



Perpetrator Intervention Research Stream Grants - February 2016

Information for applicants

ANROWS

AUSTRALIA'S NATIONAL RESEARCH
ORGANISATION FOR WOMEN'S SAFETY

to Reduce Violence against Women & their Children

First published 2016

© ANROWS

Published by: Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety Limited (ANROWS)

ABN 67 162 349 171

PO Box 6322, Alexandria NSW 2015

Phone +61 2 8374 4000 Fax +61 2 8374 5000

anrows.org.au

ANROWS gratefully acknowledges the financial and other support it receives from the Commonwealth Government and all Australian state and territory governments, without which this work would not be possible. The findings and views reported in this paper are those of the authors and cannot be attributed to the Australian Government, or any Australian state or territory government.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
Section 1 - Funding rules	6
Project requirements.....	7
Budget.....	10
Printing, formatting and commercial editing of outputs specified in the ANROWS contract.....	14
Submission process.....	14
Section 2 – Perpetrator Interventions Research Priorities	19
Overview.....	20
Strategic Research Theme 1: System effectiveness.....	23
Strategic Research Theme 2: Effectiveness of interventions.....	28
Strategic Research Theme 3: Models to address diversity of perpetrators.....	33
Strategic Research Theme 4 - Interventions developed by, with and for Indigenous communities.....	37
Section 3 – Selection process	40
Selection stages.....	41
Selection criteria.....	41
Funding agreement.....	43
Intellectual property.....	43
Incomplete or misleading information.....	43
Appeals.....	43
Further information.....	43

Introduction

This document is a guide for researchers wishing to apply for funding under the ANROWS Perpetrator Interventions Research Stream Grants which opened on 1 February 2016. It contains information about ANROWS and the Research Grants, including funding rules, Strategic Research Themes (SRTs) and Research Priorities, selection criteria, information and guidelines to assist researchers in completing the online application form, and the protocol for assessment of project proposals.

ANROWS is one of the key commitments of the *National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010–2022* (the National Plan) and is funded jointly by the Australian Commonwealth, state and territory governments. In May 2014 the National Research Agenda to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children (the National Research Agenda), which was produced by ANROWS on behalf of the Australian Commonwealth, state and territory governments, was released. In October 2014 the ANROWS Research Program 2014–2016, was funded from ANROWS' core grant and based on national priorities under the National Research Agenda, was announced. The Commonwealth Government has provided an additional grant of \$3M to implement a dedicated Perpetrator Interventions Research Stream to support the implementation of the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions (NOSPI). The NOSPI were endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments on 11 December 2015.

This ANROWS Perpetrator Interventions Research Stream is a priority within the Second Action Plan of the National Plan. The Second Action Plan focuses on improving the quality of, and access to, perpetrator interventions; and identifies that systems (including police, justice, corrections, and community services) need to work together in consistent and integrated ways to increase the effectiveness of perpetrator interventions and stop perpetrators reoffending. The Second Action Plan includes the following three relevant action items:

1. Improve the evidence base on perpetrator interventions, with a focus on reducing recidivism and a better understanding of high-risk groups.
2. Finalise and set national outcome standards for best practice perpetrator interventions.
3. Build capacity to implement national outcome standards for perpetrator interventions and improve the quality and quantity of perpetrator interventions.

ANROWS invites researchers across Australia to apply for the Perpetrator Intervention Research Stream Grants. Applicants are required to submit their proposals using the online application form available through our [grant portal](#).¹ Proposals can be submitted by researchers including those from academic and research institutions and non-government organisations. Partnerships consisting of academic, government and non-government organisations are strongly encouraged, as this promotes and facilitates knowledge transfer and provides better opportunities for research findings to inform policy and practice.

The call for applications opens **1 February 2016** and closes **5pm AEST 28 April 2016**.

¹ Between 1 February and 28 April 2016, this grant portal can be accessed from: <http://anrows.org.au/research-program/grants/current-grants>

Proposals must address the ANROWS Perpetrator Interventions Research Priorities, which are detailed in Section 2 of this document. Grants will be awarded to project proposals based on merit, determined by a peer-review selection process.

Note: Open Grant applications are not invited for Topic 1.3 - *Evaluation of the NOSPI*. Separate funding processes will apply for this topic.

ANROWS has applied for the ANROWS Perpetrator Interventions *Research Stream Grants* to be listed on the [Australian Competitive Grants Register](https://education.gov.au/australian-competitive-grants-register),² as a Category 1 Grants program.

² <https://education.gov.au/australian-competitive-grants-register>.

Section 1 - Funding rules

Project requirements

Eligibility

Any Australian-based institution or organisation with the capacity to undertake research are invited to apply for funding within the ANROWS Perpetrator Intervention Research Stream Grants. Proposals from non-research institutions, practice or community-based organisations, communities and remote regions are encouraged. Organisations without experience in managing research projects are encouraged to establish a partnership with research institutions. ANROWS can assist with the establishment of research partnerships that build capacity in responding to violence against women across research, practice and community sectors. More than one applicant may submit research proposals jointly, however one organisation must be regarded as the lead organisation (the Researcher) and take responsibility for the conduct of the research and the observance of the terms and conditions. The Principal Chief Investigator must be located within this lead organisation. Joint applicants should be named on the application.

