

# **Partner Contact:**

## **Protocol, Policy, Practice**

In Metro Toronto and Surrounding Areas

Marilyn Rivers, Ph.D. Candidate  
Counsellor, Researcher  
Violence Against Women Program  
Senior's and Caregiver's Program  
Family Service Association, Toronto

# Introduction

For many years, Toronto – and Ontario as a whole -- has been home to a government initiative referred to as the Partner Abuse Response (PAR) Program. Funded by the Ministry of the Attorney General, PAR programs seek to address the need for education and counselling to offenders who have been convicted of assaulting/abusing their intimate partners. In most cases, this involves a man abusing a woman in an intimate heterosexual relationship, although related initiatives operate to address the issue when women have been charged with assaulting men and when lesbian or gay partners in same sex relationships have been identified as assaulting/abusing their partners as well.

As an integral part of this initiative, the Partner Contact (PC) component involves a mandate to contact the partners and former partners (if applicable) of offenders who have been referred to a PAR program in order to provide information and resources designed to enhance the victim's safety. The protocol suggested by the ministry includes a number of safety measure standards for the partner contact component as follows:

- Contact the partner to provide information on available resources and on her (sic) rights,
- Provide the partner with information about the PAR program and her ongoing risks,
- Alert the partner if the program participant shows any behaviour that suggests that the partner's safety is at risk,
- Collaborate with local Violence Against Women (VAW) services to provide other assistance to the partner.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Herring, B. (2002). Evaluation of the Partner Contact Component of the PAR Program, (prepared for the Victim Services Division, Ministry of the Attorney General). Barbara Herring and Associates: Toronto, p. 1.

## The Herring Report

As referred to above, the Herring report was designed as an evaluative tool with a focus on appraising the Partner Contact (PC) component as to its efficacy and usefulness for victims. Funded by the Ministry of the Attorney General, the study focus was on adherence to Ministry guidelines and the helpfulness to victims as per this adherence. In addition, Herring et al. sought to establish a benchmark of the number of satisfied clients for future performance measures. A summary of findings indicated:

- The partners are generally satisfied with the program and are most interested in the services currently mandated for the program
- The contact is fulfilling its primary purpose, to enhance the safety of the partner
- The contracted minimum standards of the partner contact are being met
- The study identified a number of ways to strengthen delivery of the partner contact component <sup>2</sup>

It is this final finding that the current study addresses in its investigation. Among the factors indicated under 'suggestions for improvement' was the high level of frustration encountered by PC workers due to a perceived lack of cooperation between agencies, courts, police, and probation staff. Herring et al. concluded that there was a "need for more information sharing among local community agencies of services they provide"<sup>3</sup>. In an independent quest, the current study was pursued by the Family Service Association of Toronto to investigate the ways various agencies approach and conduct PC work. We hoped to identify areas of strength and challenges with the intention of sharing our findings and developing those areas of expertise.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. v

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 27

## The PAR Programs

Similar to the Herring report, this study has focused on the PC component of PAR programs for men who have been charged with some type of assault or threatening behaviour towards a woman with whom they are currently or have been previously involved with in an intimate relationship. Given the extensive findings in the literature that men in heterosexual relationships are by far the majority of those guilty of, charged with and convicted of assault and/or threatening behaviour towards a woman partner, it is consistent with both literature findings and government initiatives to focus on this population<sup>4</sup>.

Men<sup>5</sup> convicted in Ontario courts of crimes of assault against women, especially what is often referred to as simple or domestic assault, but also including assault causing bodily harm, assault with a weapon, and sometimes aggravated assault . . . as well as threatening or threatening death, are customarily directed towards a PAR program in one of two court-mandated streams dependent on level of abuse/violence and other indicators of further risk factors: the Early Intervention (EI) designation -- also called Early Plea -- or the Coordinated Prosecution (CP) model -- previously called Vigorous Prosecution<sup>6</sup>.

### **Early Intervention EI:**

Originally designed to address what are considered the `less violent' crimes of assault and intimidation, an EI plea requires that the accused have no prior criminal record of a similar nature and that the current offense did not result in significant injury to the victim. In addition, it is expected that the offender, in submitting an early guilty plea that saves court time, will be cognizant of his offense and able to acknowledge his responsibility in the crime. The EI designation offers

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g. See Dobash & Dobash (eds) (1998). *Rethinking Violence Against Women*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, pp.141-168 or MacKinnon, C. (2005). *Women's Lives: Men's Laws*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, pp. 206-239.

