

Cluster Concept Paper

**The Justice System's Response to Intimate Partner
Abuse Across Canada:
Moving towards a Canadian Observatory**

By

Dr. Carmen Gill, University of New Brunswick

In collaboration with

Dr. Helene Berman, University of Western Ontario

Dr. Margaret Jackson, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Gilles Rondeau, Université de Montréal

Dr. Leslie Tutty, University of Calgary

Dr. Jane Ursel, University of Manitoba

Submitted to Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

April 15, 2005

Contents

Acknowledgement	iv
Introduction	2
1. What is the Alliance?	3
2. What the <i>Alliance</i> wants to do	4
3. The <i>Alliance</i> research cluster design: The Development Process	5
3.1 Questions of definition: Intimate partner abuse	6
3.2 Theoretical Approach	8
4. Relevance in Canada of a strategic research cluster on the justice system's response	9
5. Mission Statement of the Canadian observatory	11
5.1 Aims of the Canadian observatory	11
6. Specific goals and research priorities	12
6.1 Policies and strategies to resolve intimate partner abuse	13
6.2 How the justice system operates across Canada	13
6.3 Targeted priorities (different/similar) among provinces	15
7. Stakeholders involvement: non-academic partners' role and involvement	16
7.1 The main players in the Canadian observatory	17
7.2 Players to be invited	17
8. Governance and management structure	17
9. Resources and funding	18
9.1 Existing funding	18
9.2 Compensation to communities for research involvement	19
9.3 Main funding agencies for this observatory	19
9.4 Five-year Period Budget	20
9.4.1 Geographic Distribution of Budget	21
10. Training	21
11. Knowledge mobilization and outreach	22
12. Evaluation of the Canadian observatory over time	22
List of Bibliographical Notices	24

Appendix 1: List of organizations represented at the regional consultations across Canada	27
Appendix 2: List of organizations represented at the National meeting	30
Appendix 3: Main players in the Canadian observatory	31

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those who participated in the regional consultations across Canada, as well as the participants that attended the national meeting held in Montreal, for their invaluable contribution to this cluster concept paper. Many thanks also to Rina Arseneault, Elizabeth Blaney, Myrna Dawson and Luc Thériault for the constructive criticism and the numerous suggestions offered to improve the present paper.

Title: The Justice System's Response to Intimate Partner Abuse¹ Across Canada:
Moving towards a Canadian Observatory

Introduction

In the last two decades the Canadian justice system has responded to lobbying efforts by women's organizations to take a more pro-active and interventionist role in responding to intimate partner abuse. This response has involved additional funding as well as, new legislation and policies on enforcement. While criminal law is federal, enforcement and implementation are typically provincial (courts) or municipal (policing) responsibilities, resulting in a variety of policies and programs across the country. In addition, a number of provinces have introduced civil legislation to address intimate partner abuse. While policy makers across Canada are committed to reducing the devastating impact of intimate partner abuse, these diverse policies and practices must be analyzed and compared to determine best practices for the country as a whole.

In 1991, the research centres on family violence and violence against women were founded “[...] to establish a sustainable capacity to conduct research on family violence and violence against women”². All of the centres in the *Alliance of Canadian Research Centres on Violence* (the *Alliance*) have been involved in research that examines some aspect of the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse. A major research initiative, *Evaluating the Justice and Community Response to Family Violence in the Prairie Provinces*³, began in 2001 in the Prairie provinces and this project is clearly revealing differences among the justice system's response in these three provinces. Findings from this study are based on (1) individual interviews with 180 women from Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan about their experience within the justice system; (2) the collection of data on applications for protection orders in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; (3) the collection of data for all cases in which an offender has been charged with a criminal domestic violence-related offence in 2002 in Calgary, Edmonton, Regina and Winnipeg. Often, we tend to look at these provinces as a whole, but the findings produced by this study clearly point to the existence of different justice system response to domestic violence. For instance, Calgary has specialization for preliminary hearings and guilty pleas; Edmonton has specialization at the trial level only and Regina has no court specialization; Winnipeg has a complete Court specialization from bail hearing to sentencing. Does a specialized Court make a difference? This study echoes and strongly confirms what earlier studies have revealed regarding important jurisdictional variation with substantially different outcomes, especially when comparing data on prior record of accused in spouse abuse cases; convictions in spouse abuse cases; trial outcomes in spouse abuse cases; etc. It also demonstrates a need for a national study

¹ The original title was *The Justice System's Response to Family Violence Across Canada: Reflections on Regional Specificity and a National Common Ground*. Changes in the title reflect the cluster team discussion on the specific target of our research. The rationale for using the term “intimate partner abuse” instead of “family violence” is presented later on in this concept paper.

² SSHRC and Health Canada. 1999. *Democratizing excellence: The experience of the research centres on family violence and violence against women*. Ottawa: The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, p. 1.

³ Tutty, L. Principal Investigator. University of Calgary. 2001-2005. *Evaluating the justice and community response to domestic violence in the Prairie Provinces*. Funded by CURA-SSHRC.

that would permit rigorous interjurisdictional analysis on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse focusing on:

- What policies and strategies are in place to resolve intimate partner abuse?
- How does the justice system operate across Canada?
- What are the targeted priorities (different/similar) among provinces/territories?

Comparing the responses to intimate partner abuse in different jurisdictions will allow the *Alliance* to not only highlight similarities and differences, but also contribute to our understanding of what can be adapted, what works, and where the gaps are located. In short, such a project will provide a better understanding of what factors ensure that an initiative will be successful. In addition, it would contribute to the formulation of a better response to violence in all the Canadian provinces and territories and to an understanding of the reasons for (and consequences of) the absence of such initiatives. This research cluster design focuses on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse in a multisectoral-coordinated effort to eliminate intimate partner abuse in Canada by enhancing the effectiveness of the systems. It will also provide accessibility of research findings to stakeholders involved on the issue.

This concept document proposes a research cluster design on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse in Canada that would use the vehicle of a Canadian observatory⁴ on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse. This document highlights the mission for this Canadian observatory, its specific goals, the research priorities and theoretical approach, as well as stakeholder involvement and financial details for the implementation of the design over a five-year period⁵. Attention is also given to how the goals and priorities will be achieved (research, training, interactions, knowledge mobilization and outreach).

A description of the *Alliance* is necessary to understand the importance for a Canadian observatory on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse to be led by this national partnership. Moreover, it is essential to explain how the members from the *Alliance* proceeded collaboratively in the development of this concept paper. It is our intention to provide a detailed rationale of our research design and to clarify the focus of the research cluster on intimate partner abuse, instead of family violence in general. This document is the result of the *Alliance* ongoing concern about the justice system response and is based on a series of meaningful consultations at the regional level, reflecting a consensus among academics, community-based organizations and representatives from provincial governments across the country.

1. What is the Alliance?

Established in 1997, the *Alliance of Canadian Research Centres on Violence* is composed of:

- *BC Feminist Research, Education, Development & Action* (FREDA), Simon Fraser University;
- *Research and Education for Solutions to Violence and Abuse* (RESOLVE), which is a tri-provincial research centre with offices at the University of Manitoba, University of Calgary and University of Saskatchewan;

⁴ An observatory is a structure commanding a wide view of its surroundings. The observatory would lead and coordinate national research projects by taking into account provincial/territories specificities.

⁵ We are proposing to pilot the observatory during a five-year period with the view that if its performance is positively evaluated in the year five it could be re-conducted for another five to 10 years.

- *Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children (CRVAWC)*, University of Western Ontario;
- *Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la violence familiale et la violence faite aux femmes (CRI-VIFF)* Université de Montréal and Université Laval; and
- *Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research (FVRC)*, University of New Brunswick.

These university-affiliated centres established the *Alliance* to strengthen community and academic partnerships, and to carry out research and public education to eliminate family violence and violence against women and children. Each centre is a cluster in itself and works at the interface of the community and university. It is a very unique research partnership model between communities and universities promoting participatory action research⁶:

Within the participatory action research paradigm (PAR), the researcher's function is to serve as a resource to those being studied-typically, disadvantaged groups-as an opportunity for them to act effectively in their own interest⁷.

This means that the *Alliance* recognizes that a dialectical process occurs during the conceptualization of a research project, the operationalization of a research design and the dissemination of findings that emerge from the research process. The most significant achievement of the *Alliance* lies in its building capacity through the involvement of researchers from different milieus. The collaborative work developed by the *Alliance* over the years has led academics, front-line workers and government representatives to coordinate their effort on the establishment of the following research cluster design.