Staff, Board Members or consultants of ANROWS, their immediate families, or companies in which any of the abovementioned hold Director or Management Committee positions, are ineligible to apply for funding under the ANROWS Perpetrator Interventions Research Grants.

Successful applicants must be able to enter into a funding agreement with ANROWS. These agreements, including the schedules outlining outcome milestones and payments and will be negotiated following the determination of successful projects.

Essential requirements

Each application for funding under the Perpetrator Intervention Research Stream Grants must address one of the research priorities detailed in Section 2 and comply with the essential project requirements for all ANROWS Research Projects. These requirements are as follows.

1. They must be designed to do any one or more of the following:
 - develop the understanding of domestic violence and sexual assault
 - identify measures and interventions that:
 - a. prevent violence against women;
 - b. stop re-offending;
 - c. promote the best interests and safety of women and their children;
 - d. enable recovery from domestic violence and sexual assault
 - inform or influence government policy, programs and practice concerning domestic violence and sexual assault
 - explore ways to improve service delivery, particularly across the domestic violence and sexual assault sectors
 - explore actions that prevent domestic violence and sexual assault.

2. They must comply with the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#).³

³ <http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines/publications/r39>.

3. Where research involves human beings as subjects, they must comply with the relevant National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) guidelines and codes.⁴ For example, section four of the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* sets out specific ethical considerations for research involving particular population groups and categories of research participants, including:

- “Women who are pregnant and the human fetus”;
- “Children and Young People”;
- “People in dependent and unequal relationships”;
- “People who are highly dependent on medical care”;
- “People with a cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability or a mental illness”;
- “People who may be involved in illegal activities”;
- “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples”; and
- “People in other countries.”⁵

Furthermore, applicants must demonstrate access to an appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC), such as those [registered with the NHMRC](#).⁶

4. If conducting research with Indigenous people, applicants must [follow AIATSIS Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies \(2012\)](#),⁷ including conducting research in a manner that is culturally appropriate, informed and controlled by the community. Please note: an additional criterion applies to SRT 4 – Interventions developed by, with and for Indigenous communities and is set out in Section 2 ‘Research Priorities’.
5. Maintaining the safety of women and their children must be the primary consideration in any ANROWS research project. Appropriate support must be provided to women and their children participating in the research, or those affected by the project (for example where their partner/the children’s father is the research participant). Respect for the dignity and well-being of participants in projects must take precedence over any expected benefits to knowledge. Participants should also be informed of the findings of the research, where safe and appropriate to do so.
6. Projects must fall under the category of ‘research’ defined as:

*the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it leads to new and creative outcomes.*⁸

⁴ <http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/health-ethics>.

⁵ <http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/book/section-4-ethical-considerations-specific-participants>

⁶ https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/files_nhmrc/file/health_ethics/hrecs/list_of_human_research_ethics_committees_registered_with_nh_mrc_january_2016.pdf.

⁷ <http://aiatsis.gov.au/research/ethical-research/guidelines-ethical-research-australian-indigenous-studies>

⁸ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2002) as cited in Department of Education and Training (Commonwealth), (2015), *Explanatory Notes: Australian Competitive Grants Register 2016, Application for Listing*, https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/2016_acgr_explanatory_notes.pdf

Included in this definition are applied forms of research, where the focus is as much on the translation and application of knowledge in relevant settings, as it is on the generation of new knowledge. In the social sciences, this can take various forms, such as action research.

7. Projects must be designed to deliver results of national benefit (i.e. findings should be of national interest or of interest to more than one Australian jurisdiction).
8. Projects must have a reasonable and cost-effective budget.

Desirable features

ANROWS also encourages grant applicants to include the desirable features listed below in their project design; however these are not essential.

1. Consider the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions (NOSPI) and support their implementation.
2. Build research capacity and partnerships through, for example:
 - a. collaboration between researchers from different organisations;
 - b. participation of project team members from government agencies, direct service providers and/or women and their children;
 - c. inclusion of research students or early career researchers on the project team.
3. Projects are multi-jurisdictional. For example, the research is national in scope or actively involves two or more Australian states and/or territories.
4. Projects provide a unique contribution to research expertise and/or practice relevant to the area of violence against women and their children. This may include the use of an innovative methodological approach, in addition to contributing to knowledge about the content area (where this methodology is appropriate for the proposed topic).

Risks and conflicts of interests

Project risks must be identified in the application. Risks might include limited availability of equipment, services or potential interviewees, safety risks for research staff, or uncertain access to grey literature, unpublished reports or data. Strategies to manage risks should also be outlined in the proposal.

Applicants must declare any conflict of interest that exists or is likely to arise in relation to any aspect of the proposed project. If a conflict of interest exists or arises, the applicant's organisation must have documented processes in place for managing conflicts. These must comply with the NHMRC [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) (2007).⁹

⁹ [NHMRC 2007, available at http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines/publications/r39](http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/guidelines/publications/r39).

