

Integrated domestic violence services: A case study in police/NGO co-location

Alternative Law Journal
2021, Vol. 46(1) 27–33
© The Author(s) 2021
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1037969X20984598
journals.sagepub.com/home/altlj



Trish Mundy 

School of Law, University of Wollongong Australia

Nan Seuffert

Legal Intersections Research Centre, University of Wollongong Australia

Abstract

Australia's National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, launched in 2010, has emphasised the need for integrated responses across government agencies, specialist domestic and family violence services and the justice system. This article presents an evaluation of an integrated, community-based domestic and family violence response service that uses a rare model of co-location in a police station, and assesses its suitability as a model service for the future. The evaluation reveals that there are many positive aspects of such co-location and the authors argue that this model should be more widely trialled in Australia.

Keywords

Domestic violence, family violence, policing, women

Australia, like many other countries faced with an emergency epidemic level of domestic and family violence (DFV), is looking for solutions in preventing the violence, supporting its victims and survivors, and holding the abusers accountable. Australia's National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, launched in 2010, was the first strategy coordinating federal, state and territory governments through four successive three-year action plans with the goal of preventing violence against women.¹ The consultation and

action plans have emphasised the need for integrated responses across government agencies, specialist DFV services and the justice system. Further, the most recent NSW Domestic Violence Death Review Team Report, 2017–2019, recommends the co-location of specialist domestic violence services, developed in partnership with local domestic violence specialist services, including Aboriginal services, at police stations.² This article presents an evaluation of an integrated, community-based domestic and family violence (DFV)

¹Council of Australian Governments, *National Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and Their Children 2010–2022* (2013) https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/08_2014/national_plan1.pdf. For a collation of these Action Plan initiatives, see: Australian National Research Organisation for Women's Safety Limited (ANROWS), *The Australian Policy Context: Government relations* (Web Page) <https://www.anrows.org.au/resources/government-relations/>.

²NSW Domestic Violence Death Review Team, *Report 2017–2019* (Statutory Report, 2020) XXII [Recommendation 27.1].

Corresponding author:

Professor Trish Mundy, School of Law, University of Wollongong, Northfields Avenue, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia.
Email: tmundy@uow.edu.au

response service that uses a rare model of co-location in a police station, and assesses its suitability as a model service for the future. The evaluation reveals that there are many positive aspects of co-locating community-based integrated services in a police station, and we argue that this model should be more widely trialled in Australia, and carefully evaluated on a broader scale, for its potential to deliver more positive outcomes in safety and empowerment for survivors of DFV, police transparency and accountability and in holding abusers accountable.

The authors were asked by the YWCA of New South Wales (NSW) to evaluate its Domestic Violence Intervention Service (DVIS), established in 1992 in the Shoalhaven area on the south coast of NSW. The DVIS aims to improve outcomes for survivors of DFV through the provision of an integrated, holistic approach that coordinates government agencies, other community and NGO services, and legal system support. It is co-located in the Nowra Police Station. Through a formal evaluation, the YWCA sought to establish whether its co-location model might contribute to understandings of 'best practices' in integrated services.³

This article analyses the findings of the qualitative, feminist-inspired evaluation of the DVIS with a focus on co-location as a suitable national model for DFV services.⁴ It is divided into four substantive parts. The first part examines the DVIS aims and objectives. The second provides an overview of the evaluation methodology and analytical framework, while the third section analyses the interview data, highlighting the benefits and challenges of the co-location model. Finally, the article concludes with discussion of the potential of this model as a national exemplar, making recommendations for co-located interagency services as part of the national DFV prevention strategy.

DVIS aims and objectives

The DVIS offers survivors of DFV crisis and long-term support, information, referral and integrated case management services. The aims of the service are to work closely with police and other key agencies in providing an integrated crisis intervention response that enhances support and outcomes for survivors. An after-hours crisis support service includes assistance with emergency accommodation and emotional support with police statements. Service components are stated to include: proactive, coordinated criminal justice responses; coordination and integration of service systems; facilitation of

prioritisation of DFV issues and services by key partner agencies; and preventative action through community education. The discussion of the findings for the evaluation below provides more specific information about the DVIS services.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation focused on the success of the DVIS against the aims and objectives identified above, with particular focus on the benefits, challenges and impact of co-locating the service in a police station. The evaluation proceeded in four phases. First, a comprehensive literature review identified best practice evaluation methodology for integrated DFV services. Human Research Ethics approval from the University of Wollongong for the design and conduct of the research came second. Third, the empirical research included identifying and interviewing service users: clients, police, magistrates, community organisations and government agencies that regularly come in contact with the DVIS. Finally, we analysed the data and wrote our report on the outcomes of the evaluation.

