will be accomplished through the establishment of a grants program to regional coordinating committees. This program will provide regional coordinating committees with financial resources which will enable them to build upon their volunteer efforts within the community.

Objectives

Objectives for the VPI will be established on an annual basis in its Action Plan, the first of which will be developed for 2001-2002. These objectives will fall within five main categories which are: Coordination and leadership, research and policy development, public awareness and education, training, and advocacy.

Coordination and Leadership

Objectives associated with coordination and leadership are those which focus on the main coordinating function of the VPI. They will include: the meetings of the Committee of Ministers, the Provincial Coordination Committee, and any sub-committees of the VPI; community participation through the provision of funding to the six regional coordinating committees and the Provincial Association Against Family Violence, and engaging various government and community boards and agencies in the VPI.

Research and Policy Development

Objectives related to research will include: activities aimed at advancing local and regional research on the prevalence of violence, on specific client groups or populations, on public attitudes towards violence, and on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the VPI.

Objectives related to policy development will include: promoting an inter-departmental Anti-Violence Policy Framework, encouraging changes to policy and legislation for survivors and victims of violence, and improving policies related to programs and services to survivors.

Public Awareness and Education

Objectives related to public awareness and education will include all activities aimed at increasing public awareness on the causes and incidence of violence. They will also include objectives aimed at the education system and the integration of violence awareness programs in schools.

Training

Objectives related to training will be concerned with promoting formal and informal training in violence awareness for all helping professionals working with survivors of violence.

Advocacy

Objectives related to advocacy will include addressing the special needs of groups such as Aboriginal communities or ensuring that all stakeholder groups of the VPI are participating in the programs and activities of the Initiative.

ANNEX B

EVALUATION RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Design

10. Is the focus of the VPI still the most relevant?
2. Are the VPI's objectives the right ones to reduce violence and improve services to victims?
3. Does the design reflect current best practices and local knowledge?
4. Is the VPI best organized to achieve its goals and objectives?
5. Are the roles, responsibilities, membership and structure of each of the elements of the VPI the best approach to achieve the goals?
6. Is the funding allocation sufficient and appropriate for each element of the VPI to carry out its particular roles and responsibilities?
7. Is the VPI consistent with the partners' mandates?
8. Have appropriate communication plans been developed?
9. Have appropriate monitoring plans been developed?

Implementation

10. To what extent is the VPI being implemented as designed?
11. How is the overall structure, relationship and communication working between the partners and other community organizations?
12. Where appropriate, are modifications taking place in response to current best practices and local knowledge?
13. Are there any barriers or constraints to the effectiveness of the Initiative at the government level due to the VPI structure?
14. Are there any barriers or constraints to the effectiveness of the Initiative at the local/regional level due to the VPI structure?
15. How have partner departments and community partners incorporated the VPI goals and objectives into their ongoing planning and operations?
16. What have been the contributions to the VPI and other violence prevention measures by the departments and community partners?
17. Do the activities of the PCC and the RCCs address priority needs?
18. Have communications been effective between and within structures?

19. Have appropriate monitoring and data collection activities been implemented?

VPI Progress

20. What activities and outputs have resulted to date? Do these follow current best practices literature and local knowledge?
21. What strengths do partners and other community organizations identify?
22. What aspects require strengthening?
23. How can the VPI be improved?
24. In what ways, if any, are the partners (departments, agencies and community groups) incorporating violence prevention principles into their programs and services? How has the VPI made a difference to how they operate?
25. Have appropriate protocols been developed by departments, agencies and service providers to handle the reporting and support to violence prevention?
26. If protocols are in place, are they being followed and is the process working?
27. Have there been improvements in the co-ordination and quality of violence prevention services in the province?
28. How have the VPI's contributions leveraged other non-VPI contributions to violence prevention by departments and community partners?