2. What the *Alliance* wants to do

The overall objective for a Canadian observatory on the justice system's response on intimate partner abuse in Canada is to maximize the knowledge mobilization impact of the *Alliance* in communities. It is obvious to members of the *Alliance* that the experience of networking in Canada has generated collaborative research, confirmed the importance of participatory action research and lead to a theoretical approach on family violence and violence against women and children that is inclusive. It has also opened the door to sound questions related to the limitation of exchange among stakeholders (academics and non-academics) in French and English Canada. Years of experience in Canadian research on violence issues have not necessarily facilitated the sharing of locally, community-applied, research with others in the country. It is not rare to learn about a specific research endeavour in a conference or in a journal, but it is rare to see how new knowledge that others can utilize affects practices in a certain region in the country. The *Alliance*

⁶ Participatory action research can be described as:

An umbrella term encompassing several traditions of theory and practices, including participatory research, collaboration inquiry, cooperative research, action research, and participatory evaluation. While definitions vary with traditions and users, common values of democratizing knowledge production and advancing social justice underlie these traditions. Deshler, D. et al. 1998. Participatory action research with deer management citizen task forces: a promising approach to citizen participatory in natural resource management. Paper presented at the 1998 IAP2 International Conference, Tempe: Arizona, October. Retrieved April 2, 2005 from Cornell Participatory Action Research Network. website: www.einaudi.cornell.edu/cparn

⁷ Babbie, E. 2001. *The social practice of social research*. 9th Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. p. 288.

is committed to engage communities so that they can benefit from research findings. However, too often, it is difficult to disseminate research that can benefit the larger society. Each research centre has conducted research and developed initiatives on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse without necessarily involving other constituencies around the country in their achievements.

The lack of a national conduit between provinces and territories, in both official languages, on the issue is another major reason behind the development of a Canadian observatory on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse in Canada. It would generate solutions to eliminate this problem. The *Alliance* wants

- To establish a national research network emphasizing continued bilingual dialogue and in-depth research on the justice system in all parts of the country and on the impact of its response to intimate partner abuse;
- To lay the ground work for standardized national data sets on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse, with particular emphasis on civil legislation and specialized response units (e.g. police, court, prosecutions); and,
- To develop regional, national and international forums for dissemination of interjurisdictional analyses and program/policy outcomes.

This is a unique and original proposal because it does not currently exist in the country or elsewhere in the world. This observatory would maximize the gathering of a critical mass of expertise from across the country and from various milieus around an issue in which Canada is certainly among the leaders in the world: the justice system's response on intimate partner abuse.

3. The *Alliance* research cluster design: The Development Process

In the development of this strategic research cluster on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse, the *Alliance* follows the research tradition implemented at the research centres to involve people working on intimate partner abuse at the local level (regions) first. This collaborative process ensured that priorities from each province would be addressed in the design of a Canadian observatory on the justice system response to intimate partner abuse. Consequently, regional meetings were held in seven provinces⁸ with people from the university, the community and the government⁹ to discuss priorities in their respective regions related to justice, community and policy responses to intimate partner abuse. Regional consultations took place in diverse cities in Canada including Calgary, Edmonton, Fredericton, London, Montreal, and other regions in Quebec, Regina, Vancouver, and Winnipeg. A broad list of themes on research, service delivery and policy issues were explored during the consultations, including:

- Human service delivery,
- Justice system treatment of domestic violence cases,
- Successful initiatives put in place under the jurisdictions (governmental, community),
- Absence of initiatives (reasons and consequences),

⁸ Brief summaries of the regional consultations in English and French are available upon request to Carmen Gill.

⁹ See Appendix 1: *List of organizations represented at the regional consultations across Canada.*

- Development of public policies,
- Research conducted on justice response,
- Mechanisms and strategies put in place to address family violence issues (partnership, protocols in the province), and
- Priorities in the province in terms of service delivery, justice response, policy, and research.

From these regional consultations, it became clear that, while there are a number of issues and concerns across the country, there are also distinct interests and various issues that need to be addressed from provincial/territorial perspectives. The content of discussion held at regional meetings reflect, for a large part, the specificities of provincial policies and programs on the issue of intimate partner abuse. The consultations also pointed to regional particularities. For instance, in some consultations, participants were concerned about aboriginal communities and the justice system treatment of intimate partner abuse in those communities; in others, there were concerns about the need for programs and policies that are sensitive to the diversity of the population; still in others the unique realities faced by those living in rural areas was important. Yet, these consultations revealed major research priorities that were similar for all the regions. Most importantly, the emergence at the local level of the lack of a national, comprehensive, and cohesive justice system response to intimate partner abuse was a consistent theme that has become the vital focus of this research cluster design. The *Alliance* recognizes that it needs to have a clear understanding of the national picture on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse in order to work more efficiently on finding solutions to eliminate violence. Moreover, the *Alliance* recognizes the necessity to be inclusive of regional particularities in the development of such a research cluster design.

At a national meeting held in Montreal on February 22, 2005, participants from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Québec and New Brunswick¹⁰ identified some of the key emerging themes and specificities that need to be taken into account at the national level. The objective of that meeting was to develop the research design, to agree on broad directions to be taken by the group over the coming years, and to create a synergy among participants around a common theme that would also respect regional specificities. The following discussion is based on discussions from this meeting. The mission, goals and research priorities are elaborated around two fundamental key elements (or building blocks) that are perceived as crucial by all the members of the team: the definitional focus on intimate partner abuse and the *intersectional* theoretical approach.

3.1 Questions of definition: Intimate partner abuse¹¹

The original title of our research cluster design was very broad in order to permit the inclusion of various dimensions of family violence and openness among academics, community partners and representative from provincial governments. At first, this broad brush enabled us to look at all research possibilities regarding the justice system's response from an *Alliance* perspective.

¹⁰ Appendix 2: *List of organizations represented at the National meeting.*

¹¹ This section is partly based on: Gill, C. *in press.* « Violence Between Intimate Partners: Understanding Theories and their Links to Intervention Strategies », in M. R. Hampton & N. Gerrard (eds.). *Intimate partner violence: reflections on experience, theory and policy.* Toronto: Cormorant Books.

However, discussions at the regional and the national levels facilitated clarification of the focus of the original intention.

In the literature, different terms are used to describe violence in the family. Depending on the researcher's standpoint, the targeted actors in a study can be: the abusers, the victims or the witnesses. The term selected will convey a certain understanding of the issue. For instance, distinctions can be made among *conjugal violence*, *domestic violence*, and *family violence*, *violence between intimate partners*, *woman abuse* and *violence against women*? Mann (2000) provides a substantial discussion on terminology available in the literature explaining, for instance, that the term *violence against women* is grounded in a feminist perspective and the term *family violence* reflects a sociological and helping professional perspective. Mann also notes that some researchers believe that the terms *violence against women* and *family violence* refer in some ways, to different issues within the spectrum of abuse, demonstrating the diversity of views and interpretations of the abuse phenomenon.

Hence, in the literature, we find variation in terminology. *Family violence* is a designation encompassing violence against any member in the family setting (child, teen, woman, man, elder). Duffy & Momirov (1997) use this term but recognize the gendered nature of family violence. For many researchers (Gelles, 1997), family violence has a larger implication than *conjugal* or *domestic* violence, *violence between intimate partners* and *violence against women*. In French, the use of the term *conjugal* violence (Larouche, 1987) is related to violence between intimate partners, similar to the term *domestic violence* or *violence between intimate partners* in English. Yet, other researchers have used the same term to emphasise a broader definition, inclusive of both genders. For instance, Buzawa & Buzawa (2002) use *domestic violence* as a gender-neutral term, assuming that violence is a problem for both genders.

The use of the term *violence against women* clearly states that violence is not gender-neutral, that women are more at risk of violence, and it encompasses all types of violence towards them. It represents “unique aspects of the wider social problem of violence ...” (Johnson, 1996: XX). Martin (1996) states that all violence against women is characterized by “*l’abus de pouvoir exercé par un ou des hommes dans une société où les rapports sociaux de sexe sont inégalitaires et souvent synonymes de domination*” (121)¹². The use of the term *woman abuse* (DeKeseredy & MacLeod, 1997; Miedema & Nason-Clark, 2004; Tutty & Goard, 2002) is clearly stating that, although violence can affect every member of the family, women are more often at risk in their intimate relationship: “For example, twice as many women as men are beaten, five times as many choked, and almost twice as many have a gun or knife used against them” (Status of Women, 2002: 12).