The evaluation was designed with participant safety – both physical and emotional – as the priority. Perhaps the most important aspect of this research was designing a safe process for inviting clients to participate. Staff at the DVIS assessed the level of risk of participation for current and former clients and invited, by phone, only those not at risk. They also informed the researchers of the most appropriate method of contact. A list of potential participants was provided to the researchers and participants were randomly chosen from this list. A range of factors contribute to difficulties with participant recruitment in studies around DFV, including reluctance to speak about the abuse, casual and precarious work situations that may require showing up at short notice, frequency of moving, the high rate of interactions and appointments with government and community services, children who may need extra attention as a result of living with the abuse, and the trauma and exhaustion that are part of recovering from abuse. As a result, while much larger numbers of potential participants were contacted, and more clients agreed to interviews, in the end we interviewed five current and four former clients who experienced low, medium and high risk of violence. This group included one CALD and one Aboriginal woman; we also interviewed one external agency worker who identified as Aboriginal (see discussion below of the challenges of co-location).⁵

³The evaluation report is available from the authors. Nan Seuffert and Trish Mundy, *Evaluation of the YWCA NSW Domestic Violence Intervention Service* (2017).

⁴For a literature review of integrated and interagency service responses to DFV, and a discussion and analysis of the feminist orientation of the evaluation and methodology in the context of an argument about the tensions between feminist-inspired integrated DFV services and neo-liberal governmental service imperatives, see Nan Seuffert and Trish Mundy, 'Law, Society and Domestic Violence: "Best practice" methodologies for evaluating integrated domestic violence services' in Chris Ashford and Alexander Maine (eds), *Research Handbook on Gender, Sexuality and the Law* (Edward Elgar, 2020) 301.

⁵A discussion of the demographics of the region and the DVIS workers' thoughts on service provision to CALD clients can be found in the evaluation report, see Seuffert and Mundy (n 3).

Police, including Domestic Violence Liaison Officers and other key staff (four interviews), government and non-government agencies (four interviews), a Local Court Magistrate (one interview) and DVIS staff (two interviews) made up the key informants and service users interviewed.

Methodological risks of client recruitment by the service were managed through random selection of participants from the lists and by 'triangulation' of research methods. A 360 degree perspective on the service was achieved by balancing potential client subjectivity with program data, stakeholder interviews and recent literature and policy reviews.⁶ In-depth interviews of one to two hours were conducted with all participants to understand their relationship with, and experiences of, the DVIS, including perceptions of its role, work and effectiveness.

The risk of emotional distress and trauma for victims of violence was minimised by focusing interview questions on experiences of the services provided, rather than on the violence itself. Participants were offered follow-up support services. No participant in the study expressed distress during or after the interview and none requested referrals to support or counselling services.

Benefits of the DVIS co-location model

The evaluation was focused in part on assessing the benefits, challenges and impact of co-location in a police station as a potential best practice for integrated DFV services. Three key benefits were found: (1) education and increased police accountability and transparency; (2) promotion of safety for the women and children; and (3) facilitated women's autonomy and empowerment. We address these benefits in turn. Challenges related to co-location of the DVIS – the potential reluctance of some Indigenous DFV survivors to attend the police station, tensions in the working relationship between the DVIS and the police, and role clarification and workflow issues – are then discussed.

The DVIS is physically co-located in the police station in Nowra. Entry is through the main door to the police station into a large foyer; directly ahead is the police reception and to the left is a door into the DVIS. This physical co-location means that DVIS staff interact with police and police staff on a daily basis, and clients could benefit from both services in one visit, with frequent cross referrals. It facilitated a relationship of trust and

partnership, which contributed to better outcomes for DVIS clients across the board, particularly for their safety. Police responses to survivors of DFV, including minimising and trivialising the violence and 'victim blaming', have consistently been identified as a key obstacle to effective DFV intervention.⁷ The evaluation found that co-location of the DVIS played an important role in addressing these obstacles both with individual officers and, importantly, in the *broader police culture*. The role of DVIS in educating new police officers was directly and significantly facilitated by co-location. An informal convention arose of police officers on probation spending one to two hours with DVIS staff during their early weeks in the job. A key informant from a government agency describes the impact of this practice:

They've [police] been to the academy. They think they know everything, but they know nothing [about domestic violence] and the best supervisors will instruct them to go and sit with [the DVIS coordinator] for an hour. [She] will take them under her wing and they will come out – in terms of their policing of domestic violence, they will be completely different to cops who haven't had that. (#1)⁸

A DFV service not located at a police station would be unlikely to have this access to new officers and individualised, targeted upskilling.