<sup>5</sup> This investigation will use pronouns to align with the findings of the VAW sector, i.e., the offender will be assumed to be a man and the victim to be a woman.

<sup>6</sup> See Partner Assault Response (PAR) Program Standards, Ministry of the Attorney General, Victim Services Division, June 2003.

the accused a chance to complete the PAR program while on bail and in cases where the couple is interested in reconciliation, he may return to the home under the injunction that he departs the premises upon verbal request by the woman, designated in an official 'Revocable Consent Letter' which the woman victim writes and which PAR and PC workers retain on file (see further explanation below).

The EI stream is designed to happen quickly, while the potential for remorse and rehabilitation is seen as greatest; the offender must contact the PAR agency within 48 hours of the court finding and the agency receiving him as a client is expected to place him in a group setting as soon as possible. Some courts even require that the offender return to court within weeks to 'prove' that he has followed up on the requirements. Meanwhile the offender must attend the PAR program in exchange for a 'deal' of no jail time and no federal criminal record if he completes the program and adheres to other bail conditions, (e.g. no firearms). Thus, for instance, the man whose work involves traveling may maintain his livelihood and continue to support his family financially. The level of responsibility granted to PAR programs in these cases is very high since there is no probation officer assigned. PAR and PC staff must therefore work closely to monitor the man. If offenders in this stream do not adhere to the conditions imposed or show additional difficulties not identified by the court, for instance, substance abuse or mental health problems, a breach must be prepared and considerable effort is involved in contacting authorities to assure the victim's safety and the offender's re-arrest. The work of the PC worker is crucial in these cases.

### **Coordinated Prosecution CP:**

Covering the myriad of additional situations in which assault/intimidation between intimate partners results in police charges being laid, the CP stream encompasses both the lesser and greater charges of assault. Offenders who choose to plead not guilty but are found guilty nonetheless; offenders who have a record of prior assaults; perpetrators who have caused severe injury to the victim etc . . . primarily find themselves channeled into this model. The CP model indicates that a conviction has already been found by the court -- even if the offender pled guilty voluntarily -- and at least part of the sentence, since it is

deemed a domestic case, is that he must attend a PAR program within a time frame designated by a probation order. In addition, the offender must adhere to any additional conditions that the probation officer believes necessary to ensure the safety of the victim and compliance with court guidelines and this may include regular meetings with the probation officer (PO), substance abuse counselling, psychiatric evaluation etc. In this stream, PO's have the authority to enforce conditions without returning to court – unless the offender consistently refuses to follow his probation order requirements. As opposed to the EI stream, offenders are watched closely by PO's who also contact partners/victims when possible and provide information and support to the PAR agencies working with the offenders. As in EI cases, victims may submit a Revocable Consent letter to the PO to allow for contact and the PO shares this with the agency.

**Revocable Consent Letter:**

Where a couple wishes to reconcile and/or the victim has other reasons for wanting contact with the accused, the No Contact or Restraining Order put in place by police or courts is waived at the behest of the woman and this decision is made public and official through the submission to PAR coordinators and PC Workers of a `Revocable Consent' letter. The letter is written by or in consultation with the woman victim and outlines what she wishes with respect to contact with the accused/offender named therein and that she understands she may revoke this consent verbally at any time. Designed as resolution for the myriad of reasons that women may need the accused to have contact, including access to children, the impetus has been to offer women a tool that supports her right to safety and equality within the relationship, i.e. she has court-designated authority to tell him to leave at any time. Given that not all offenders are consistently inclined to follow directives that support a woman's autonomy, PC workers may find these letters violated with frustrating frequency, resulting in increased risk to women and children and additional, urgently-required follow up procedures for PC workers.

### **The PAR Program:**

The PAR program is a 16 week psycho-educational curriculum designed to include both an educational and a therapeutic component. Ideally, male offenders are required to look at issues of violence/abuse from a pro-feminist perspective, to come to terms with their behaviour from the point of view of the woman. Agendas vary as per facilitator; however, an analysis of male violence towards women is customarily addressed using tools such as 'power and control' versus 'equality' wheels, videos of reenactments etc., and men are encouraged to acknowledge to the group their responsibility in hurting the women and -- if applicable -- children in their lives. (NOTE: Ministry Guidelines indicate that if children reside in the home where partner abuse is occurring, they are negatively impacted)<sup>7</sup>.