For our understanding and for practical reasons, our national team is refining the term *family violence* by using the postulate Tutty & Goard (2002) made about women abused by intimate partners¹³. Recognizing that male partner abuse remains relatively rare, they remind us that the abuse of women still occurs much more frequently than the opposite.

¹² “an abuse of power perpetrated by one or many men in a society where gender-based relations are unequal and often synonymous with domination” (free translation).

¹³ Tutty and Goard provide a good discussion about incidence rates on repeated abuse of women by men (2002: 14).

From this standpoint, the national team recognizes the diversity in labelling and defining the issue and is moving forward on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse across Canada, including children as direct or indirect victims of spousal abuse. Just as important as the definitions and diversity issues are, it is also important to establish the theoretical foundations from which policies and programs in the area are to be observed and analysed.

3.2 Theoretical Approach

An integrated approach to the cluster model emphasizes dialogue between key actors involved in the field of violence in different provinces. It brings together people from government, community-based organizations, businesses, and universities. Our area of concern pertains to social change and is oriented toward identifying solutions to intimate partner abuse with regard to the use of the judicial system. This cluster approach is guided by a participatory, action-oriented, research agenda. This is not to say that all the research work of the cluster will necessarily follow a particular methodological process. In fact, other methodological perspectives will also be used when they fit the tasks to be performed. In addition, we are taking into account the integration of geographically-situated sub-clusters that are already in place to stimulate the emergence of a consensus at the national level. From this perspective, it is important to build a research agenda that is inclusive of convergent as well as divergent aspects of problems and solutions that will, in the long term, be influenced by the research directions in which our particular research centres are engaged.

The creation of a Canadian observatory will engage people from different milieus and will be inclusive of provincial, territorial, regional and community dynamics. Key actors on the issue of intimate partner abuse will come from different provinces, from different provincial jurisdictions, and from sectors that deal with different social issues in their regions. Coming from different milieus and provinces, an intersectionality framework is the appropriate one. An intersectionality approach "[...] includes an analysis of the multiple nature of identity and interlocking nature of systems of privilege and oppression to show how the categories of race, class, gender and sexuality rely on each other to function within systems of domination" (Ristock, 2002:100). Intersectionality recognizes that a combination of systems of oppression operate together to sustain and reproduce inequality. An intersectionality approach recognizes the historical, social, and political contexts in which individuals live. In turn, it recognizes that social location shape women's experiences of violence and their access to programs and services.¹⁴ Such a framework allows flexibility and openness to target priorities, involving a multi-dimensional perspective that may vary among regions, provinces and territories. The intersectionality framework also recognizes the diversity of people's experience of intimate partner abuse. Using an intersectional analysis in research:

¹⁴ Crenshaw, K. 1994. "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity, politics, and violence against women of color", in M. Fineman & R. Mykitiuk (eds.). *The public nature of private violence: The discovery of domestic abuse*. New York: Routledge.

Engages girls/women/people in their communities; has a consultation process that goes beyond “representation”; uses participatory methodology; permits reshaping the research question and methodology because of the input; builds capacity of the individuals and the communities; builds in solutions/strengths and not just the negative aspect of a lived experience; assesses the limitations of both quantitative and qualitative approaches and does not apply an either/or approach; attempts to achieve concrete change.¹⁵

Therefore, our approach to the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse is dictated by an innovative framework that is consistent with the actual work developed by the Centres in a participatory-action model¹⁶ in the *Alliance*, and that will improve our partnership across Canada.

4. Relevance for Canada of a strategic research cluster on the justice system’s response

From each of the Centres’ perspectives, we can highlight existing studies on the justice system’s response to family violence, especially to women abuse. The studies they have conducted on this issue are very substantial. Centres’ members of the *Alliance* conducted and continue to conduct research in their community on various aspects of the justice response to family violence. For instance, in **British Columbia**, research undertaken by a FREDa associate examined the appropriateness of using restorative justice approaches in cases of intimate violence (Cameron, 2003). As well, SSHRC-funded researchers are examining the links between health and justice in marginalized girls’ and young women’s experiences in order to better identify barriers to accessing services and opportunities for them. Most of the young women in the second study were sex trade workers who had experienced violence (Jackson & Henderson, 2005). This research overall has led to different projects for marginalized girls’ such as the Girls’ Conference held in Vancouver in 2003 entitled: *Keepin’ It Real’: Girls Speaking Out about Diversity*. RESOLVE, under the leadership of RESOLVE-**Alberta** (CURA funding), is completing an impressive assessment of the justice system in domestic violence cases that clearly demonstrates the importance of inter-provincial research in this aspect of the administration of justice. They are also starting another major CURA project, lead by RESOLVE-**Manitoba**, taking a longitudinal look at women who have been abused by intimate partners. RESOLVE-Manitoba is leading two impressive on-going studies on Family Violence Court (1990-2005) and on the Domestic Violence Protection Order legislation for which data has been collected from 2002 to 2005. In 1996, RESOLVE-Manitoba conducted a study on recidivism rates among offenders who completed batterers treatment groups and those who did not. In **Ontario**, the Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children (CRVAWC) is an active participant in the London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse. The City of London, Ontario, became a leader in the development and provision of services to battered women with the establishment of the London Co-ordinating Committee on Family Violence in 1980. The Centre has conducted research on sexual harassment and child protection. Moreover, CRVAWC has funded research initiatives to examine aspects of the justice system. In **Quebec**, a research team has conducted

¹⁵ Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. 2004. *The final Summary report of a roundtable on integrated feminist analysis*. London, ON: Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children.

¹⁶ This means that people are working together to connect the university with communities.

research on the attrition of domestic violence cases in Montreal Courts (i.e. causes that are dropped before the end of procedures). Another research team recently studied the role of the criminal justice workers and of the social intervention practitioners in the prevention of wife homicide. An FQRSC-funded study is also underway on child custody and access and its links to violence between intimate partners. In **New Brunswick**, research on conditional sentencing in domestic violence and related cases is underway to better understand this particular strategy used by the justice system as an alternative to incarceration. Another study is looking at how allegations of spousal abuse affect legal decision-making about the future care of dependent children, and explores how legal decisions about children affect family members' lives. A research has also been conducted in regard to the PEI justice system and its response to women abused by their intimate partners (Woman abuse and the PEI Justice System Research Team, 2004). All these studies are geographically oriented and conducted locally.

There are still major knowledge gaps across the country in regards to how the Canadian justice system operates among provinces and territories, what policies are in place in provinces and territories, how they evolve over time, how to deal with marginalized clientele, etc.? The Family Violence Initiative¹⁷, launched in 1988 by the federal government, is certainly an important and valuable resource for information on coordinated policies at the federal level. It has not, however, created a strong bond with the provincial jurisdictions in regards to intimate partner abuse nor established a coordinated intersectoral effort to eliminate intimate partner abuse across Canada. The provinces have created their own legislation to deal with domestic violence¹⁸, starting with Saskatchewan, where the Victims of Domestic Violence Act [1995] (Brown, 2000), was implemented, followed by others across the country. Each of the provinces has different processes and services, and diverse communities, which increase the complexity of the examination of the justice system response on intimate partner abuse. For instance, in all provinces and territories, charging and prosecution policies on spousal abuse are in use, but there are differences among provinces with respect to how decisions to charge are made (Ad Hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group, 2001:11). Policies do have an impact on intimate partner abuse (the victims, the abusers and the witnesses) which can have unintended consequences. For instance, there is a need to re-examine policies that were implemented over the last twenty years in terms of what works, what does not work. How do conditional sentencing policies impact the victims? At this time, we know that there is not one successful policy that can resolve the complexity of the issue. Unlike other violent crimes committed by strangers, intimate partner abuse is difficult to solve because of the nature of the situation: intimate partner abuse occurs between people that know each other, and may have children, compare to being assaulted by a stranger, where it is obvious that the victim does not want to pursue any relationship with the abuser. This certainly impacts decision-making on the issue.