This education exchange goes both ways, with DVIS workers and police acknowledging mutual learning. For example, a DVIS worker indicated that the co-location model has given her 'a whole new respect for police'. (#2) A senior police officer referred to the 'insights' into policing afforded to DVIS through co-location. (#3)

Integrated DFV services are recognised as contributing to the enhancement of accountability and transparency of the partner agencies and of justice system responses through advocacy, monitoring and proactively holding agencies and the justice system actors accountable.⁹ The evaluation found that trust built over time resulted in access by the DVIS to police information and data, enhancing the credibility of the information provided to external partners, and facilitating trust, respectful dialogue and shared understandings. A Magistrate and a women's refuge worker pointed out that co-location is vital in achieving accountability. The Magistrate commented that 'Having them co-located at the police, having them right there and then, there is then some accountability. So, sometimes they've

⁶Jan Breckenridge et al, 'Meta-evaluation of Existing Interagency Partnerships, Collaboration, Coordination and/or Integrated Interventions and Services Responses to Violence against Women: State of knowledge paper', *ANROWS Landscapes* 11/2015 (2015) 1, 5, 25-26, 30-31.

⁷Liz Kelly, *Domestic Violence Matters: An evaluation of a development project* (Research Study Report for the London Home Office No 193, 1999) 57-67; Tracy Cussen and Mathew Lyneham, *ACT Family Violence Intervention Program Review* (Australian Institute of Criminology, Technical and Background Paper No 52, 2012) 89, 96.

⁸Interviews were conducted on a confidential basis at three different locations. As identification of ethnicity, class or position, or pseudonyms, might allow a participant's quotes to be linked together, and participants to be identified, interview comments have been numbered sequentially without any further information to protect confidentiality.

⁹See, eg, Katrina Finn and Amy Compton-Keen, *Domestic Violence Integrated Response Gold Coast: An Examination of Current Practice and Opportunities for Development* (Domestic Violence Prevention Centre Report, 2014) 3, 6; Robyn Holder, 'The Emperor's New Clothes: Court and justice initiatives to address family violence' (2006) 16(1) *Journal of Judicial Administration* 30, 33.

been able to go into bat for us, where women may not have got the best of responses [from the police]'. (#4)

A government worker with knowledge of the service explained that although police responses to DFV have improved in recent decades, there are inherent challenges of policing DFV which continue to contribute to police resentment:

So DV is relentless... it doesn't very often lead to a positive outcome. Victims are often reluctant to give statements. Police go to a lot of trouble and do a lot of work, sometimes putting themselves at risk, that ends up with no positive result. So it can be a frustrating, annoying, burdensome kind of thing.

Having a presence in the station that keeps hammering the importance of sensitivity and all of those kinds of things is vital. Left on their own, police tend to kind of forget about those aspects...

Accountability can kind of slip. You're accountable within the chain of command but external accountabilities can go unserved. So having... [the DVIS] there... does provide... an accountable reference point. (#5)

The importance of the effective role of the DVIS in education, in holding police accountable and insisting on transparency, cannot be underestimated. Co-location, and the daily presence of the DVIS in the midst of police practices, is essential in enabling this accountability. Tensions resulting from this monitoring for accountability are discussed below.

The established working relationships between the DVIS and police, and the trust and respect developed over time, contribute to enhanced short and long-term safety for the clients. The phrase 'I felt safe', or variations thereof, recurs in several of the client interviews. For some, the perception of safety is linked to the physical security of the police station, with specific references to the location where police are on site and can offer protection and a sense of safety, such as this client stating 'I felt safer [going to the police station]'. (#6) A DVIS worker describes the practical way in which co-location at the police station enables immediate safety for clients at point of crisis:

If we feel that somebody is not safe to go home... or to their community then we've got the police right there to be able to... talk it through with them about why these people are not safe and what are they going to do; an urgent AVO or relocation. We've had to relocate people out of area... [to other towns and cities for safety]... So that sort of response is good but we need police's help for that. (#7)