Most facilitators appear quite ambitious in the amount of material they attempt to cover. In my years working as a case coordinator/facilitator in these groups I adhered to, as a standard, the need to cover all forms of oppression, recognizing that many of the men in the program had experienced racism, financial deprivation, physical and mental disability, sometimes homophobia, cultural domination, even torture at the hands of political enemies in their country of origin. For men who had been treated similarly to the ways they brutalized women, an understanding of how bullying behaviour and its manifestations and effects creates lasting harm for us all proved to be the most efficient and coherent way to introduce the victim's point of view and often worked as a catalyst to elucidate a deeper therapeutic understanding for the whole group. Although I believe most PAR facilitators follow a similar trajectory, I offer only my own experience here.

Male offenders must attend 16 weekly group meetings where they are expected to participate in discussions about the abuse of men towards women and protocol demands that they cannot miss more than two sessions consecutively or three in total, although this requirement may vary as per cultural and personal variables. While they attend the program, men are apprised that their partners and/or former partners will be contacted and they are required to sign documentation to identify their acceptance of this requirement, filling in any information they may have

---

<sup>7</sup> See Partner Assault Response (PAR) Program Standards, Ministry of the Attorney General, Victim Services Division, June 2003, pp. 9-10.

concerning how to contact the women involved. In many cases, this signed form is the only avenue by which PC Workers receive information about how to contact women.

## The Study

### **PURPOSE**

This study was pursued as an initiative to discover similarities and differences among the various agencies in Toronto and outlying areas in the ways we initiate and conduct ongoing contact with the partners of clients attending PAR programs, otherwise known as Partner Contact (PC) work. Our own agency -- Family Service Association of Toronto -- has experienced tremendous change during recent years in the way we approach the task -- moving from part-time workers doing PC work as well as PAR facilitation, to full-time workers doing no other type of work, to VAW counsellors including PC work in their workload. This study was undertaken at the request of my manager, Lisa Manuel, to learn more about how different organizations are conducting partner contact and to ensure we had the best processes we could have in place to ensure the safety of women and the accountability of their partners for their actions.

### **METHODOLOGY**

A total of 12 agencies were contacted and 15 participants interviewed over the course of five months. Although difficulties were encountered in attempting to arrange interviews within often overwhelming schedules, everyone approached was willing and often eager to participate. The ratio of supervisory personnel to PC Workers in the study was 4/11 with early interviews conducted at one agency with both. It quickly became apparent that the difficulty in reaching and speaking to PC Workers would necessitate forgoing the request to interview both supervisors and PC Workers for this small study. I settled for interviewing the person easiest to

reach and most likely to be able to offer an hour of her/his time. Nine agencies within Toronto were interviewed as well as three outlying areas (See Appendix A).

Although my original intention was to cover all types of PAR initiatives and programs, it became apparent that some of the differences encountered were best bracketed for further study. Therefore, although an early interview included an agency working with women offenders, the difficulties encountered in attempting to analyze the data when it was compared to that of male offenders were excessive. I have included a mention here and a partial analysis as a reminder that certain assumptions about the PAR initiative do not apply unilaterally across gender. For similar reasons, even though many agencies offered information about their approach when abuse is encountered in same sex relationships, I also left the investigation of PC work in these PAR programs for future study as well. I expected that significant differences would appear across ethno-specific cultures and these have been identified.

Initially conceived as a telephone interview study, our intention was to collect as much information as possible in written form along with the interview data, for purposes of comparison and perhaps to spark potential sharing between agencies of those written materials that participants find most helpful. Questions were devised in collaboration with my supervisor, and their original intention was adhered to in spirit, if on occasion the exact wording was rephrased (see Appendix B). Rarely did my interviewees and I stick to the questions being asked. It was common to depart from the inquiry on tangents only loosely connected with the data being collected. Some of this material later appeared as part of the analysis; some of it was discarded. In all cases, I have maintained confidentiality as per our agreement

Several questions began to appear redundant as the study progressed, especially those in the final section asking about administrative procedures; in these instances I would skip the redundancies if questions had already been answered previously. In addition, some questions were interpreted differently by various participants and my tendency was to leave the interpretation intact, seeing the difference as important to an in-depth understanding of the complexities involved in doing PC work.