ANNEX C
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

Name		Group
1.	Kerri Adams	Grand Falls-Windsor Grand Falls-Windsor Committee Against Violence -community representative
2.	Mike Barry	Department of Justice - Adult Probation Western and Northern RCC - departmental representative
3.	Stephanie Battcock	Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Labrador RCC - departmental representative
4.	Blaine Beaumeiser	RCMP - Clarenville Eastern RCC
5.	Cheryl Bennett	St. John's Avalon RCC - co-ordinator
6.	Lorraine Best	Seniors Resource Centre PCC representative
7.	Derrick Bishop	NGALE (Newfoundland and Labrador Gays and Lesbians for Equality) Provincial organization
8.	Wayne Broomfield	Labrador Aboriginal Affairs Labrador RCC - departmental representative
9.	Rose Carey	Citizens Crime Prevention Committee PCC & provincial organization representative
10.	Barb Case	Strategic Social Plan PCC representative - departmental
11.	Nancy Coish	Grand Falls-Windsor Grand Falls-Windsor local Committee Against Violence - community representative
12.	Anne Marie Connors	Cara Transition House Central RCC - community representative
13.	Sheila Connors	Human Resources and Employment Labrador RCC -departmental representative
14.	Allan Corbett (interviewed jointly with Joy Maddigan)	Health and Community Services PCC - departmental representative
15.	Deanne Costello (interviewed jointly with Blenda Dredge)	Health and Community Services Northern RCC Co-Chair- departmental representative
16.	John Cummings	Dept. of Justice Deputy Minister
17.	Lisa Davis	Chair of Forteau Committee Northern RCC - community representative
18.	Mary Devereaux	Avalon East School District Safe and Caring Schools Initiative / VAAT trainer

ANNEX C
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

19.	Kim Dreaddy	Provincial Association Against Family Violence	PCC representative
20.	Blenda Dredge (interviewed jointly with Deanne Costello)	Health and Community Services	Northern RCC Co-Chair-departmental representative
21.	Sean Dutton (interviewed jointly with Tracy King)	Labrador Aboriginal Affairs	ADM, LAA
22.	Mary Ennis (interviewed jointly with Marie White)	COD	Provincial organization
23.	Patti Fleming	Labrador Legal Services, Happy Valley - Goose Bay	Labrador RCC - Co-Chair
24.	Emma Genge	School District #2	Northern RCC - departmental representative
25.	Michelle Gill	School District #3	Western RCC - departmental representative
26.	Cathy Gogan	ADM, Youth Services and Post-Secondary Education	Deputy Minister
27.	Freeman Greene	Human Resources and Employment	
28.	Bernice Hancock (interviewed jointly with Loraine Sheehan)	Status of Women - Stephenville	Community at large
29.	Joyce Hancock	Newfoundland and Labrador Status of Women	PCC representative Avalon RCC
30.	Ed Hayden (interviewed jointly with Brendan Mullaly)	Human Resources and Employment	PCC - departmental representative
31.	Beulah Hayley	Charlottetown, BB	Central RCC - community representative
32.	Lorraine Hearn	Grand Falls - Windsor	Central RCC - Co-ordinator
33.	Gwen Hiscock	Discovery Women's Network	Eastern region
34.	Susan Hoddinott (interviewed jointly with Sharon Whelan)	Department of Justice - Victims Services	Western RCC, Co-Chair
35.	Yvonne Jacobs	Seniors Resource Centre	Provincial association
36.	Kathleen Jason	Western Regional Coalition to End Violence	Western RCC - Coordinator