The proposed strategic research cluster originated from the *Alliance* of research centres in Canada. It is a unique opportunity to look at the particularities of different jurisdictions in regards to community, policy and justice responses to intimate partner abuse. It is meant to go beyond the actual state of research each centre of the *Alliance* is conducting locally to a coordinated research approach of Canadian jurisdictions. The *Alliance* suggests that the strategic

¹⁷ The Family Violence Initiative (1997-2002) from Health Canada is probably the most significant federal investment in family violence prevention.

¹⁸ The term "domestic violence" is broadly used under provincial jurisdictions.

research cluster on the “justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse across Canada: Reflections on regional specificity and a national common ground” be now designed as the *Canadian observatory on the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse: Towards a National common ground*. The following section presents the broad objectives of the observatory.

5. Mission Statement of the Canadian observatory

The mission statement of a Canadian observatory on the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse is to work as a national research partnership to:

- Conduct research that will ensure the uptake of new knowledge by stakeholders and that will encourage a multi-sectoral coordinated effort to reduce and eliminate intimate partner abuse that will help the establishment of an effective system across Canada.

5.1 Aims of the Canadian observatory

The aims of the *Canadian observatory on the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse* are as follows¹⁹:

- ▶ Establish the Canadian observatory on the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse as the national research centre of excellence in the study of intersectoral and inter-jurisdictional interventions on intimate partner abuse;
- ▶ Create a conduit for continual dialogue in both official languages among academics, frontline workers, professionals, provincial/territorial/federal government representatives and interested individuals at the regional, national and international levels;
- ▶ Acknowledge expertise in the domain;
- ▶ Enhance the effectiveness of the system and provide accessibility of research findings to stakeholders involved on the issue;
- ▶ Integrate a training component to the studies by involving graduate and post-doctoral students;
- ▶ Invite experts from academia and communities to share their knowledge and practice skills;
- ▶ Develop a coordinated intersectoral approach to intimate partner abuse;
- ▶ Promote effective responses to intimate partner abuse with successful initiatives put in place in provinces;
- ▶ Lay the ground work for the national standardized data collection on the justice system’s response while being respectful of the work already done in different jurisdictions.

¹⁹ The following aims are not listed in order of execution.

- ▶ Compare policies/programs/services to intimate partner abuse among provinces/territories, what works, what does not work;
- ▶ Establish a biennial National Conference on the justice system’s response and intimate partner abuse to be held every two years.
- ▶ Develop a national website on policies, strategies, and other responses to intimate partner abuse under provincial jurisdictions;

6. Specific goals and research priorities²⁰

The *Alliance’s* research experience confirms the necessity of conducting research that will ensure the uptake of research by stakeholders that will encourage a multi-sectoral coordinated effort to reduce and eliminate intimate partner abuse that will help the establishment of an effective system across Canada (Ursel, 2003). Following Tutty & Goard (2002), the *Alliance* is considering the importance of meeting challenges for future research on the justice system and intimate partner abuse: “Research assessing the efficacy of a variety of law enforcement, justice and community responses to domestic violence is crucial in deterring further violence and ensuring the ongoing safety of victims and their children” (126). To this date women’s experience has played a limited role in research looking at the justice system response on intimate partner abuse. As Landau (1998) pointed out: “Women who experience spousal abuse and do not contact the police must also be included in evaluations of justice system responses, and in the development of effective strategies for eliminating spousal assault and protecting women” (15). According to the Federal Family Violence Initiative (2002), “[...] the most pressing challenges is finding ways to address family violence issues in ways appropriate to the experiences, circumstances and needs of Canada’s diverse population and communities” (45).

It is the purpose of this observatory to look at the justice system response from the perspective of those who are entering in the justice system and those who avoid the system altogether. Both types of victim experiences can inform what works and what doesn’t in the provinces/territories. The Canadian observatory can make a unique contribution to communities, as there is little integrative analysis of the entire provincial/territorial jurisdictions responses.

The Canadian observatory will give priority to the following analytic considerations:

- √ comparisons among provinces/territories;
- √ intersectoral coordinated intervention;
- √ women’s experience;

to investigate the justice system’s response to intimate partner abuse.

²⁰ This section is based on the brief summaries of the regional consultations as well as on the national meeting.

The *Canadian observatory on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse: Towards a National common ground* focuses on three major questions of study on the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse:

- What policies and strategies are in place to resolve intimate partner abuse?
- How does the justice system operate across Canada?
- What are the targeted priorities (different/similar) among provinces/territories?

6.1 Policies and strategies to resolve intimate partner abuse

In its developmental stage, the Canadian observatory will conduct a national audit of different policies, programs and services that are responding to intimate partner abuse. This will consist of mapping the services and programs in the provinces and territories and inventorying policies under provincial/territorial jurisdictions. In the next stage, the observatory will monitor policy development²¹ at the provincial, territorial and national levels and the impact on provincial jurisdictions and communities. This will provide accurate information and help refine research on the justice response, understand how provision of services intersects. What is the power of policy impact? Policy analysis is needed to understand the disjunction between policy and its implementation. In the *Alliance* members point of view it is critical to bring initiatives from across the country together in the intersectional framework to have an understanding of the entire picture of the justice system's response on intimate partner abuse.

In policy development it would be very important to know the outcomes of various dispositions in criminal court, outcomes of protection/prevention orders, outcomes of mediation, outcomes and reliability of risk assessment tools, etc. For instance, the Canadian observatory will focus on policy issues and changes such as the effect of mandatory reporting to Child Welfare in cases of witnessing spousal violence and how this is affecting victims' likelihood of seeking assistance for the abuse. It is necessary to conduct a series of audits of existing policies and procedures to determine what is working and what is not. The result of these audits, should be a practical blueprint (rather than an "ideal template") of what changes to existing policies are needed. Also it is important to conduct a review of certain reports in order to evaluate and monitor recommendations, which have been implemented—as well as those that have not. We need to ensure that we move from research to action to sustainable change.

For the Canadian observatory it will be important as well to have data from other provinces/countries to compare our performance and to learn about new programs and policies. Knowing and exploring what worked or did not work in another jurisdiction, about a program or policy can assist in developing programming in Canadian provinces.

6.2 How the justice system operates across Canada

The original objectives of criminalizing intimate partner abuse were to promote the safety and security of victims, to render the perpetrator responsible for his actions, to raise confidence in the justice system and, more broadly, to recognize that intimate partner abuse is a crime against

²¹ The Observatory on violence against women within the European Union has developed the Daphne programme 2002-2003 to monitor policy developments at the national level and at the European and at international levels. It is an avenue to consider. New Policy Action Centre on Violence against Women, Retrieved March 28, 2005 from the website: www.womenlobby.org.

society. The current question, then, is: How do we make women safe in Canada? What is clear from our national meeting, is that there is a lack of information on how the system works within provinces/territories, and how information is collected in various regions (Ursel, 2002).

Data collection on intimate partner abuse entering in the justice system varies in each province. Although intimate partner abuse is a recognized crime by the criminal justice system, the justice treatment is connected to the provincial/territorial jurisdictions. This impacts the justice response in different ways across the country. Differences between civil and criminal justice legislation complicate the actual efficient response to the issue. As mention earlier, specialized courts are not established in each region. Child custody and access is also a major issue in cases of partner abuse. For example, the flow of information between family court and criminal court jurisdictions is difficult. Police may assist a woman and at the same time accompany a man to remove his belongings from the home, but may be unaware of any separation agreement or violence that has been cited as the main problem in family court. One critical issue therefore is how can the civil and criminal justice systems better share information in a timely manner? The interface between criminal and civil court raise numerous research questions to be tackled by the observatory:

- How can we bridge the gaps between criminal and civil court matters (i.e. abuse is often not considered in assessing access to children)?
- Is there an historic attitude towards intimate partner abuse that is still active in the justice system (i.e. Is the court's response to intimate partner abuse to mediate because these are still considered "domestic" cases?)
- What happens to families after they have been involved in the courts because of intimate partner abuse? What is the impact of the court process on women?
- How can we reach women at risk of lethality with no justice involvement?
- How can we make perpetrators more accountable? Get courts to take breaches seriously?
- Does the justice system collude and repress resistance to violence? i.e. mandatory reporting to child welfare by police may make women reluctant to report abuse.
- What are the differential experiences of people entering the justice system from mandatory and voluntary points?
- How do we prevent women from being re-victimized when they are involved with the justice system? Does a history of abuse cause further withdrawal and reluctance to access the legal system?