All but one off-site interview was conducted over the telephone. For this one exception, I traveled to the agency location and spoke to the PC Worker in person, gathering written information after the interview. Three other interviews, with PC Workers at my own agency, FSA, were conducted in person during the course of busy work days, with one of these being interrupted by the work itself and resumed days later. I chose the PC Workers at FSA for both their convenient location and also to ensure that the two ethno-specific cultures and three languages represented in our PAR groups were covered in this report, i.e. Tamil, Farsi and English. Copies of letters, policies and procedures filtered in by fax and email over the course of many months from the participating agencies.

### **QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS**

In all cases, I took handwritten notes during the interview process and transcribed these to a computer data base (NUDIST) subsequently in order to manipulate data as per coding via thematic material (See Appendix C). As a qualitative analysis, I employed several feminist research methods involving multiple site interviewing approaches with particular attention to the methodology of Shulamit Reinharz and her 'identification' principle. Reinharz advocates for a "deep identification" between that which is being studied and "the woman doing the study". She suggests blending thoughts, emotions, and ways of relating into the fabric of the study and refers to this as the 'connected knowing' between researcher, participants, content and purpose of the study.<sup>8</sup> I believe it is of particular importance that my own work at FSA has involved both parts of this analysis – the PAR and PC components. I worked as a PC Worker part-time for two years while simultaneously doing assessments of male offenders and conducting both a PAR group and a second stage, in-depth therapy group for men. My personal identification with this work was part of the reason I was chosen and chose to do the research. Without insider knowledge, I do not believe the conversational tangents that at times so richly rewarded me and other participants

---

<sup>8</sup> Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist Methods in Social Research. Oxford University Press: New York, p. 232-234.

would have happened; nor would the analysis have followed the process I pursued. As an example, I offer my original concept of what I saw as an outcome – a five-page report with most emphasis placed on the differences in procedures and communications with facilitators. What follows speaks to the depth of the PC work involved in contacting and working with victims and to the discipline, integrity and dedication of PC Workers, their supervisors and umbrella agencies across Toronto and the outlying areas who gave of their time and effort.

## **RESULTS**

Results have been divided by thematic material and I offer an overview here.

### **Special people to do special work:**

Although consistently across workers and agencies, the PC component was seen as a job requiring counselling skill to perform, there was some variation in emphasis placed on this particular function. Reports from workers support an ongoing need for the upgrading of skills but it appears from the information offered that official, traditional forms of training are less significant than dedication to the work and concern about women's well-being. Nonetheless, the majority of participants indicated that the level of training obtained by most PC workers was comparable to that in the general counselling field, with some exceeding these requirements. Many times, the tedious nature of attempting to reach women without correct information was mentioned as an obstacle to feeling effective in the job. This, combined with the observation that PC Workers 'never know what to expect' when they make that call creates an atmosphere of excited anticipation requiring workers to ready themselves for any type of occurrence. As one supervisor stated, 'it takes a special kind of person to do this work'. She was referring to a PC Worker who also worked in an administrative capacity as part of her position. The administrative component in this case was also seen as an asset to the PC work since the demand for accountability in the recording of details concerning a woman's safety is daunting. Another supervisor reported that her

agency had `given up on using VAW counsellors to do the PC work.’ She reported that `the PC work was too much for them to handle with their direct work as well’; her creative solution appeared in the form of a special worker who is being trained in VAW work but not officially designated a counsellor.

### **Time or the lack of it:**

From one PC Worker working one day per week and covering four groups to two full-time staff plus three part-time workers covering seven groups, the variance of time officially allotted for performing this important work covers all the territory between. For some agencies, it is staff counsellors who `fit’ the work into their existing jobs. This appears to present particular issues for the workers involved but is deemed to be more protected in terms of job security. Consistent across all interviews was the message that there is not enough time officially allotted for partner contact work and the belief that this stems from the allocation of scarce resources combined with the variability of the job, especially when victims experience crises that require an immediate response and no additional services have yet been accessed. It becomes the PC Worker’s job to refer or even secure those services, especially when language and/or cultural barriers are involved. For example, as one worker expressed it, “our client is the woman; it may be the first time they have an opportunity to talk to a counsellor and they have many needs”. Therefore, no one could specify with any confidence the amount of time on average the work requires: too many variables interfere with any attempt to assess the time it takes. As one worker described it, “When I start to make that call, I never know what’s coming. I could be busy for a few minutes or an hour and a half. I have to be ready for that”.