Project Deliverables

Once the preferred researchers are identified through a merit-based selection process, a detailed research design, including refining methodology and budget, will be negotiated with the researchers and, if applicable, with input from the advisory group as part of the contract negotiations with ANROWS.

Unless identified otherwise in the project scope for the individual project (see below), each project will include the contracted outputs listed below. The research report and research to practice and policy report will undergo a peer review process.

1. **Progress report:** A brief outline of agreed methodology and research plan, including any changes that have been agreed with ANROWS to date. This must also include a summary of progress of activities to date and is to be completed using the proforma provided by ANROWS.
2. **Research report:** A major report that includes an executive summary, state of knowledge review/literature review (as appropriate), research questions, rationale, a repeatable methodology that has enough description to be replicable and reviewed by peer assessors, description of key findings, analysis which clearly contextualizes the research findings with reference to the literature scoped in the 'state of knowledge' summary, and conclusions (which may or may not include recommendations). The Research Report must be academically rigorous (including citation of sources). The state of knowledge/literature component of the Research Report should be a summary of academic and grey literature and any other relevant sources of knowledge on the topic that is academically rigorous, includes details of a repeatable search methodology and citations, and assesses the quality of the examined studies using a recognised methodology.
3. **Research to practice and policy report:** A shorter report that is no longer than 4 pages. It must be in plain English, summarise the key findings of the Research Report and provide advice and/or make recommendations on the implications for practice for researchers, service providers and/or policy-makers.
4. **A knowledge translation or dissemination strategy** agreed to by ANROWS and the applicant that is appropriate for the specific project and target audience.
5. **An Acquittal Report** completed at the end of the project, using a proforma provided by ANROWS.

The standard of content and editing of the reports at 2 and 3 should be fit for publication including adherence to the *ANROWS Style Guide* however ANROWS will be responsible for design and typesetting publications.

Budget

Applications should include a budget that outlines all project-related expenses. The budget should be accompanied by a justification of these expenses. Other income sources should also be included with the budget, in accordance with the online application form. Applicants are requested to verify all figures before submitting the application.

Budgets should include the costing information for salaries, administration, travel, capital expenditure, knowledge translation and dissemination and other costs.

Funded budget items

Salaries

ANROWS requires researchers to use salary costs and will not support consultation rates/fees for members of the identified research team. In calculating rates of pay, applicants should refer to any relevant enterprise agreement of the host institution or organisation. Salary on-costs of a maximum of 30% should be included.

As a guide, researchers should note that ANROWS is unlikely to support salaries that exceed the salary scale used by the University of Melbourne at <http://www.policy.unimelb.edu.au/schedules/MPF1170-ScheduleA.pdf> for comparable positions.

To ensure parity across institutions, on-costs must be no more than 30%. This is consistent with the funding rules of the Australian Research Council (ARC).

In exceptional circumstances, ANROWS may approve the utilisation of short consultancies for the provision of particular expertise to the research team.

Administration

Project administrative costs should not be greater than 15% of the total budget.¹⁰

Project administration includes, but is not limited to:

- provision of standard infrastructure such as a desk and computer;
- access to computer programs and software commonly used in research activities (e.g. Microsoft programs, NVivo, SPSS, and Endnote);
- access to library resources, administrative support and IT assistance; and
- provision of normal office supplies such as photocopying, basic postage, stationery and telephone.

Travel

Travel costs include costs related to the collection and analysis of data, such as airfares (economy class), accommodation, meals, car hire, taxi fares, train and car mileage. In calculating travel costs, applicants should make clear reference to the [Australian Tax Office \(ATO\) Tax Determination on travel-related expenditure](#).¹¹

Travel cost per diems must be no more than the rates set out in the tables which are part of the ATO Taxation determinations of [reasonable travel and overtime meal expenses](#)¹² for the most recent financial year.

No overseas travel will be funded.

¹⁰ Where a flat administration cost of 15% is added to a project budget, the total budget must be calculated using the formula = total project budget (prior to administration charge) x 1.15.

¹¹ <https://www.ato.gov.au/law/view/document?docid=%22TXD%2FTD201514%2FNAT%2FATO%2F00001%22>

¹² <https://www.ato.gov.au/law/view/document?docid=%22TXD%2FTD201514%2FNAT%2FATO%2F00001%22>

Travel for conferences in Australia will not be funded unless it is an agreed dissemination strategy in the contract with ANROWS.

Travel for face to face meetings of members of the research team needs to be justified, with teleconference / videoconference being ANROWS's preferred option for meetings of the research team.

Equipment, software or other capital expenditure

Equipment, software or other capital expenditure should only be costed if they are specialist items that are not included in the administration cost.

Items should be costed fractionally if they are to be used by the organisation beyond the project's duration, or if they are to be used for other, non-project activities during the life of the project.