From police response to judicial and attorney response there are survivors of intimate partner abuse that need support and coherent intervention to solve the situation. Looking at the justice system response to intimate partner abuse from different provinces is a very complex issue and this requires a clear understanding of how the system operates.

Beyond the criminal justice system there are different civil legislations under provincial/territorial jurisdictions that are, as well, complicating how the system operates across Canada. Moreover, all victims do not necessarily enter the justice system and will never have contact with the criminal justice system. Some women never charge their abusers (Jiwani, 1998). Instead, these survivors get a divorce and custody of the children. Many do this by accessing legal aid. Abusers may go abusing.

The Effects of Specialized Justice/Policy Initiatives to address intimate partner abuse will be a focus of the observatory. For instance, we need to ask:

- What models of specialized courts and research/policies exist across Canada? What are the effects of specialized (docket) courts, trial courts, specialized police teams on perpetrators, victims and their children?
- In the cases of specialized courts, does the incidence of dual charging increase after implementation and what is the impact?
- What are best practices and the effects of specialized domestic violence police teams? How do different models of domestic violence teams affect outcomes such as recanting?
- Does freedom of information legislation create real or perceived barriers for agencies sharing information to assist victims, holding perpetrators accountable?
- What can a national review of research on batterer intervention programs tell us?
- How effective is the provincial civil legislation that provides emergency protection orders? Do they protect claimants? How are breaches handled?
- What is the effect of mediation/arbitration when domestic violence is present? How do processes, that assume equal power between parties, affect women?
- How is restorative justice working? How is it working cases of sexual violence, in Aboriginal and minority communities, with youth crime?
- Do new laws and policies differentially affect Aboriginal and minority communities?

6.3 Targeted priorities (different/similar) among provinces

The demographic characteristics are very diverse across Canada. This fact partially accounts for regional variations in the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse. Our regional consultations were extremely meaningful in regards to conducting research that responds to local and provincial needs. The Canadian observatory will recognize distinct community issues across the country and distinct targeted priorities among regions. Depending on the region and province, the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse has to address specific populations needs and diversity. Rural populations (including farming communities), Northern populations, Aboriginal communities, and Ethnic groups are among targeted groups of the Canadian observatory. Recognizing that there are distinct community issues, and that one response/treatment to address intimate partner abuse does not fit all, the Canadian observatory will tackle a vast number of questions including:

- How many women return to their partners for financial reasons or to protect their children (in the case of unsupervised access of children because of court orders)?
- What programs assist women in leaving abusive relationships (such as provincial financial resources) and how effective are they?
- Who takes over after the justice system response? What happens to women/victims after the justice door closes?
- There is a need to extend research on the justice system in cases of domestic violence into rural and remote regions. What impact does proximity to services have on the assessment of seriousness and the justice system's response? These

regions often cannot offer the full array of services available in the city and the impact of some orders can be quite different in a rural or remote area, for example, if a woman's partner is subject to a no contact no communication order on a reserve this may mean that the woman has to move out because the house belongs to the man.

- Are there effective models of domestic violence programs for rural/remote and northern Canada?
- What is an appropriate model for rural response to intimate partner abuse?
- Is there differential treatment of victims or perpetrators from minority populations in the justice system? Does actual or perceived differential treatment deter women from entering the justice system?
- Unique dynamics are being created in Saskatchewan and Manitoba due to an increasing Aboriginal population – how will these impact current systems? How will services adapt?
- Are treatment programs for Aboriginal and minority populations effective?
- What cultural pressures affect Aboriginal and minority women to resolve their domestic violence in their traditional cultural way? When Aboriginal women withdraw from justice responses to intimate partner abuse, how does this perpetuate stereotypes about them?

Immigrant women can be particularly vulnerable under the sponsorship program. If a spouse sponsors them, and he becomes abusive, the fear of deportation may keep the woman in the relationship. As well, depending on what the woman may be eligible for applying, she may have concerns about safe housing (e.g., if federal, which is better, as opposed to provincial assistance). A possible research project might address the impact of the Immigration Act on abused women, their experiences with the justice system, and factors that influence their choices to report abuse or not.

- How do immigration and sponsorship laws impact women in violent situations? How are sponsorship programs breaking down in intimate partner abuse cases? How do abusers manipulate sponsorship system? What are the special circumstances for immigrant women who leave their abuser?
- There is a need to increase cultural sensitivity and work collaboratively with people who live in the community. Areas have distinct and different needs, which need to be addressed (rural, urban, north). What are the different issues facing these regions and how can we best coordinate efforts for solutions?
- How can we better engage abused women and inform them of the available resources earlier?

These are just few issues highlighted at regional consultations and identified as priorities for the development of the Canadian observatory research agenda.

7. Stakeholders involvement: non-academic partners' role and involvement

The *Alliance* of the research centres is in a unique position to take the lead in the current project, already being immersed in communities across Canada, having multiple public collaborative relationships and experience in interpreting research results in ways that engage the general

public, often in both official languages. Such experience with past partnerships suggests that our research group is capable of making a significant contribution to the development of an innovative research cluster. The Canadian observatory will be built upon the existing multi-sectoral partnerships of *Alliance* members bringing together researchers from various disciplines, with strong research skills and expertise in the domain of family violence, intimate partner abuse and violence against women. In total, *Alliance* centres are affiliated with over 600 government and community agencies and have forged long-term academic-community partnerships. This is a work in progress that is constantly evolving. At the regional level, there are various on-going research projects that are not necessarily connected with the national research community. The Canadian observatory will create the national common ground for comparing jurisdictional' response to intimate partner abuse.

In each Centre, non-academic partners are involved in a participatory action research approach. Interaction between these groups is necessary when researching violence issues in different regions of the country. Research becomes connected to the local needs and experiences. Communities are directly able to benefit from research outcomes. In this Canadian observatory, non-academic partners will play a crucial role, along with academics, as they will be all part of the research processes. The non-academic partners from community-based organizations or governmental agencies are to contribute to the establishment of forthcoming research directions. The Canadian observatory will engage in building research capacity through continuous partnership development.

7.1 The main players in the Canadian observatory

There are many institutions/organizations that will be involved in the Canadian observatory. Many people representing institutions or organizations are already partners with the Research Centres across the country on diverse projects. A list of the main players to date is presented in Appendix 3.

7.2 Players to be invited

During the first year of activity, the Canadian observatory will invite representatives from the following types of groups/organizations/institutions to join the team:

Aboriginal organizations; Assembly of First Nations; Canadian Bar Association; Chiefs of police or their designate; Cultural organizations; Departments of social service and justice at the provincial level

8. Governance and management structure

The Canadian observatory will be a neutral setting, driven by an open-minded dialogue, emphasizing participatory partnership research. It will be inclusive of diverse interests and will encourage the incubation of ideas for policy transformations and changes. The endeavour of the observatory is to build trust among all people involved. The observatory will be located within universities for administrative and accountability purposes and will share research resources with community organizations and provincial government representatives. In order to be considered as a constructive and inclusive partnership, the observatory will establish a *zone franche* for every partner involved. The observatory should not be developed for the promotion of any single ideology or political agenda or any particular group of interest. A Canadian observatory on the

justice system's response to intimate partner abuse will recognize community expertise and assure an equal partnership in research. To achieve this primary principle, the Canadian observatory will create a National advisory committee, and structure regional branches under the research centres in the provinces.

A *National Advisory Committee* comprised of members from the *Alliance* (academics, community-based organizations and government representatives) will oversee the research directions and elaborate a five-year strategic plan. This committee will bring together one academic, community-based organization and government representative from each province/territory, and representatives from First Nations.

Every research centre will play an active role in conducting research under the umbrella of the Canadian observatory. It is fundamental for the observatory to enable provincial, regional and local specificities into the development of research directions to be taken at the national level.

A national biennial conference will be an opportunity to hold a face-to-face AGM with Canadian members

9. Resources and funding

It is in 1991 that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and the federal Family Violence Initiative (FVI) funded the Centres member of the *Alliance* "to establish a sustainable capacity to conduct research on family violence and violence against women"²². (5). Since then all Centres became financially sustainable. Before detailing a budget for the sustainability of the observatory, it is worthwhile to present the actual situation regarding existing funding of the Research Centres. This information is clearly demonstrating that each Centre is self-sufficient at the present time, is well-established, has infrastructures in place and that the funding projections made here are for the observatory only.