### **Contradictions between “counselling” and “safety outreach”:**

#### **Reality versus guidelines**

Conversations with women victims were reported to last from a few minutes to more than an hour, the longer calls often occurring as the result of an ongoing crisis or the occurrence of another assault. Although not all PC Worker’s have been trained as counsellors, all women doing this work indicated that counselling

was needed in a large percentage of cases. Those workers with less counselling training were almost always involved in upgrading their skills, recognizing that the job required it. Frequently, mention was made of the policy from the Ministry which indicates that PC work is not intended to be counselling<sup>9</sup> but as one PC Worker indicated, “this is confusing for women. Many times women will want to talk to someone and don’t understand what the difference is between counselling and what I’m doing”. In contrast, some women indicate they do not want to be called and as one PC Worker said “I don’t take it personally. Some women are highly alert; she may want to know about me and say she will call me and then she doesn’t. I will call her until I get a firm ‘don’t call here’ message”. All PC Worker’s reported that they respected women’s wishes in this regard and will not call back. Sometimes there is more to deal with. One worker told me that one woman revealed how she regretted calling the police and then yelled at the worker every-time she called, taking her anger out on the PC Worker instead of requesting no more calls.

#### **What goes into four contacts:**

All participant agencies identified the Ministry protocol of four contacts as their target and/or minimum, most indicating that they prefer to make contact once per month while the offender is attending PAR group sessions. However, many participants indicated there was a large variance. For instance, if a woman does not return calls when messages are left, workers will continue trying to reach her sometimes making up to a dozen attempts. Other workers identified they will make only the four attempts in an effort to contain heavy workloads. Since Ministry guidelines do not specify the number of calls required when a victim doesn’t answer, this procedure is decided by individual agencies and workers. Most PC Worker’s leave messages if this is advisable (i.e., the offender and victim are separated), but in cases where an offender may be blocking the messages, most PC Workers will apply more effort rather than assume she is choosing not to return

---

<sup>9</sup> Partner Assault Response (PAR) Program Standards, Ministry of the Attorney General, Victim Services Division, June 2003, pp. 29-30

their calls. One agency, for instance, sends a letter, leaves a message, then sends another letter before giving up. The process takes most of the four months the man may be in group. In addition, most workers report that they may make more calls if there are safety concerns or if women have questions they need answered. One worker told me women sometimes keep calling after the man has completed PAR with one client checking in with her years later. Two PC Worker's said they had women come to visit them at their offices and one of these workers expressed sadness that she now must discourage the practice since her particular program had recently felt the need to cut back on expenses.

### **Letters: Are they effective?**

Out of 11 agencies participating, six send letters consistently with one of these programs sending two letters to each victim, one as the man begins the program and one as he completes or fails; two agencies never send letters and two send them only if they cannot reach women by phone. As with other issues, one PC Worker expressed a concern with sending letters, identifying a cultural issue that makes the use of Canada Post problematic; "I'm not sure who has access to the mail," she said. "It's a cultural piece; sometimes there's more than the partner in the home." Another culturally specific PC Worker reports she has 'given up on letters' due to obstacles to sending them in her community: she indicated that often she does not have the correct address and the letter comes back: "I have no time to check to see if letters come back or not," she said. Most services see the sending of a letter as a single contact but no one appears to depend upon it. For instance, even workers who identified the letter as comprising their first contact with the victim indicated that they attempt to make four additional telephone calls. The letter therefore took on the appearance of an extra task except for those instances when no telephone number was available or the four telephone conversations were not possible. In addition, 3/11 agencies send extra information with the letters, including items such as safety planning aids, information about the effects of woman abuse on children etc. As part of the study, interviewees were asked to provide copies of the letters they send. Due to concerns around

confidentiality, copies will be held for further coordination between workers and agencies and are not available here.