The DVIS supports women to maximise their safety by taking legal action to enforce court orders, doing so in the manner judged safest by the woman. Stakeholders in

government, non-government and judicial agencies, also expressed confidence in the DVIS provision of immediate and short-term safety to mutual clients. For example, a Magistrate emphasised the proactive role of the DVIS in ensuring that AVOs are tailored in a way that can effectively protect children's safety. (#8)

Long-term outcomes in DFV programs, such as reductions in the number, frequency and severity of violent incidents, and reduction in the overall prevalence of violence within a community, are notoriously difficult to measure.¹⁰ However, every client interviewed stated that engagement with the DVIS contributed to their long-term safety, and indicated that co-location assisted with this.

Two clients volunteered that they would probably or inevitably have remained in a violent relationship were it not for the DVIS. Many clients felt, in relation to prosecution and court processes, that they would have 'given up' (#9), while one client stated that she 'would have killed herself' (#10) were it not for the role of the DVIS in supporting her through recurring violence and constant court cases over the course of several years.

Where clients encounter long-term, repeated violence, DVIS support increases the likelihood and confidence of the victim reporting incidents to police and pursuing legal redress, as these two women stated:

I know if it wasn't for them, I wouldn't have gone through with the reporting. (#11)

It's been 18 months now since I told him to leave, oh my God, just the intimidation, the stalking, the threats, it's awful. Sometimes I just feel like going back so it will go away but then, without [worker's name] and all that... Now I know that I am – that I'm safe and I'm strong enough to follow police – ring police if I'm scared and stuff like that. (#12)

The assistance of the DVIS in cooperation with other agencies enabled practical safety measures, including those involving police, to be put in place, preventing or minimising harm from abusers. For example, the transition from temporary accommodation to permanent housing increases clients' sense of safety (#13; #14; #15; #16) and has profound impacts for women and their children.

Sustained engagement with the DVIS assists clients with the determination and strength to maintain their own safety. Clients perceive the DVIS to have significantly enhanced their safety, with co-location contributing by enabling communication between clients, the DVIS and the police. This conduit outlasts the initial crisis phase and promotes continued policing intervention, enhancing longer term safety.

The interviews confirm that the DVIS is successful at empowering clients, and that empowerment is linked to co-location and enhanced by the DVIS cooperative relationships with the police, in facilitating appropriate police

¹⁰See, eg, Breckenridge et al (n 6).

responses to ongoing violence. One aspect of this empowerment is that safety over time contributed to the strength and determination to pursue and persist with justice system processes. This strength and determination also underpinned recognition that women were not to blame for the abuse, and that they had 'an option' to leave abusive relationships, and 'a bit of hope that you can do it on your own. Because that's one thing that you end up feeling before you leave is 'I can't be on my own', because they make you feel so useless that you don't think you'd live.' (#17)

Empowerment also led women to the ability to see themselves as an agent of change for others. Four clients expressed a desire to 'give back' to the service and 'make a difference' to the wider community by becoming DFV advocates for other women, referring to themselves as 'survivors, not victims'. One woman commented that she hoped 'to make a difference to my community and . . . to actually make change – to make change and to put funding in and use funding for things that will get done'. (#18)

Enhanced safety and empowerment of clients also contribute to their ability to make other positive changes in their lives. Every client stated that aspects of their lives had improved through engagement with the DVIS, ranging from material gains such as housing, to personal achievement and community engagement, accessing further education, and psychological and emotional transformation in self-confidence, pride and happiness. Further, enhanced safety and empowerment are directly linked to the co-location of the DVIS – swifter and more effective policing, and a more positive police culture and practice in relation to DFV all promote women's continued engagement with legal process and enhance empowerment.

Challenges of the DVIS co-location model

We turn now to the challenges of co-location. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people make up 5.5 per cent of the Shoalhaven region population, significantly higher than the NSW and national populations (2.9 per cent and 2.8 per cent, respectively).¹¹ Aboriginal people in the Shoalhaven, like Indigenous people across Australia, have a mistrust of police stemming from the historical and recent legacy of police violence.¹²

Just two participants in the evaluation identified as Indigenous – one client and one external agency worker. However, non-Aboriginal participants also made relevant comments. The client who identified as Aboriginal in her interview stated that she had been supported by the DVIS for about 18 months and was highly satisfied with the service and the information and support offered to her. She emphasised the importance of access to a non-Aboriginal organisation for support. She

explained her reluctance to use Indigenous services due to privacy and confidentiality concerns, and the presence of members of her family and the perpetrator's family in many of these organisations. She also stated that she probably would not have engaged with an Aboriginal worker at the DVIS if there had been one. (#19)