9.1 Existing funding

The Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre (FVRC) annual budget is about a third of a million dollars per year. The Centre receives support from the University of New Brunswick in the form of infrastructure. The university also provides administrative staff and contributes part of the salary of a full time Faculty member for the next five years. Since January 1998, the FVRC has been funded through an endowment of \$2.5 million raised by the Muriel McQueen Fergusson Foundation. The FVRC support one permanent staff positions from our core funding. Grants and contracts support two research/project coordinators and research assistants.

The annual budget of the Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la violence familiale et la violence faite aux femmes (CRI-VIFF) is about half of a million dollars per year. CRI-VIFF receives support from the Université de Montréal and the Université Laval in the form of grants and infrastructure. CRI-VIFF has funded research through the Community-University Research Alliance (SSHRC) and the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture.

The Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children is partially funded by an operating budget from the University of Western Ontario (UWO). This covers rent, utilities, University of Western Ontario administration and finance, as well as some funding for salaries at

²² SSHRC and Health Canada. 1999. *Democratizing excellence: The experience of the research centres on family violence and violence against women*. Ottawa: The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, p. 5.

the Centre. The remainder of the funding currently comes from a Scotia Bank donation as well as support built into various grants.

RESOLVE Manitoba receives base line funding from the Prairie Action Foundation and the University of Manitoba of approximately \$90,000 per annum. The remaining funds are grants and contracts that RESOLVE Manitoba has received. Their annual budget is about a quarter to a third of a million dollars per year, the vast majority from grants and contracts. RESOLVE Manitoba support two permanent positions from their base line funding and their grants and contracts support the remaining 10 to 15 staff of research assistants.

RESOLVE Saskatchewan receives base line funding from the Prairie Action Foundation and the provincial government of approximately \$40,000 per annum. The remaining funds are grants and contracts that RESOLVE Saskatchewan has received.

RESOLVE Alberta annual research funds are approximately a fifth to a quarter of a million dollars per year. RESOLVE Alberta receives base line funding from the Prairie Action Foundation of approximately \$40,000 per annum. The remaining funds are grants and contracts that RESOLVE Alberta has received. RESOLVE Alberta support two permanent half time positions from their base line funding and their grants and contracts support the remaining seven or 8 staff of research assistants.

The FREDA Centre is supported by Simon Fraser University (SFU) in the provision of space for offices and meetings. SFU also provides administrative support for some financial accounting and ethics approval processes. The Centre is project-driven otherwise, currently receiving research funding support from the National Crime Prevention Centre, Heritage Canada, and Federal Status of Women Canada. Individual researchers associated with the Centre also receive funding from SSHRC and CIHR.

9.2 Compensation to communities for research involvement

The recognition of community expertise can be done by providing financial compensation to organizations involved in research advisory committees, working committees and governing body of the observatory. Partners should be able to involve themselves in the development of research initiatives, conceptualization of research projects and programs, organization of activities of knowledge transfer and administrative decision-making.

Ideally, monies should be available to community organisations who want to associate with a particular researcher to develop intervention tools and manuals, specialized programs or protocols with research results. This can be done by permitting research teams to finance the conceptualization of these tools along with their implementation and evaluation. This is a concrete way of insuring that research results are integrated into practice, that the research we are funding in Canada responds to the needs of community partners and that there is a cross-sharing of expertise and perspectives between research and community partners. There should also be possibilities for community organizations involved in research teams to receive funding to finance small research projects to better understand and get a grip on emerging issues for their clients and organizations.

9.3 Main funding agencies for this observatory

The following list represents funding agencies from which members of the *Alliance* can potentially receive funding for this observatory: Canadian Heritage; Department of Indian and Northern Affairs; Department of Justice; Department of Public Safety and Emergency

Preparedness Canada/National Crime Prevention Strategy; Provincial/territorial governments
 Social Development Canada; Social Science and Humanities Research Council; Status of
 Women Canada.

9.4 Five-year Period Budget²³

	YEAR 1	5 YEARS
Personnel		
Graduate students (7 x \$15,000)	105,000	525,000
Post-doctoral Fellow	45,000	225,000
Coordinator	60,000	300,000
Communication officer	40,000	200,000
Travel		
Academics	56,000	280,000
Partners	56,000	280,000
Communication (phone, fax, mail, courier)	16,800	84,000
Translation	21,000	105,000
Interpretation	42,000	210,000
Infrastructure/Furniture (year 1 only)	42,000	42,000
Computer hardware (year 1 only)	28,000	28,000
Dissemination (year 2, 3, 4, 5 only)	0	42,000
RTS - Academics	35,000	175,000
Time Release - Partners	70,000	350,000
Project Seeds Money (\$15,000 x 7 centres)	105,000	525,000
TOTAL	\$721,800	\$3,371,000

²³ This budget is calculated on the basis of seven research centres.

9.4.1 Geographic Distribution of Budget (Approx.)

	YEAR 1	5 YEARS
• Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre (UNB)		
Administration (10%)	\$72,186	\$337,100
Translation/Interpretation	\$21,000	\$105,000
Research	\$89,802	\$418,414
<u>UNB total (25% of annual budget)</u>	<u>\$182,982</u>	<u>\$860,514</u>
• FREDA (Simon Fraser)	\$89,802	\$418,414
• RESOLVE (U. of Calgary)	\$89,802	\$418,414
• RESOLVE (U. of Sask.)	\$89,802	\$418,414
• RESOLVE (U. of Manitoba)	\$89,802	\$418,414
• CRVAWC (Western Ontario)	\$89,802	\$418,414
• CRI-VIF (Montréal and Laval)	\$89,802	\$418,414
TOTAL	\$721,800	\$3,371,000

10. Training

The nature of the observatory is to emphasize work in partnerships that will be comprised of people from different milieus. Inevitably, the entire development of the observatory and the various parts of the research agenda are to be developed among stakeholders involved in the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse. By taking an active role in the development of the research agenda and projects, representatives from community organizations and government will be immerse in the research process, will get to know about various data collection techniques and will contribute to the production of knowledge. This will not be a one-way learning process; the observatory will as well provide an extraordinary learning process to academics involved in research with communities. Simple questions as: how to build trust relationships with partners; How to recognise partner's expertise; How to work in partnership; are all aspects of the training experience academics and partners will gain in their work in the observatory. It is envision that the observatory will be a training platform for everyone involved.

The Canadian observatory will attract graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. Graduate students involved from each centre will have the opportunity to develop their research skills with non-academic partners in community-based research, to be involved in data collection and analysis. Graduate students will have the opportunity to develop a research project for their thesis. They will benefit from a strong group of researchers from academia and from other organizations involved in the observatory. Two post-doctoral fellows will be recruited in

universities participating with the observatory. These post-doctoral fellows will have an opportunity to develop and lead a specific project in the observatory. This is an excellent way to prepare research leaders for tomorrow in the area!

11. Knowledge mobilization and outreach

In order to develop research partnerships, which engage academics, community service providers, and representatives from the government, we must work with a variety of community partners, be inclusive of marginalized groups and have diverse ways of contributing to and sharing knowledge. Under the Canadian observatory, research projects will be designed and implemented to lead to useful results for local communities. This will be possible by involving all stakeholders sharing a common research interest from the beginning of the process. Knowledge mobilization is about building trust relationships among stakeholders. Using a participatory-action research model has shown to the *Alliance* that it is beneficial to everyone. The strategy used over the last few months for the preparation of this cluster concept paper is a good example of how research partnerships can be developed at the Canadian observatory.

Communication and collaboration in the future will be facilitated because academics from various disciplines and partners from different milieus have agreed on the development of a cluster around the justice system's response to intimate partner abuse across Canada. It is clear that the Canadian observatory will become a platform for stakeholders to meet, to develop projects, to share findings and to influence the policy making process across the country. It is important to invest time and money into such a meaningful research agenda that will respond to community needs and that will maximize the impact of knowledge on the general society.