ANNEX C
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

37.	Jackie Lake-Kavanagh (interviewed jointly with Pam Thomas)	Department of Justice	PCC representative - departmental
38.	Cynthia Kelly	CYN Co-ordinator, Harbour Breton	Central RCC
39.	Tracy King (interviewed jointly with Sean Dutton, ADM)	Labrador Aboriginal Affairs	PCC representative - departmental
40.	Betty Kippenhuck	Charlottetown Anti-Violence Committee	Northern RCC - community representative
41.	Bill Lee	Newfoundland and Labrador School Boards Association	Community Organization
42.	Sheree Macdonald	Women's Policy Office	PCC representative - departmental
43.	Joy Maddigan (interviewed jointly with Allan Corbett)	Health and Community Services	PCC - departmental representative
44.	Laurie Martin	Eastern Regional Committee Against Violence	Eastern RCC - Co-ordinator
45.	Cameron Meade (interviewed jointly with Laura Wellman)	Child, Youth and Community Support / Corrections	Western RCC - community representative
46.	Jennifer Mercer	Mental Health Crisis Centre	Formerly with WPO
47.	Heather Modlin	St. Francis Foundation	
48.	Brendan Mullaly (interviewed jointly with Ed Hayden)	Human Resources and Employment	PCC - departmental representative
49.	Rosemary Mullins		Community at large
50.	Doreen Noseworthy	Port Aux Basques Peaceful Communities Committee	Western RCC - community representative
51.	Wayne Oakley	Youth Services and Post Secondary Education	PCC representative - departmental
52.	Janet O'Donnell	Libra House, Happy Valley - Goose Bay	Labrador RCC - community representative
53.	Bernie Ottenheimer	Avalon East School Board	Avalon RCC
54.	Dave Pittman	Human Resources and Employment	Western RCC - departmental representative
55.	Harold Press	Dept. of Education	Deputy Minister

ANNEX C
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

56.	Vivian Randell	Human Resources & Employment	Deputy Minister
57.	Mary Reid	Independent Living Resource Centre, St. John's	Community Organization
58.	Darlene Rice	Grenfell Regional Anti-Violence Team	Northern RCC - Coordinator
59.	Darlene Rideout	Grand Falls	Chair, Central RCC PCC representative
60.	Dorothy Robbins	Past Director, Women's Policy Office (retired)	WPO
61.	Mona Romaine	Eastern Region Committee Against Violence (ERCAC) chair	Eastern RCC - Chair
62.	Sherry Rowsell	Labradorians for Peaceful Communities, Happy Valley-Goose Bay	Labrador RCC - Co-ordinator
63.	Lorraine Sheehan (interviewed jointly with Bernice Hancock)	Status of Women - Stephenville	Community at large
64.	Brenda Smith	Department of Education	PCC representative - departmental
65.	Michelle Smith	NL Advisory Council on Status of Women	PCC representative
66.	Linda Snow	Human Resources and Employment - Carbonear	Eastern RCC - departmental representative
67.	Linda Soper	Sexual Abuse Community Services, Stephenville	Western RCC - departmental representative
68.	Wanda Stanford	Discovery Women's Network	Eastern
69.	Jay Steiner	Human Resources & Employment	Central RCC - departmental representative
70.	Cynthia Synard	Human Resources and Employment - Marystow	Eastern RCC - departmental representative
71.	Pam Thomas (interviewed jointly with Jackie Lake-Kavanagh)	Department of Justice	PCC representative - departmental
72.	Mona Wall	Women's Policy Office	VPI Manager
73.	Judy Ward		Northern RCC - community representative

ANNEX C
LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

74.	Laura Wellman (interviewed jointly with Cameron Meade)	Child, Youth and Community Support / Corrections	Western RCC - community representative
75.	Sharon Whelan (interviewed jointly with Susan Hoddinott)	Department of Justice - Victims Services	Co-Chair, Western RCC and PCC representative
76.	Marie White (interviewed jointly with Mary Ennis)	Coalition of persons with disabilities (COD)	Provincial organization
77.	Charmaine Wight	Health and Community Services	Grand Falls-Windsor Local Committee Against Violence
78.	Kevin Williams	Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation	PCC representative - departmental