State of knowledge (literature review) costs

A state of knowledge review is a synthesis of existing knowledge on a particular topic and is to be included as part of the Research Report for most ANROWS funded projects. Occasionally, a state of knowledge review may also be a deliverable publication on a project in its own right. Three types of synthesis of literature are outlined below, of which ANROWS will fund only the first two.

A standard review can cost up to \$25,000. The report should be:

- a critique of academic, grey literature and any other relevant sources of knowledge on the topic
- academically rigorous and includes details of a repeatable search methodology and citations.
- accessible to an audience without specialist expertise in the topic.

A review done systematically is expected to cost between \$25,000 and \$30,000. It is to be as per the standard review above, but also includes:

- assessments of the quality of the examined studies using a recognised methodology.

Included literature can be limited to databases available through the researcher's institution and free services (e.g., google scholar), however the databases should be clearly identified in the methodology.

ANROWS will not fund a **systematic literature review**, which uses a full Cochrane or GRADE methodology (or other gold standard systematic review methodology) due to the time and cost involved. This type of review has:

- standardised reporting of a repeatable method,
- literature searching until saturation including hand searching (and not limited to databases subscribed to by the author's institution),
- grading of all papers by at least two academics, and
- a standard recommendation format consistent with the chosen method.

As literature reviews are 'desk-based' research activities, their costs are typically embedded in salary costs. If the state of knowledge review is itemised in the budget, applicants should ensure that there is no double-counting of the cost of the review in salary items.

Knowledge translation and dissemination costs

Dissemination strategy: Project budgets should include the costs associated with their proposed dissemination strategy. This strategy should be designed to engage with the broader community or with key

project beneficiaries, such as service providers or governments. Some strategies will not have a cost beyond the salaries and production costs already embedded in the budget. For applications with a separate costing for the dissemination strategy, the costs may be associated with activities such as hosting a training event or workshop, producing a video or publishing practice guidelines.

The cost of designing and producing electronic copies of standard contracted publications, such as Research Reports, will be covered by ANROWS. However, if a dissemination strategy involves the publication of a specific document (e.g., practice guidelines), applicants may cost the production of this item in their budget.

Webinars, social media and apps: Most organisations will have facilities for webinars, meaning that researchers should consider access to these facilities as a possible in kind contribution to the project. Funding of webinars will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.

Social media is a standard aspect of modern communication and research practice. These systems are likely to be already set up, and as such, will not be funded by ANROWS.

ANROWS will not fund the development of phone applications (apps).

Conferences and journal articles: ANROWS considers that conferences and journal articles are a standard academic activity. These activities will not be funded by ANROWS unless they are a contracted dissemination strategy.

Funding for submission to open access journals will not be provided.

Other research related costs

The maximum amount ANROWS will pay as an **honorarium to research participants** depends on the length of the research activity. In comparison with interviews, lower rates are expected for most focus group activities. Standard interviews / focus groups (approximately 1 hour) are expected to cost between \$30 and \$40 per person. A participant in a short interview or focus group (<1 hour) will not be paid more than \$30, while a participant in a long interview / focus group (over 2 hours) will not be paid more than \$50.

Honorariums for standard involvement of a service provider or other agencies in a project (e.g., recruiting participants) will not be funded by ANROWS. Where honorariums for services are included in budgets, the researcher must make reference to the research-related activities and outputs of the participating service (e.g. participation on advisory groups, organising focus groups for the research, reviewing and commenting on literature reviews and other research documentation, and so on).

Transcription costs: ANROWS has a standard maximum of \$2 per recorded minute. An additional fee of 0.20c per minute for 'strong accents' is common and should be calculated for vulnerable populations.

Websites and webpages: In most instances, a web presence will be an extension of an existing organisational website. In these cases, the design has already been developed and costs are minimal and should be incorporated into the existing budget.

Significant justification is required if a separate website (with associated design and URL costs) is proposed. A separate website will only be funded if this is demonstrated to be an integral part of the methodology and should not cost more than \$5000 (including ongoing costs).

Printing, formatting and commercial editing of outputs specified in the ANROWS contract

ANROWS will be responsible for publishing standard contracted publications and therefore will not fund the printing, formatting or professional editing of state of knowledge papers, progress reports, research reports, or research to practice and policy reports.

Excluded costs

The following items should not be included in budget as they will not be funded by ANROWS:

- Teaching relief
- Consultancy fees for members of the research team (short consultancies for specialised assistance may be possible)
- Standard librarian, administration or IT assistance
- Overseas travel
- Travel to Australian conferences, unless this is an agreed dissemination strategy
- Equipment, software or other capital expenses that will not be used primarily for the project
- Standard equipment, software or other capital expenses, that would reasonably be covered by the administration fee of 15%
- Car or vehicle purchase and maintenance.
- Phone app development
- Conferences or journal articles, unless this is an agreed dissemination strategy; fees for open access journals will not be covered, regardless of the agreed dissemination strategy
- Honorariums for standard involvement in the research project of service providers and agencies
- Printing, formatting or professional editing of standard ANROWS outputs, namely: state of knowledge papers, progress reports, main research reports, or research to practice and policy reports.