The Indigenous worker participant identified aspects of poor inter-cultural practice and insensitivity on the part of DVIS, in approaches to casework and inter-agency relations. However, there was some ambiguity in her comments; she may at times have been referring to the YWCA Shoalhaven broadly, rather than the DVIS specifically. She acknowledged that some Aboriginal women do not want to use an Aboriginal-specific service and emphasised the importance and value of choice. She also regarded the co-location of the DVIS and its association with police as a potential barrier for Aboriginal women: 'Aboriginal women don't – there are just a lot of trust issues with police. They're scared that the police are involved so FACS [state child welfare agency] are going to be involved and we've always said that it would hinder people attending'. (#20)

Police attitudes to DFV may include resentment and resistance, as discussed above. However, all DVIS and police interviewees recognised that law enforcement policies have placed increased emphasis on DFV, and that policing of DFV is taken much more seriously than it was a generation ago. Nevertheless, cultural differences in the approaches of police and NGOs to DFV, including police resentment and resistance to the presence of victim support and advocacy in the police station, were identified:

Traditionally police have tended to think, this is policing, this is criminal justice, this is care bear stuff, this is for the social workers and the counsellors and all that kind of stuff and never the twain shall meet. That's too simplistic. I mean, in some senses it's inevitably going to end up that way because police don't have the expertise or the time or whatever. But the interface between those two roles needs to be amiable, not conflicted. (#21)

A minority of police officers have this view, and it has reduced over time. The DVIS coordinator recognised this resistance, referring to being 'treated like a tea lady' for the first year or two of the program, until trust and respect were gradually developed. (#22) A former police officer noted that while he had a good relationship with the DVIS,

they're either loved or hated and I think the ones that don't like them it's more from a lack of understanding of what they do and the feel of the intrusion into the police station. (#23)

This tension for co-located services, between maintaining cordial working relations with police officers and the

¹¹Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016 Census Quick Stats – Shoalhaven (Web Page, 2017) https://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/LGA16950.

¹²Legislative Council Standing Committee on Social Issues, Parliament of New South Wales, *Domestic Violence Trends and Issues in NSW* (Report No 46, August 2012) 92 <https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/inquiries/1687/120827%20Final%20report.pdf>.

need to advocate for improved policing practices, has been identified in research internationally.¹³ The fact that the DVIS managed to reduce these tensions over time, combined with the one-on-one training and more general police education, seem to outweigh the negatives.

The police officers interviewed for the evaluation all raised issues regarding the impact of the DVIS on police roles and allocation of work within the station, both positive and negative. Clients' use of the DVIS as a 'gateway' to services, stopping first in the DVIS office when they enter the police station, allows immediate provision of support, particularly when police are busy or unavailable. However, police who regard a particular victim as problematic may divert her to DVIS as the 'too hard basket'. (#24) It was also suggested that diversion of victims to DVIS may allow abdication of responsibility for the 'core business' of 'the criminal side of things'. (#25)

Use of the DVIS as a gateway service may result in the DVIS referring to a police officer of their choice, bypassing the usual 'job flow' allocation determined by the police supervisor. (#26) However, for a DVIS worker 'cop shopping' is vital for traumatised victims in need of sensitive and sympathetic police officers, particularly if they have had negative experiences with police in the past. (#27) Several of the clients affirmed the importance of forging links with supportive police officers. (#28; #29; #30; #31; #32; #33; #34; #35)

Another issue raised by all of three police officers interviewed was their perception that the DVIS staff have 'free rein' (#36) of access to all areas of the police station. They are concerned that DVIS can 'walk in' on sensitive operational briefings or discussions (#37; #38; #39), although the extent to which this occurs is unclear.

It was not suggested that these problems are serious, intractable or outweigh the benefits of co-location. Rather, review of co-location policies was suggested in order that issues 'can be ironed out'. (#40; #41) Tensions between non-government support and advocacy services and the police culture are probably deeply embedded and should be openly addressed rather than optimistically disregarded. The DVIS is achieving its goal of collaborative work with the police through co-location; ensuring sustainability of the model requires a joint commitment and ongoing communication.

Conclusion: Co-location as a best practice model?