**Messages: To leave one or not.**

Seven representatives from the 11 agencies identified that they would leave a message for the woman on a service or answering machine on the first call, sometimes qualifying this with an adjunct that messages must be allowable according to prior information from PO's or other victim services. Of the seven programs, four specified that the message would only include the first name of the PC Worker and the agency telephone number without identifying agency, program or purpose for the call. Four other PC Workers indicated 'maybe' as answer to this question citing concerns about the offender's possible proximity despite assurances to the contrary and the possibility that the woman may be screening her calls. As one worker described it, "This is always a difficult decision. Sometimes I leave one and hope there is no danger, or I may leave an official sounding message. I look at the file to see if the woman is with her partner." Both of these PC Workers, consistent with most services, reported that they would not leave a message at all if their records indicated that the couple was living together. The majority of participants identified their reluctance to leaving messages as based on the potential wrath and/or manipulations of male offenders were they to discover the call was made to women partners.

As reported in the 2003 Ministry Standards (see footnote 5 page 30):

Experience has demonstrated that many men who are referred to a PAR program are antagonistic towards and resentful of the program's contact with their (ex) –partner. Many men have actively interfered with this contact by, for example, intercepting mail-outs, accompanying the woman to appointments, monitoring phone calls to or from outreach staff, lying about her inability to speak English, and threatening her not to speak with partner contact workers.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See Partner Assault Response (PAR) Program Standards, Ministry of the Attorney General, Victim Services Division, June 2003, p. 30

## **Discussion**

Results supported the hypothesis that PC Workers and their supervisors are largely interested in increasing communications across agencies. PC Workers especially seemed eager to have a chance to talk to other PC Workers about what they do and how they do it, even when this work was overwhelming in scope and the demands on their time were significant. All workers appeared to be aware of the need for entirely different approaches in responding to the variety of cultures represented and when cultural specificity was built into the program, approaches were often seen as dramatically divergent.

Many PC Workers were complementary towards colleagues, celebrating excellent relationships with supervisors, PAR coordinators and counselors who appeared to understand the importance of their role. In fact, a PC Worker's relationship with and access to the group facilitators involved with the offenders was often seen as crucial to feeling able to adequately respond to women at all.

A significant and repeated response to the final question regarding additional issues of importance to workers was the observation that talking about their experiences doing PC work opened up and/or increased workers' desire to continue a discourse about the work. A common conclusion was the recognition of how isolated a PC Worker can become due to the nature of the work alone and how few resources are actually built into the system to assist them in dealing with the ongoing crises to which they must attend. Most workers were clear with me about the limitations of the support they received, commenting that this was not a function of any one person and that for the most part, PC Workers were well-

supported by supervisors and colleagues. It was the nature of the work and the way in which it is perceived generally that appeared to be the most isolating aspects for participant workers. As one PC worker commented, "PC work is not valued the way it should be". She told me workers had been voicing their concerns for years, that several meetings had been arranged for workers to have the opportunity to talk to each other but . . . "we're so busy that we don't really have the time".

PC Workers without exception were aware of the importance of what they were doing in the lives of the victims who appreciated the contact; to varying degrees, however, they were unsure about how their work was viewed by the larger VAW or therapeutic community and especially how its systemic function was seen or prioritized by the Ministry of the Attorney General's Office which provided the funds for the service, attaching these funds to the offenders enrolled in PAR programs. More than once, for example, I was reminded that while male offenders attend 16 weeks of group sessions, they may bring with them more than one victim for PC Workers to contact, yet the funds available for those contacts remain the same regardless of the number of victims or amount of work required.

Intended to serve as a resource to the agencies and workers concerned, this preliminary investigation has touched only the surface of the complexity involved in pursuing this work. Further study is clearly indicated to elucidate specifically the value that Partner Contact Work holds in the field of working with victims of violence and abuse. Nonetheless, the research outlined here provides a glimpse into what appears to be a large variance in ways of doing business, yet a glimpse that ultimately illuminates parallels in approach that the work itself seems

to demand of its practitioners. Differences in policies held by various agencies, interpretations of the protocol outlined by the Ministry, and an exceptional variety of creative solutions to staff and funding limitations result in a range of practices whose investigation provides a window of opportunity into a much needed general knowledge of the field. In the event that further study is requested to elucidate the extensive differences involved when women in heterosexual or lesbian relationships and men in gay partnerships are charged with similar offences, this study may also serve as a benchmark reference point for the contacts made with victims in those settings.

## **Table of Appendices**

Appendix A: List of participating agencies

Appendix B: List of interview questions asked by researcher of this study to the participant

Appendix C: List of themes coded from resulting data.