Budget justification

A budget justification should be included in each application providing an explanation for the following costs: purchase, salaries (including why the staff are required and what tasks they will be performing), travel and other costs.

Submission process

Applicants must submit project details as required, using the ANROWS Research Grants online application form at <http://anrows.org.au/research-program/grants>. These details include project summaries, research approaches (methodologies), budget information and proposed knowledge translation and exchange strategies.

Browser system requirements to access the ANROWS Grants portal are listed below. Applicants may need to enable the pop-up window function within their browser.

Browser compatibility:

- Internet Explorer v7 (limited) or v8
- Firefox v 2+
- Safari v 3+
- Google Chrome v 3+

Applicants should complete all fields on the application form and comply with the stated word limits, when applicable. All information included on the application must be accurate and not be misleading or false. This includes information about prior research, publications, capacity and proposed timelines.

The application should stand alone in providing sufficient information to peer assessors as there may be no further opportunities to provide additional information.

Number of applications and projects

Each proposal must address one of the ANROWS research priorities published within the given funding round. These priorities are detailed in Section 2 of this document and are also available at anrows.org.au. If researchers wish to apply for funding under more than one priority or for several projects under the same priority, each project must be submitted on a separate application form.

Completing the application form

The grant application form has been designed to assist ANROWS obtain all the information needed to select proposals based on merit, including addressing the project requirements, desirable features of projects, and selection criteria (listed in Section 1 of this document). It is vital that applicants familiarise themselves with these criteria and ensure they are addressed in their application.

Applicants can access the grants application form through a link on <http://anrows.org.au/research-program/grants>. The link on this page takes applicants to the ANROWS grants management portal, where they will be requested to create a unique user name and password, before being taken to the form. Applicants are advised to keep a record of this user name and password. If an applicant has previously applied for an ANROWS grant they should use their existing user name and password. Please fill in all fields in the application form, and upload documents where requested.

ANROWS uses the Australian Institute of Grants Management system, SmartyGrants. SmartyGrants provide a [Help Guide](#)¹³ for applicants which includes detailed information about the application form and submission of applications. Additional information about key fields in the Research Priorities Grants application form is provided below.

¹³ <http://help.smartygrants.com.au/display/help/Help+Guide+for+Applicants>

Research team terminology

The *Principal Chief Investigator* is the person who will lead and coordinate the Research Team. The Principal Chief Investigator must be located within the lead organisation administering the funding. The Principal Chief Investigator is a type of Chief Investigator.

The *Chief Investigator(s)* is a person who provides a significant contribution to the project, either through their intellectual contribution, or their leadership of particular research activities.

Project Partners are those involved as co-researchers, but do not include organisations or communities solely providing advice to researchers. A Project Partner may be an individual or an organisation.

Page 1: Applicants' profile

Details of the lead organisation, which is the organisation where the Principal Chief Investigator is located, must be included. For joint applications, a lead organisation and Principal Chief Investigator must be identified.

Applicants must also provide details of the person who can authorise the applicant's capacity to apply for grants on the organisation's behalf. This might include, for example, the Research Office Director, CEO of an organisation or Deputy Vice-Chancellors.

Partner organisations are those person/s or organisations involved as co-researchers, but do not include organisations or communities solely providing advice to researchers.

In addition, applicants are asked to attach a brief resume, which will provide ANROWS with information about their track record. Please include qualifications, relevant publications, community leadership positions and advisory positions, as relevant, in this resume. Please also list any community or organisational links relevant to the project application. If a partner is an organisation rather than an individual, a letter of support from the organisation should be attached.

Page 2: Previous experience with ANROWS

In this section, the principal researcher should identify any previous experience of receiving funding from ANROWS.

Page 3: Project details summary

The project details summary page assists ANROWS with pre-assessment administration, hence applicants are asked to provide information about the Strategic Research Theme and Topic number and name of their project. At the callout for each grants round ANROWS publishes information about Strategic Research Themes. This information is also provided in Section 2 of this document. The SRT's and information contained in Section 2 have been identified and informed by research and consultations undertaken for [ANROWS's State of Knowledge: Perpetrator Interventions in Australia \(Mackay, Gibson, Lam & Beecham, November 2015\)](#).¹⁴ Applicants are encouraged to refer to this paper.

The central contact for the project should be listed on this page. This may be the principal researcher or a project administrator.

¹⁴ <http://anrows.org.au/publications/landscapes/perpetrator-interventions-in-australia>

Page 4: Research project description

Key project information is captured in this page, including aims, methodology, value of the research to potential stakeholders working to reduce violence against women and their children, and proposed strategies for communicating findings of research findings to them, and other potential audiences. Depending on the project, these might include for example, professional training modules, service models or practice guidelines, or webinars.

Key elements enabling compliance with ANROWS essential project requirements should also be noted here. For example research involving human subjects, including clients or victims, requires approval from an ethics committee, and observance of AIATSIS guidelines is required for research with Indigenous communities. For more information, see the *Funding Rules* in Section 1 of this document.