Our evaluation revealed that the key aspects of co-location of the DVIS at the police station were the development of mutual trust and a good working relationship, and a willingness for the two parties to learn from each other. The key benefits for integrated service delivery include immediate provision of emotional support and validation for victims in crisis, ease of access to in-depth information regarding policing and other justice system processes, and a confident guide through the maze of government and community services and the legal system. The co-location model assists in achieving immediate and longer-term safety, and confident advocacy for the rights and needs of survivors of DFV.¹⁴

The potential was also identified for a co-location model that would result in enhanced police empathy and respect for victims and survivors, improving chances that the abuser will be held accountable. Co-location enables workers, with proximity to police, insight and direct participation, to enhance police 'accountability' in responding to DFV.

These benefits of co-location present powerful arguments for trialling co-located specialist, integrated community DFV services more broadly. It should be noted that the DVIS was a well-established service at the time of the evaluation, with stable long-term staffing and a history and track record of building trust with the police, government agencies, other community groups and clients. This suggests that longer term investment in trials of this model are necessary and cautions against the short-term pilot projects so often funded in this area.

Attention to the challenges of co-location, particularly alternative choices in culturally appropriate services for Aboriginal women, should also be a key aspect of any trial. International literature has found that many women 'marginalised by ethnicity' distrust police and integrated services that include the police – often for good reasons.¹⁵ Alternative options for support, in the form of non-police DFV crisis services, may be particularly important for marginalised groups,¹⁶ including Indigenous people in Australia.¹⁷ Finally, any trial of co-located services should incorporate ongoing communication and review of policies of engagement between police and the DFV service, and will be a key to the trial's success.

¹³Gill Hague and Ellen Malos, 'Inter-Agency Initiatives as a Response to Domestic Violence' (1997) 70(1) *The Police Journal* 37, 40–1; Australian Law Reform Commission and NSW Law Reform Commission, *Family Violence – A National Legal Response* (ALRC Report No 114, NSWLRC Report No 128, 2010), 1228 <https://www.alrc.gov.au/publication/family-violence-a-national-legal-response-alrc-report-114/>; Kelly (n 7) 85–7, 91–7, 103–9.

¹⁴At the time of the evaluation NSW had commenced its 'Safer Pathway' program, a uniform statewide system of referrals aimed to ensure that DFV victims are offered streamlined, consistent and 'robust' access to support. From the perspective of DVIS workers and others, this was an ironic step backwards from their effective integrated service. Seuffert and Mundy (n 4) 53–4.

¹⁵Hague and Malos (n 13) 40–1.

¹⁶Kelly (n 7) 79; Anne P DePrince et al, 'The Impact of Victim-Focused Outreach on Criminal Legal System Outcomes following Police Reported Intimate Partner Abuse' (2012) 18(8) *Violence Against Women* 861, 876.

¹⁷Australian Law Reform Commission and NSW Law Reform Commission (n 13).



The findings of this modest evaluation also suggest that the DVIS co-location model has real potential to address what is referred to as ‘the implementation problem’¹⁸ in relation to DFV – that is, the perennial gap between ‘the law on the books’ and ‘the law in action’ – by enhancing the accountability and transparency of police and promoting the continued engagement of victims with legal processes which, crucially, promote the safety and empowerment of women and increase the chances that abusers will be held to account. Research demonstrates that police, legal system decision-makers and other officials may be resistant to change in law and policy in the area of DFV,¹⁹ leading to a failure to implement law and policy reform intended to address the epidemic of DFV. Co-located, community based DFV services should be more widely trialled and evaluated

as part of an effort to meet Australia’s national priority of addressing the needs of survivors of domestic violence and holding abusers accountable.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Meredith McLaine for excellent research assistance and the YWCA NSW Domestic Violence Intervention Service for their partnership and support of the project.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article: Funding for this research project was provided by a National Australia Bank Community Impact Grant.

ORCID iD

Trish Mundy  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0490-742X>

Trish Mundy is a Professor in the School of Law, Faculty of Business and Law at the University of Wollongong, and a member of the Legal Intersections Research Centre.

Nan Seuffert is a Professor and Director of the Legal Intersections Research Centre at the University of Wollongong.

¹⁸Rosemary Hunter, *Domestic Violence Law Reform and Women’s Experience in Court* (Cambria Press, 2008) 6.

¹⁹Ellen L Pence and Mary F Shepard, ‘An Introduction: Developing a coordinated community response’ in Mary F Shepard and Ellen L Pence (eds), *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond* (SAGE Publications, 1999) 3.