FAMILY HARM NEW RISK MEASURES
HANDOUT

The Family Harm approach includes risk measures with two components:
- Static Assessment of Family Violence Recidivism (SAFVR)
- Dynamic assessment

The risk measures are used in all Family Harm Investigations.

HOW DO POLICE DETERMINE A TOTAL LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR SAFETY?

The Total Level of Concern for Safety is determined by the risk measures and the quality of our investigation.

EXPLORING THE MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description / Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Static Assessment of Family Violence Recidivism (SAFVR) | The SAFVR (pronounced ‘safer’) measure is a predictive statistical measure which calculates the likelihood a person will commit a family violence offence in the next two years given Police are attending a family harm investigation today (at the time it is calculated). The statistical model results in a high, moderate or low risk and is derived from information Police have access to in a variety of different databases. It has a very high predictive value for Aotearoa and is based on variables such as:
  - a Family Violence (FV) index offence / incident codes,
  - age at time of Index offence / incident
  - offence as an aggressor;
  - sentences of more than 30 days
  - gender + age.
  - Statisticians looked at a range of variables and determined, through regression analysis, the most predictive.
  - Two years of data was used to calculate the predictive value, which is why this value holds true for two years.
  - The SAFVR measure is combined with the outcome of the dynamic questions to give officers a Total Level of Concern for Safety at the scene of the Family Harm Investigation. |

Frontline Safety Plan
At least 72 hours
Dynamic questions and quality investigation

Police ask dynamic questions as part of a Family Harm Investigation. These are a select set of questions designed to help determine the Total Level of Concern for Safety. They are put to the person at risk and are about the person posing risk.

- **The person at risk** is the person most likely to be harmed.
- **The person posing risk** is the person believed to be the most likely to cause harm.

Tip: Remember ‘mutual participants’.

Put simply – the person at risk is the person who we will ask the questions of in any risk assessment, whereas the person posing risk will be the person we ask the questions about. In all of these cases, tamariki and vulnerable people are still included in the safety plan.

When determining who is at risk, Police ask themselves ‘If the family were all left at the address together, who is most at risk of being harmed?’ The quality of any investigation will help determine who is at risk and the person posing risk, and may well inform responses to some of the dynamic questions.

Total Level of Concern for Safety

SAFVR and dynamic questions are combined to provide Police with a Total Level of Concern for Safety – the response will be high, moderate or low.

Family Harm Graduated Response Model

Once the Total Level of Concern for Safety has been determined, the Family Harm Graduated Response Model provides a range of safety actions to consider via the Frontline Safety Plan. Safety action must be taken at the scene, with some additional safety action post initial attendance in some circumstances.

Frontline Safety Plan

The Frontline Safety Plan is the actions officers take to improve the safety of the victim and children for at least 72 hours post initial attendance.

Why at least 72 hours for a Frontline Safety Plan?

Within that timeframe a multi-agency meeting, daily safety assessment meeting (SAM) or a review by a Family Harm Specialist should take place. Their role is to review what has already been done and, if necessary, build upon what Police have done at initial attendance to keep people safe. Also, PSOs are sometimes issued for five days.

Multi-agency meetings or safety assessment meetings look at sustainable safety for the victim and tamariki and ongoing action with the aggressor. Plans generated at these meetings will potentially involve multiple agencies and will build upon the Frontline Safety Plan.

VICTIM AND AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY

It is commonly misunderstood that victims are at liberty to escape. In reality separation is difficult because an abusive party’s behaviours undermine victims’ abilities to escape. It can be very difficult for a victim/primary victim (and tamariki) to leave a harmful partner or whānau.

THE STATISTICS *

- 67% of IPV homicide victims were killed by male predominant aggressors in the time leading up to or following separation.
- In 19% of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) death events the offender was also the primary victim.
- 52% of female primary victims (IPV deaths) had contact with Police at least once.
- 89% of IPV deaths have a recorded history of abuse.
- 77% of the male offenders in CAN death events were known to Police for abusing the mother of the deceased child, female partner and/or prior female partners.
- 76% of intrafamilial death events involved offenders and deceased with known statutory histories of family violence, sexual offending and/or violence against non-family members.


VICTIM AND AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY

The graphic illustrates that where there is a low level of concern for safety, a victim is able to take more responsibility for their own safety and safety of their tamariki.

Conversely, where there is a high level of concern for safety, it is more difficult for the victim to take responsibility for their own safety, so the onus is on Police and other agencies to help.

At a Family Harm Investigation Police are in a unique position to help make victims and tamariki safe and to take appropriate action with aggressors to improve the safety of the victim/tamariki.