It is also important that projects prioritise the safety of women and children at all times. If services, victims or clients, or perpetrators of domestic or sexual violence are included in the study, researchers must outline how they will ensure that the safety and well-being of women, children and others is maintained. Potential risks will need to be identified and addressed here.

Other project risks, such as difficulties securing service or client participation, limited availability of equipment or services, or safety risks for research staff should also be outlined where noted on the form.

Page 5: Project budget

Budgets should include staff salary costs, administrative costs, resources, travel, conference attendance and costs associated with producing the project deliverables, and other dissemination strategies.

Budget justifications should be included in the online application form as advised. These should explain the reasons for including budget items. Further information about [budgets](#) can be found on pages 10-14 of this *Information for applicants*.

Page 6: Referees

Contact information should be included for referees from:

- previous project or grant funding bodies
- target audiences, beneficiaries or communities relevant to this project.

At least one referee should be for the principal researcher and at least one referee (which could be the same person) should be directly familiar with the project's topic. For example, if the project involves significant liaison with government agencies, at least one referee should be from a government agency to demonstrate past experience working with government.

Page 7: Attachments

The online application form requires the uploading of documents, the lead organisation's Annual Report and most recent statement of financial position and statement of financial performance of your organisation that is signed by your accountant/ Finance Manager **must be provided**. Applicants may also upload any other supporting documents in this section. These must be supplied as a PDF or a Microsoft Word compatible format.

Information to assist applicants with submissions is available below and from anrows.org.au, in the Research Program Grants pages. Please contact ANROWS at enquiries@anrows.org.au or (02) 8374 4000 if further information or assistance with the application process is required.

Page 8: Declaration

To submit an application, applicants must acknowledge they have read these funding rules in a declaration on the last page of the application form.

Closing date

Applications must be received no later than 5 pm, Australian Eastern Standard Time (Sydney) (AEST) on the closing date of applications. This date is published on the ANROWS website for each funding round. Please adjust for local differences, and allow time to resolve any potential connectivity issues if these are relevant.

Submitted applications will be considered final and changes will not be possible after the closing time and date. Submissions after this time will not be accepted by ANROWS.

Section 2 – Perpetrator Interventions Research Priorities

Overview

ANROWS invites applications to conduct projects addressing the Perpetrator Intervention Research Priorities, a summary of which are below. These priorities have emerged from a multi-stage process, including a review of academic and grey literature on perpetrator interventions, consultation with the Department of Social Services (Cth), the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions (NOSPI) Working Group members (Cth, state and territory) and key thought leaders and relevant service providers across Australia. The *State of Knowledge: Perpetrator Interventions in Australia*, produced and published by ANROWS, encompasses the outcomes from this process and is available from <http://anrows.org.au/publications/landscapes/perpetrator-interventions-in-australia>. Applicants are encouraged to consult this publication when reviewing the four Strategic Research Themes (SRTs) below.

The Research Priorities will support the implementation of the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions across all states and territories.

As illustrated in the table below, the Research Priorities are organised within a framework of four SRTs, which relate to all of the National Plan's six outcomes:

1. Communities are safe and free from violence.
2. Relationships are respectful.
3. Indigenous communities are strengthened.
4. Services meet the needs of women and their children experiencing violence.
5. Justice responses are effective.
6. Perpetrators stop their violence and are held to account for their actions.

The following pages provide detailed information about each topic to guide applicants in their proposals.

Perpetrator Interventions Research Priorities (November 2015)

Strategic Research Theme	Research Priority	Brief summary of preferred research projects*
SRT 1 System effectiveness	1.1 Meta-evaluation of where perpetrator interventions are, and should be, situated within the overall response to violence against women and their children	Analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of linkages between perpetrator interventions, and other prevention, early intervention and response initiatives. Consider criminal, civil, child protection and family law responses, and collaborative efforts to effectively stop violence or enable a perpetrator to engage with behaviour change (for example, housing, employment or financial services; services addressing matters such as

* Please note that interventions addressing both sexual assault and domestic and family violence are intended to be addressed across all SRTs. Further, although some specific initiatives for sub-populations have been noted, research effort across all SRTs should target the following sub-populations across all SRTs: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples; rural and remote perpetrators and women; perpetrators and women with disability; younger perpetrators and women (i.e 18-24 year age group); older perpetrators and women; culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) perpetrators and women; gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (GLBTIQ) people; immigrant perpetrators and women; women without children; and children.