ANNEX D

HIGHLIGHTS OF VPI ACCOMPLISHMENTS

COMMUNITY/REGIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Central	Significant regional awareness activities Trevor the Bully - three part presentation, students, teachers and parents and was purchased by Department of Education for use in all Grade 2 classrooms; RCC Co-ordinator did in service with teachers on bullying that was funded through Victims Services; Hand in Hand against bullying has extended to entire community in Twillingate, New World Island area; Well ahead in terms of presentation packages and materials. Development of resource materials, distribution and networking and supporting communities on their own turf. Outreach and networking.
Avalon	Bars, Booze and Sexual Violence project Experiencing Violence through Gender Lens Inclusive conference Monthly meetings & networking all positives
Western	Bigger presence in communities due to establishment of local committees - seven active groups Active in areas that had no activity before such as east and north of Corner Brook Regional workshop in first year Co-ordination and leadership mobilizes them to act Lot of work on structural issues Strategic thinking with respect to model for structure and meetings with key departments, agency managers. Collaboration at meaningful levels.
Eastern	Information sharing among members 50 people trained in three VAAT sessions (15 facilitators) Essay competition Awareness campaign Networking, public awareness events, e.g. Bonavista youth and drama club, conference with Discovery Women's Network, essay contests, posters. VAAT training. Strategies for Living, database being added to Web site.
Labrador	Labrador Connects conference Produced calendars and placemats Able to be a contributor to other local committees Calendar and placemats produced through joint efforts
Northern	Focus is awareness activities, e.g., regional placemats coffee breaks, drama groups, Winterfest Treasure Hunt, Team Esteem Camp, two regional forums Seven local committees
Provincial	Provincial Association Against Family Violence completed report, Moving Towards Safety: Responding to Family Violence in Aboriginal and Northern Communities of Labrador.

DEPARTMENTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

WPO	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Led development of Anti-Violence Policy Framework• Leadership for VPI committee structures and process• Model for community - government collaboration developed for wider use• Developmental work on VAAT implementation, materials and resources• Co-ordination and planning of VAAT sessions with VAAT regional planning teams• Public attitude and service providers survey completed• Organized planning retreat March 2002• Established Evaluation Advisory Committee and awarded formative evaluation contract• Co-ordinated media campaign and regional activities during violence prevention month with all VPI partners, and other ongoing public promotion and advertising• VPI PR and fact sheets completed• Developed Web site for VPI
Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• redesign of Web site with maps identifying nature and location of all justice services• incorporation of violence prevention awareness into information sessions for departmental staff• Re-activation of Justice Issues Committee• Justice Issues Committee report "Strengthening the Voices of Children . . ."• Partnering with VPI on evaluation of Victim Services Program• Draft of Restorative Justice policy / program will go through external consultation process before finalization• Committee to review and update Department's family violence protocols and publish for public circulation• held 21 provincial consultations in 01/02 for its 2002-2005 Strategic Plan
YSPSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentations to public and private colleges to increase education on violence prevention• VPI was agenda item at Council on Higher Education meeting in May 2003• CONA to participate in VAAT regional planning teams• Plan to work with community partners to develop approaches and programs to deal with youth violence as it relates to bullying, date rape, and gang violence

HCS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracted with Provincial Association Against Family Violence to do shelter training • Increased operational funding for shelters • Surveyed health boards in 01/02 on anti-violence activities and submitted report to PCC • Circulated report done by Provincial Association Against Family Violence “Moving Towards Safety....” to support discussion • Announcement of major project regarding documentation of program-level policies throughout the organization • Implementation of December 6 recognition initiatives throughout the department • Completion of A Newfoundland and Labrador Legacy, outlining major milestones in violence prevention for last 30 years • Created a ‘contact us’ link on web site
Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided funding for member from the north coast of Labrador (Tongamiut Inuit Annait, The Inuit Women’s Organization) at VAAT training in June 2003 • Meeting participation and RCC participation • Tied into their broad objective to have land claims produce healthier communities • Aboriginal Justice Strategy funded by Justice Canada will provide \$75K to Miawpukek First Nation (MFN, Conne River) • Province donated \$1 million to Innu Healing Fund to assist in provision of recreation centres for youth in Innu communities • Torngat Recreation Commission • Family Treatment Centre
HRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing recommendations in policy “Moving Forward: Responding to the Needs of Victims of Violence” • Complete pilot projects stemming from report “Moving Forward...” and expand the policy provincially • Signed service agreements with transition houses • Amended and distributed policy manuals • Trained departmental staff as VAAT facilitators • Appointed representatives to Boards of Directors of most transition houses • Partnering with HCS to address Comforts Allowance and to address gaps in client service delivery
NLHC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation conducted on the effectiveness and impact of NLHC’s Victim of Family Violence policy