# Appendix A

## Participants (in alphabetical order):

Abrigo

Catholic Family Services of Peel

Chinese Family Services of Toronto

Counterpoint

COSTI

\*\*\*Elizabeth Fry Society\*\*\*

Family Service Association, Toronto

Family Services, Durham

Family Services, York Region

John Howard Society

Native Child and Family Services of Toronto

Rexdale Women's Center

\*\*\* The Elizabeth Fry Society works with women charged with assault. Although responses from the PC Worker in this agency were recorded early in the process and thus influenced subsequent interviews, differences indicated across gender were deemed too great for inclusion in the results of this study. We hope to include them more thoroughly in future research which focuses on themes more consistent with PC Worker and client experiences in this circumstance.

## Appendix B

### PARTNER CONTACT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Who does the Partner Contact work at your place of business?
2. Does this person have involvement with perpetrators identified by legal system?
3.
  - a) Is there a protocol/process agreed upon by mgt and workers for PC work?
  - b) Is this protocol written up? Copy Available?
4. Questions regarding protocol:
  - a) Who makes the first call?
  - b) When is the first call made?
  - c) What happens if you get an answering service/machine?
  - d) What happens if someone other than the victim answers the phone?
  - e) What happens if you know it is the perpetrator who answered the phone?
  - f) Do you inform anyone if the perpetrator answers the phone and your information indicates there is a restraining order?
  - g) How many calls are made and does this vary? What are the reasons for variance if any?
  - h) Do you or someone else at your service send letters to women? Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the letter?
  - i) What happens if your contact with the victim indicates there has been another assault against her by the perpetrator?
  - j) What happens if your contact with the victim indicates there are other forms of abuse taking place against her by the perpetrator?
  - k) Do you inform the leaders of the men's groups about details of the woman's complaints?
  - l) What types of information do you not disclose to group leaders?
  - m) Do group leaders vary in their desire to receive information about women's concerns? How do you view this?
  - n) What is the protocol regarding what is done with information you disclose to men's group facilitators about a woman's concerns? Does it vary for the different leaders?
  - o) How is this information stored in your files?
  - p) What is done with private information about women's location/telephone numbers. Do the men's group facilitators have access to it?
  - q) Do PC Worker's have access to information about men enrolled in the PAR program?
  - r) How much information about men do PC Worker's receive? Where is it stored?
  - s) Do you have a computer data base where information is stored about both?
  - t) What access is permitted PAR leaders to women's files?
  - u) What access is permitted PC Worker's to PAR files?
  - v) Is there anything else you think it may be necessary to research regarding the issue of partner contact work?

## Appendix C

### List of NODES/Themes

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Time Used                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Number of Calls</li> <li>ii. When first call made</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Time Allocated</li> <li>c. Letters</li> <li>d. Messages                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reaching Service or Machine</li> <li>ii. Another Person Answers</li> <li>iii. Perpetrator Answers</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Counselling               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Level of Skill</li> <li>b. Amount of Training</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Communications               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Type</li> <li>b. Level of Comfort</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. SAFETY               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Safety Plan</li> <li>b. Subsequent Assaults</li> <li>c. Non-Physical Abuses</li> <li>d. When Offender Violates a NC or RO order</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Women Clients               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 1<sup>st</sup> contact</li> <li>b. Desire for Contact</li> <li>c. Complaints</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Partner Contact Workers (PC Worker's)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Role(s) in Agency</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Differences               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Culture</li> <li>b. Culture and Language</li> <li>c. Reflected in Agency</li> <li>d. Reflected in Program</li> <li>e. Not Reflected</li> <li>f. Gender</li> <li>g. Sexuality</li> <li>h. EI</li> <li>i. CP</li> </ul> </li> <li>8. Policies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Agency</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. Access to Info               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. About PC women</li> <li>b. About PAR men</li> <li>c. Sensitive Info</li> </ul> </li> <li>10. Protocol               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ministry, WACT</li> <li>b. Agency</li> </ul> </li> <li>11. Concerns               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. PC Worker's</li> <li>b. Supervisors</li> </ul> </li> <li>12. PAR Facilitators               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Approach</li> <li>b. Gender</li> <li>c. Communications with PC Worker's</li> <li>d. Groups</li> </ul> </li> <li>13. Information               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Paper filing systems</li> <li>b. Computer use</li> <li>c. Confidentiality</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|--|--|