Dissemination becomes very important for stimulating changes and for adopting best practices. A national forum will be established in the form of a biennial community-university conference held in a different location each time. Partners will also benefit from regional Research Days organized by the different research centres across the country every year. Knowledge mobilization is not only about dissemination it also has to do with the research process itself, which in return informs and generate successful exchanges among stakeholders. The model of collaborative partnership research works. Nevertheless, our experience with collaborative partnership research at the *Alliance* has demonstrated that considerable time must be devoted to bringing the communities and the academics together. Discussions need to take place around the respective involvement and the roles that people will play on teams. From this perspective, the collaboration itself is also an outcome of the research, as it reinforces links and generates solidarities among people on different issues. As a result, the capacity to act develops.

12. Monitoring and Evaluation of the Canadian observatory

Monitoring and evaluation of the activities performed by the Observatory will take both the formative and summative forms, focusing on processes and outcomes on the basis of systematically collected qualitative and quantitative data.

Ongoing procedures will be implemented to monitor selected aspects of service utilization (such as the website use) and the organizational functions of the Observatory, including the accessibility of the research produced across Canada. This should help in providing regular feedback on how the work is being done and utilized. We hope to be able to build these

procedures into the routine management information system (MIS) of the observatory. Similarly, an ongoing monitoring of the research outcomes will be instituted based on information collected at regular points in time. This built-in monitoring of both processes and outcomes will greatly facilitate the preparation of the Observatory's annual report. This utilization-focused document will be written with multiple stakeholders in mind, ranging from victims to researchers and funding agencies.

The formal summative evaluation of the Observatory will take place between years 3 and 5. It will focus on the partnership capacity for integration of different milieus, the involvement of students in training, the stability of partnerships and the potential for long-term sustainability of the Observatory. In addition, knowledge mobilization, transfer and outreach will be among the outcomes evaluated. This evaluation of outcomes will cover traditional dimensions such as measuring the satisfaction of stakeholders with various research products, tools, material, and training activities in the communities. We will also attempt to estimate the influence of our activities on the policy-making process. All evaluation activities will be conducted in a systematic fashion after meaningful consultations with the relevant stakeholders in order to maximize the utilization potential of the evaluation efforts. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies will be used in these efforts, depending on the evaluation tasks to be performed. Quantitative measures will be taken with regards to the number of project reports completed, journal articles submitted and published, presentations made at academic conferences and general public workshops. Special care will be given to reporting the number of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows involved in the Observatory's projects. Qualitative information will also be collected through interviews with a sample of key stakeholders to qualitatively explore their involvement as partners in different projects of the observatory, and to measure the satisfaction of their organizations with these initiatives.

During the fifth year of the Observatory, a meta-analysis will be performed using evaluation-relevant materials in a consolidated review of the objectives and activities of the Observatory. On the basis of this evaluation, to be presented to SSHRC and other contributing funding bodies to this cluster, a decision shall be made regarding the future of the Observatory (i.e., to renew or not its funding for another five years).

List of Bibliographical Notices

- Babbie, E. (2001). *The social practice of social research*. 9th Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Brown, T. (2000). *Summaries of charging and prosecution policies implemented in Canada*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.
- Buzawa, E.S. & C.G. Buzawa. (2003). *Domestic violence. The criminal justice response* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Cameron, A. (2003). *Gender, Power and Justice: A Feminist Perspective on Restorative Justice and Intimate Violence*. Masters of Laws thesis. University of British Columbia Faculty of Law.
- Canada. (2001). *Final report of the ad hoc Federal-Provincial-Territorial working group reviewing spousal abuse: Policies and legislation*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.
- Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. 2004. *The final Summary report of a roundtable on integrated feminist analysis*. London, ON: Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children.
- Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity, politics, and violence against women of color. In M. Fineman & R. Mykitiuk (eds.). *The public nature of private violence: The discovery of domestic abuse*. New York: Routledge.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. & MacLeod, L. (1997). *Woman abuse. A sociological story*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Deshler, D. et al. 1998. "Participatory action research with deer management citizen task forces: A promising approach to citizen participatory in natural resource management". Paper presented at the 1998 IAP2 International Conference, Tempe: Arizona, October [electronic version]. Retrieved April 2, 2005 from Cornell Participatory Action Research Network at www.einaudi.cornell.edu/cparn
- Duffy, A. & Momirov, J. (1997). *Family violence: A Canadian introduction*. Toronto: Lorimer.
- Gelles, R. (1997). *Intimate violence in families*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Gill, C. *in press*. Violence between intimate partners: Understanding theories and their links to intervention strategies. In M. R. Hampton & N. Gerrard (Eds.), *Intimate partner violence: Reflections on experience, theory and policy*. Toronto: Cormorant Books.
- Jackson, M.A. & A. Henderson. (2005). Restorative Justice or Restorative Health: Which Model Best Fits the Needs of Marginalized Girls in Canadian Society? In submission to *Criminal Justice Policy Review*.

Jiwani, Y. (1998). *Rural women and violence: a study of two communities in British Columbia. Unedited Technical Report*. Ottawa: Department of Justice [electronic version]. Retrieved June 4, 2002 from www.harbour.sfu.ca/freda/articles/rural00.htm

Johnson, H. (1996). *Dangerous domains: Violence against women in Canada*. Toronto: International Thompson Publishing.

Landau, T. (1998). "Working document: Synthesis of Department of Justice Canada research findings on spousal assault". Ottawa: Research and Statistics Division of the Department of Justice [electronic version]. Retrieved May 16, 2002 from <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/rs/rep/wd98-5a-e.pdf>

Larouche, G. (1987). *Agir contre la violence*. Montréal: La pleine lune.

Mann, R. (2000). *Who owns domestic abuse? The local politics of a social problem*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Martin, F. (1996). *Narrow doorway: Women's stories of escape from abuse*. Burnstown, ON: General Store Publishing House.

Miedema B. & N. Nason-Clark. (2004). Introduction. In M.L. Stirling, Cameron, C.A., Nason-Clark, N. & B. Miedema. *Understanding abuse. Partnering for change* (pp. 3-19). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

National Clearinghouse on Family Violence. (2002). *Family violence initiative/initiative de lutte contre la violence familiale. Year Five Report*. Ottawa: Health Canada.

National Clearinghouse on Family Violence. (1999). *Democratizing excellence: The experience of the research centres on family violence and violence against women*. Ottawa: SSHRC and Health Canada.

Policy Action Centre on Violence Against Women (n.d.). *What's new* [electronic version]. Retrieved March 28, 2005 from www.womenlobby.org.

Ristock, J. (2002). Responding to lesbian relationship violence: An ethical challenge. In L. Tutty and C. Goard (Eds.), *Reclaiming self: Issues and resources for women abused by intimate partners* (pp. 98-116). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood & RESOLVE.

Status of Women Canada. (2002). *Assessing violence against women: A statistical profile*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Tutty, L. Principal investigator. University of Calgary. 2001-2005. *Evaluating the justice and community response to domestic violence in the Prairie Provinces*. funded by CURA-SSHRC.

Tutty, L. & Goard, C. (2002a). Woman abuse in Canada: An overview. In L. Tutty & C. Goard (Eds.), *Reclaiming self: Issues and resources for women abused by intimate partners* (pp. 10-24). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood & RESOLVE.

Tutty, L. & Goard, C. (2002b). Challenges and future directions. In L. Tutty and C. Goard (Eds.), *Reclaiming self: Issues and resources for women abused by intimate partners* (pp. 117-129). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood & RESOLVE.

Ursel, J. (2003). Using the Justice System. In *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile*. Canadian Centre Justice Statistics, Ottawa, Ontario. (June)

Ursel, J. (2003). "His Sentence is My Freedom": Processing Domestic Violence Cases in the Criminal Justice Processing of Domestic Violence Cases in The Winnipeg Family Violence Court. In L. Tutty and C. Goard (Eds.), *Reclaiming self: Issues and resources for women abused by intimate partners* (pp. 43-63). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood & RESOLVE.

Woman abuse and the PEI Justice System Research Team. (2004). *HerStory of woman abuse and the PEI justice system*. Fredericton: Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre.

APPENDIX 1:

List of organizations represented at regional consultations

BRITISH COLUMBIA

January 28, 2005

B.C. Institute Against Family Violence
B.C. Coalition to Eliminate Abuse Against Seniors
B.C./Yukon Society of Transition Houses
Multicultural Family Support Services Society
Justice Institute of B.C. – Community Justice Programming
Vancouver School Board – Community Youth Programming
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General – Victim Services Division
FREDA, Simon Fraser University
RCMP
Vancouver City Police Department
Children’s and Women’s Health Centre of B.C.
Native Court Worker Association of B.C.