Education

- 29. Safe and Caring Schools Initiative announced fall 2001
- 30. Action Plan for Safe and Caring Schools Initiative announced February 2003
- 31. Five of 11 School Boards have submitted policies on student behaviour in accordance with Article 29.06 of NLTA collective agreement which states that districts were to have Safe and Caring Schools policies developed and implemented by April 2003. Boards with policies in place are District 1 Labrador, District 4 Cormack Trail, District 5 Baie Verte/Grand Falls, District 9 Avalon West/Bay Roberts and District 7 Burin Peninsula.
- 32. Plans to establish a measurement process around the Safe and Caring School Initiative to track outcomes and outputs
- 33. Student Support Services Newsletter, NLTA and NLFSC Newsletters, Department Web site and a Safe and Caring Schools brochure

ANNEX E

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Policy

Violence Prevention Initiative - an Anti-Violence Policy Framework
Provincial Coordinating Committee: Operating Principles and Guidelines
Guidelines for Funding: Regional Coordinating Committees 2001-2002
Guidelines for Funding: Regional Coordinating Committees 2002-2003
Questions on VPI Funding to Regional Coordinating Committees

Meetings

VPI Provincial Coordinating Committee - Report of Outcomes of Provincial Coordinating Committee Retreat March 11-12, 2002
Minutes of PCC meetings posted on VPI website

Agreements WPO with RCC's

- Regional Coordinating Coalition Against Violence (Eastern Avalon Region – NF & Lab)
- Grenfell Region Anti-Violence Team
- Labradorians for Peaceful Communities
- Eastern Region Committee Against Violence Inc.
- Committee Against Violence Inc.
- Western Regional Coalition to End Violence

Funding Proposals

- Regional Coordinating Coalition Against Violence Proposal 2001-2002
- Regional Coordinating Coalition Against Violence (Eastern Avalon), Proposal to the Violence Prevention Initiative for Funding Year 2002-2003
- Regional Coordinating Coalition Against Violence – Eastern Avalon Region Funding Proposal 2003-2004
- Grenfell Region Anti-Violence Team Proposal for Funding (2001-2002???)
- Grenfell Region Anti –Violence Team Inc., Proposal for Funding 2002-2003
- Grenfell Region Anti-Violence Team Inc. Proposal for Funding 2003-2004
- Grenfell Region Anti-Violence Team Inc. Proposal for Funding 2003-2004
- Labradorians for Peaceful Communities Proposal for Funding 2001-2002
- Labradorians for Peaceful Communities, Proposal for Funding 2002-2003
- Labradorians for Peaceful Communities Proposal for Funding 2003-2004
- Labradorians for Peaceful Communities Proposal for Funding 2003-2004
- Central Regional Coordinating Committee 2002-2003
- Western Regional Coalition to End Violence 2001/02 Violence Prevention Initiative Proposal
- Eastern Region Committee Against Violence Inc. Proposal for Funding 2001-2002
- Eastern Region Committee Against Violence Inc. Proposal for Funding 2003-2004
- Eastern Region Committee Against Violence Inc. Proposal for Funding Renewal 2003-2004

Work Plans

- Violence Prevention Initiative Action Plan 2001-2002
- Violence Prevention Initiative Action Plan 2002-2003
- Central Regional Coordinating Committee Work Plan 2001-2002
- Central Regional Coordinating Committee Work Plan for 2003-2004
- Central Regional Coordinating Committee Work Plan 2003-2004
- Western Region Work Plan 2001-2002
- Western Region Work Plan 2002-2003
- Safe and Caring Schools Initiatives, Department of Education. Violence Prevention Initiative Action Plan 2002-2003
- Department of Human Resources and Employment, VPI Action Plan - Status Report
- Letter from Kevin Williams. Report to VPI Provincial Coordinating Committees, Action Plan 2002-2003
- Women's Policy Office Report. Action Plan Item for 20-03: Implement Framework for Evaluation of VPI
- Report from the Department of Youth Services & Post-Secondary Education. Action Plan 2002-2003

Quarterly/Year End Reports

Western Regional Coalition to End Violence

- Quarterly Report July – December 2001
- Mid-Year Report: April – September 2002
- Financial Report: December 2002
- Year-End Report: April 2002-March 2003

Labradorians for Peaceful Communities

- Quarterly Report July – September 2001
- Income Statement October – December 2001; April – June 2002
- Quarterly Financial Report July – September 2002
- Semi-Annual Report March – September 2002

Grenfell Region Anti-Violence Team

- Quarterly Report July – September 2001
- Semi-Annual Report April – September 2001
- Quarterly Financial Report October – December 2001; January – March 2003

Eastern Region Committee Against Violence

- Financial Quarterly Report October – December 2001
- Quarterly Report November 2001 – March 2002
- Quarterly Report July – December 2001
- Semi-Annual Report, June to September 2002
- Quarterly Financial Report April 2002 – March 2003
- Final Report June 2002 – March 2003

Central Regional Coordinating Committee

- Quarterly Report July – October 2001
- Quarterly Financial Report October – December 2001
- Interim Report, April to September 2002
- October - December 2002

Coalition Against Violence- Eastern Avalon

- Third Quarter Financial Report December 2001
- Semi-Annual Report and Quarterly Financial Report April to June / July to September 2002

Specific Initiatives

- Violence Awareness & Action Training, Facilitator's Guide
- Violence Awareness and Action Training Overview from www.gov.nf.ca/vpi/vaat_overview.htm
- Frequently Asked Questions on VAAT Model – Draft
- VPI Violence Awareness Action Training Pilot Project, May 2002
- A Newfoundland and Labrador Legacy. Striving Toward and Equitable and Peaceful Society. Commemorating Thirty Years of Our Endeavors. 1972-2002
- Towards the Year 2000 from www.gov.nf.ca/vpi/publications
- Violence Prevention Initiative: Violence Prevention is Everyone's Responsibility (folder with handouts)
- Moving Forward. Responding to the Needs of Victims of Violence. Social Policy Development Through Collaboration and Partnership.
- Strengthening the Voice of Children. Responding to the Needs of Children in the Justice System.
- Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Student Support Services – Safe and Caring Schools
- Gender Matters. A Gender Equity Analysis of Legal Aid in Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Making it Safe. Women, Restorative Justice and Alternative Dispute Resolution.
- Moving Forward. Responding to the Needs of Victims of Violence. Social Policy Development Through Collaboration and Partnership. February 2002
- VPI Developing a Community Collaboration Process, March 2003
- Case Study: The Justice Committee
- VPI Provincial Coordinating Committee. Report of Outcomes of Provincial Coordinating Committee Retreat, March 11-12, 2002

Data / Reports

- Memo from V. Reddick to A. Gogan. Information for VPI Evaluation Advisory Committee
- Memo from A. Gogan to S. Trenholm. Information for the Evaluation of the Violence Prevention Initiative.
- Neglected Adults Referral and Application Data
- Memo from A. Marche to D. Crozier. Bullying Survey Results
- Report: Family Violence Against Seniors
- Provincial Strategy Against Violence. Final Implementation and Evaluation Report, June 30, 2000.
- Victims of Violence. Client: Aisling Gogan. Survey Results, February, 2003
- Violence Prevention Initiative Service Providers Survey. Preliminary Results, February 2003.
- Quantitative Tracking Study on Violence Awareness in Newfoundland and Labrador. Final Report
- Provincial Survey of Attitudes Towards Violence. Research Report
- Department of Justice, 2002-2003 Report to the Violence Prevention Initiative
- Department of Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs, Report to the Violence Prevention Initiative

2002-03

- Student Support Services – Safe and Caring Schools
- Public Awareness Campaign Questionnaire Results, 1997
- Provincial Survey of Attitudes Towards Violence, Research Report, March 2002
- Violence Prevention Initiative, A Survey of Service Providers to Victims of Violence, April 2003
- Victim Services Program Evaluation, August 2003
- Victim Services Program Evaluation, Research Findings, August 2003
- RNC Victim Analysis Data, 2001/2002
- HCS Neglected Adults Referral and Application Data, 1998-2002