ALBERTA

February 1 & 2, 2005

Integration Services, Edmonton
Edmonton Police Services
Detective, Spousal Violence Intervention Team, Edmonton
Detective, Elder Abuse Team Edmonton Police Services
University of Alberta Sexual Assault Centre
Crown Prosecutor
Seniors’ Safe Housing
South Spousal Violence Team
West Spousal Violence Intervention Team
Strathcona Shelter Society.
Alberta Justice
Calgary Crown Prosecutor’s Office
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters
Ministry of Children’s Services
Resolve Alberta, University of Calgary
Calgary Coalition Against Violence
Alberta Association of Sexual Assault Centers
City Social Services, Healing the Spirit Program
Calgary Counselling Centre
Homefront (Calgary’s Specialized DV court)
The Brenda Stafford Centre and Gateway Place
Calgary Women’s Emergency Shelter Men’s Crisis Program

Calgary Counseling Centre
Prairieaction Foundation
YWCA Sheriff King Home
PhD Student, University of Calgary
Sheriff King Home group facilitator
External Relations, Prairieaction
Calgary Women's Emergency Shelter
Resolve Alberta, University of Calgary

SASKATCHEWAN

February 10, 2005

Regina Police
Saskatchewan Justice,
Provincial Court, Saskatchewan Learning,
Department of Community Resources and Employment
Women's Shelters
STOPS to Violence
Provincial Association for Transitions Houses of Saskatchewan
Resolve Saskatchewan, University of Saskatchewan

MANITOBA

January 25, 2005

Family Violence Prevention Branch, Department of Family Services and Housing
Victim Services Domestic Violence Unit, Department of Justice
Family Law Branch, Department of Justice
Seniors and Healthy Aging Secretariat
Private Law Firm (Criminal law) Phillips, Aiello
Private Law Firm (Family Law) Deeley, Fabbri & Sellen
RESOLVE Manitoba, University of Manitoba
Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba
Department of Public Prosecutions, Family Violence Unit, Department of Justice
Manitoba Association of Women's Shelters
Judicial Services, Department of Justice
Winnipeg Police Service
Provincial Court, Department of Justice

ONTARIO

February 7, 2005

Changing Ways
Ontario Ministry of Attorney General
Ontario Police College
London Police Department, Domestic Violence Officer
Researcher

Merrymount Children's Centre
Strathroy Rural Women's Centre
London Arab Women's Council
Muslim Family Safety Project
Media consultant and graphics artist
Atlohsa Native Women's Healing Services
University of Guelph - Sociology
Second Stage Housing
Disabled Women's Network of Ontario
Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children
Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System
University of Western Ontario

QUÉBEC

January-February 2005

Juge de la cour provinciale
Procureurs
Centre de la famille de la jeunesse Batshaw
Équipe de recherche de CRI-VIFFF : Femmes, Violence et des Systèmes Judiciaires,
Université de Montréal
Services Côté cour
Association Québécoise de Plaidoyer Victimes
Fédération des ressources d'hébergement pour femmes violentées et en difficulté du
Québec
CLSC Côte des Neiges
Comité interministériel de coordination en matière de violence conjugale, familiale et
sexuelle
Ministère de la Justice
ACCESSS
Au Cœur d'homme
Regroupement provincial des maisons d'hébergement et de transition pour femmes
victimes de violence conjugale

NEW BRUNSWICK

January 21, 2005

Public Legal Information and Education Services, New Brunswick
Executive Council Office, Women's Issues Branch
Victims Services -- Public Safety
Coalition of Transition Houses
Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre
New Brunswick Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
University of New Brunswick – Sociology
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research

APPENDIX 2:

Organizations represented at the National Consultation, Montreal

February 22, 2005

FREDA Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children, Simon Fraser University
Calgary Counselling Centre
RESOLVE Alberta (Research and Education for Solutions to Violence and Abuse), University of Calgary
RESOLVE Saskatchewan, University of Saskatchewan
University of Regina
Saskatchewan Justice
RESOLVE Manitoba, University of Manitoba
Manitoba Association of Women's Shelters
Manitoba Family Violence Prevention Branch
Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children, University of Western Ontario
University of Guelph
Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la violence familiale et la violence faite aux femmes (CRI-VIFF), Université de Montréal
Lise Poupart, Côté cour, Centre de santé et de services sociaux Jeanne Mance
Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research (MMFCFVR), University of New Brunswick
New Brunswick Coalition of Transition Houses
New Brunswick Executive Council Office, Women's Issues Branch

APPENDIX 3:

Main Players in the Canadian Observatory

Canadian Alliance of Research Centres on Violence

FREDA Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children, Simon Fraser University

RESOLVE Alberta (Research and Education for Solutions to Violence and Abuse), University of Calgary

RESOLVE Saskatchewan, University of Saskatchewan

RESOLVE Manitoba, University of Manitoba

Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children, University of Western Ontario

Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la violence familiale et la violence faite aux femmes (CRI-VIFF), Université de Montréal

Muriel McQueen Ferguson Centre for Family Violence Research (MMFCFVR), University of New Brunswick

Universities

Simon Fraser University

Université Laval

Université de Montréal

University of Alberta,

University of Calgary

University of Guelph,

University of Manitoba

University of Regina

University of Saskatchewan

University of Western Ontario

University of New Brunswick

Provincial Government Ministries/Departments

Ministry of Public Safety – Victim Services Division (BC, NB)

Crown Prosecutor’s Office (AB, QC)

Ministry of Children’s Services (AB)

Ministry/Department of Justice (AB, SK, QC, MB)

Provincial Court (SK, MB, QC)

Native Court Worker Association (BC)

City Social Services, Healing the Spirit Program (AB)

Integration Services with City of Edmonton, Community Services (AB)

Department of Community Resources and Employment (SK)

Family Violence Prevention Branch, Department of Family Services and Housing (MB)

Seniors and Healthy Aging Secretariat (MB)

Ontario Ministry of Attorney General

Services Côté cour (QC)

Public Legal Education and Information Services (NB)

Executive Council Office, Women’s Issues Branch (NB)

Vancouver School Board – Community Youth Programming
RCMP
City Police (Vancouver, BC, Edmonton, AB, Regina, SK, Winnipeg, MB, London, ON)
Ontario Police College
Comité interministériel de coordination en matière de violence conjugale, familiale et sexuelle (QC)

Community Organizations

B.C. Institute Against Family Violence
B.C. Coalition to Eliminate Abuse Against Seniors
Multicultural Family Support Services Society (BC)
Justice Institute of B.C. – Community Justice Programming
Children’s and Women’s Health Centre of B.C.
Calgary Counselling Centre
Detective, Spousal Violence/Elder Abuse Teams (AB)
Seniors’ Safe Housing (AB)
South/West Spousal Violence Teams (AB)
Strathcona Shelter Society (AB)
Alberta Council of Women’s Shelters
Calgary Coalition Against Violence
Association of Sexual Assault Centers (AB, NB)
Homefront (AB)
The Brenda Stafford Centre and Gateway Place (AB)
Calgary Women’s Emergency Shelter Men’s Crisis Program (AB)
Prairie Action Foundation (AB)
YWCA Sheriff King Home (AB)
STOPS to Violence (SASK)
Provincial Association for Transitions Houses/Women’s Shelters (BC/Yukon, SK, AB, MB, QC)
Private Law Firm (Criminal law) Phillips, Aiello (SK)
Private Law Firm (Family Law) Deeley, Fabbri & Sellen (SK)
Changing Ways (ON)
Merrymount Children’s Centre (ON)
Strathroy Rural Women’s Centre (ON)
London Arab Women’s Council
Muslim Family Safety Project (ON)
Atlohsa Native Women’s Healing Services
Second Stage Housing (ON)
Disabled Women’s Network of Ontario
Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System (ON)
Centre de la famille de la jeunesse Batshaw (QC)
Association Québécoise de Plaidoyer Victimes (QC)
Fédération des ressources d’hébergement pour femmes violentées et en difficulté du Québec
CLSC Côte des Neiges (QC)
ACCESSS (QC)

Au Cœur d'homme (QC)
New Brunswick Coalition of Transition Houses
New Brunswick Advisory Committee on the Status of Women