<p>All National Plan Outcomes</p>		<p>health, mental health, drug and alcohol; and case management). Examine how different components of a system response address perpetrators (for example, child protection) and how best practice models can be integrated into the wider systematic approach. Consider a return on investment approach to evaluation.</p>
	<p>1.2 Evaluation of specific system responses</p>	<p>Analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of specific system responses, for example, police responses, court appearances/sentencing, corrections, and community services. This could include a comparison of sentencing options among jurisdictions, taking into account repeat offenders.</p>
	<p>1.3 Evaluation of the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions (NOSPI)</p>	<p>Evaluation of the NOSPI, with the objective of ensuring that best practice principles inform the ongoing implementation of the NOSPI by states and territories.</p>
<p>SRT 2 Effectiveness of interventions National Plan Outcomes 4, 5, 6</p>	<p>2.1 Defining and measuring effectiveness</p>	<p>Determination of definitions and measures of effectiveness by ascertaining and considering differences and commonalities in views between different groups, practitioners, men who use violence, and women and child who experience violence. Develop indicators of success for program and system level interventions. This analysis and evaluation should also seek to establish what factors motivate men to change their attitudes and behaviour.</p>
	<p>2.2 Development of best practice in evaluating perpetrator interventions</p>	<p>Develop best practice evaluation principles and guidelines for evaluating interventions, including a consideration of: individual and group based interventions; specific intervention components (such as mandatory attendance and facilitator characteristics); timeliness of interventions; different philosophical approaches underpinning interventions; long-term effectiveness of specific program components, including links between program completion and recidivism; and generalisable evaluation mechanisms such as pre- and post-assessment tools and quality assurance processes. Consider the development of a National Evaluation Framework.</p>
	<p>2.3 Evaluation of specific interventions</p>	<p>Evaluation of specific perpetrator interventions to determine effectiveness (including an assessment of safety and accountability and the views of women and children experiencing violence). Preferably include evaluations of alternative interventions, for example, the Circles or Support and Accountability program, the Safe and Together child protection model or restorative approaches.</p>
	<p>2.4 Effectively engaging and retaining perpetrators in interventions</p>	<p>Deepen understanding of the pathways of sexual assault and family and domestic violence perpetrators through the criminal justice system, other legal processes, and community-based pathways in all states and territories. Determine the best interfaces and times at which to connect with men who use violence. Consider the role child protection and other services that engage with perpetrators and seek to motivate change. Recommend best ways to address key attrition points and points of vulnerability in all types of interventions.</p>
<p>SRT 3 Models to address diversity of perpetrators National Plan Outcomes 1, 4, 6</p>	<p>3.1 Best practice models for sexual assault perpetrators</p>	<p>Evaluation of whether Risk Needs Responsivity models are best practice for perpetrators of adult sexual assault in Australia, considering issues such as: suitability of targeting treatment to risk; applicability to different types of violence; and the practicality of this type of treatment model in Australia, given small numbers of perpetrators in remote area programs and potential language barriers. Compare the different interventions used to address family violence and sexual assault perpetrators and whether sexual assault occurring in a family violence context requires a specific service response. Include examination of alternative/hybrid models such as the Good Lives Model.</p>

	3.2 Best practice models for family and domestic violence perpetrators	Evaluation of whether the adoption of RNR-informed principles or Duluth-informed models are best practice for perpetrators of family and domestic violence, considering practical issues relevant to the Australian context, such as numbers of perpetrators in remote area programs. Consider the suitability of models that address perpetrators as fathers. Examine alternative/hybrid models.
	3.3 Models to address diversity	Evaluation of relevant models to address the different needs of subpopulations of perpetrators, for example, consider the Cultural Context Model for culturally and linguistically diverse perpetrators. Evaluate similar models or identify best practice principles for interventions with further sub-populations such as: rural and remote perpetrators; immigrant perpetrators; perpetrators with disability; younger perpetrators; older perpetrators; and gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (GLBTIQ) perpetrators. All evaluations should include consideration of women's safety.
SRT 4 Interventions developed by, with and for Indigenous communities National Plan Outcomes 1, 3, 4, 6	4.1 Determine best practice principles for program delivery for Indigenous perpetrators	Draw on what is already known from extensive consultation with Indigenous leaders, researchers, service providers and community members to determine and develop best practices in program delivery for Indigenous perpetrators. Acknowledge that the needs of Indigenous perpetrators may intersect with issues linked to the effects of colonisation, such as health, economic, and housing concerns.
	4.2 Understanding role of lore and culture in interventions with Indigenous perpetrators	Document what it looks like in practice for Indigenous perpetrator interventions to be "grown" by Indigenous communities, and how to place lore and culture at the centre of Indigenous perpetrator interventions. Consider how healing practices and accountability of Indigenous men to women and community are best balanced with ensuring safety of Indigenous women who experience violence.

Strategic Research Theme 1: System effectiveness

1.1 Meta-evaluation of where perpetrator interventions are, and should be, situated within the overall response to violence against women and their children

Need

There is currently limited research exploring the effectiveness of the systems engaged in, or intersecting with, perpetrator interventions. More specifically, there is limited research exploring the linkages between primary prevention of domestic and family violence and sexual assault, early interventions, and perpetrator interventions (including criminal, civil, child protection and family law proceedings). There is a need for research to explore when and where specific perpetrator interventions need to be situated within an integrated and systematic response to family and domestic violence and sexual assault. There is a need for research to consider the collaborative efforts to effectively stop violence or motivate a perpetrator to change their attitudes and behaviour (for example, housing, employment or financial services; or services addressing matters such as health, mental health, drug and alcohol). Specifically, research is needed to explore:

- The connections between primary prevention, early interventions, and tertiary responses.
- The effectiveness of a multi-agency strategy and/or integrated response model to engage with perpetrators to hold them accountable for their violence and affect attitudinal and behavioural change.
- The factors that motivate men to change their attitudes and behaviour. Of particular interest is an examination of those factors not associated with the justice system (e.g. police interventions or court proceedings).
- Current knowledge of what constitutes “perpetrator responsibility” versus “perpetrator accountability” and build on this, which may include exploration of service providers’ obligations to establish “accountability” and how this is demonstrated in practice at various levels (e.g. Deniers Programs and understandings of accountability).
- The possible application of a return on investment approach to evaluation examining the potential cost savings to the justice, health and human service systems generated by perpetrator interventions¹⁵. This may also include the possible application of a social return on investment (SROI) approach to evaluation if appropriate. “SROI is a form of stakeholder-driven evaluation blended with cost-benefit analysis tailored to social purposes.”¹⁶

Desired outcomes

- Development of evidence to support a more efficient and effective integrated system that responds appropriately to perpetrators of all types.
- This meta-evaluation should, at a minimum:
 - Provide a synthesis and update of existing literature reviews on this topic.

¹⁵ For an example of a Return on Investment approach see Perfect Moment (2010) *Strength to Change Return on Investment Study*. NHS Hull. Retrieved from http://media.wix.com/ugd/56111a_b72a2eea617c4e82bdba605a16756c4c.pdf

¹⁶ For more information on social return of investment see Social Ventures Australia Consulting (2012), *Social Return on Investment: Lessons Learned from Australia*. Retrieved from <http://socialventures.com.au/assets/SROI-Lessons-learned-in-Australia.pdf>

- Map and briefly describe key elements of the connections between early interventions, primary prevention, and tertiary responses, which will inform the development of appropriate public policy and service delivery.
- Identify the current gaps in evidence for programs and approaches (i.e., identify what we don't know about these approaches). This should include consideration of:
 - how robust available evaluations have been;
 - process compared to outcome focused evaluations;
 - emerging evidence of effectiveness of programs and approaches in the absence of robust evaluations; and
 - possible recommendations concerning key minimum elements of interventions and evaluation methods to include in future.
- Identify what key features of perpetrator interventions addressing domestic and family violence and sexual assault can be more appropriately integrated within a systematic response to violence against women and children. This should include:
 - exploring the success of perpetrator interventions in specific locations (e.g. remote, rural and metropolitan) and addressing needs of different sub-population groups (e.g. Indigenous women, young people, culturally and linguistically diverse women, and women with a disability);
 - identifying key support structures or contexts around approaches that are needed to give longevity to effective perpetrator interventions (e.g. legislation, governance, policy context); and
 - contextualising findings within the synthesis or summary of the literature identified in the synthesis described on page 19. For example, findings from international research should include an analysis of the broader service system responses to family and domestic violence and sexual assault within the relevant countries or regions.

Methodological considerations

- This research must include active participation of women's services and services providing perpetrator interventions.
- It is anticipated that the lack of sufficient rigorous evaluations of programs and approaches may make the use of traditional meta-evaluation methodologies challenging for this project. The researchers should outline in their application a methodological approach that is academically rigorous and yet is likely to be able to accommodate both the desire to look at a range of programs and approaches and the lack of rigorous evaluations for inclusion.
- Given the wide variations in the nature of the programs, and the potential lack of rigorous evaluation of program effectiveness against the stated needs and objectives, there may need to be an empirical element to this meta-evaluation. This may involve contact with key stakeholder/s to supplement a "desk based" meta-evaluation methodology.
- This research should not focus on specific intervention programs, rather it should consider programs and other interventions within the context of a wider integrated response to domestic and family violence and/or sexual assault.

Jurisdictions have identified the following programs and approaches to be considered for inclusion as part of this project, however proposals examining other programs, approaches are also welcome.

- Use of evidence based risk assessment tools and practice for non-Indigenous and Indigenous domestic and family violence perpetrators, and comparisons of use across Australia including any specific approaches for other sub-population groups
- Early intervention approaches that seek to prevent the further escalation of violence.
- Formalised integrated responses to domestic and family violence and/or sexual assault including for example consideration of the review-of Tasmania's of Safe at Home criminal justice response.¹⁷
- Use of GPS tracking and monitoring devices to improve the safety of domestic and family violence victims and the accountability of perpetrators, including consideration of:
 - electronic tracking of domestic and family violence perpetrators at different points of intervention (including pre-trial, after conviction/community based orders, and post-sentence);
 - GPS location tracking in real-time; home detention/curfew adherence/exclusion zone;
 - mandated requirements for perpetrators to pay part or full costs of monitoring as an aspect of accountability for their behaviours; and
 - use of GPS alarms by victims of domestic and family violence.
- Combined interventions for perpetrators with co-occurring issues, for example substance misuse and mental health issues.
- Approaches to address perpetrators within regional/remote communities.
- Approaches to victim support and contact at different points across the spectrum of perpetrator interventions for both domestic and family violence and sexual assault.
- Approaches that involve specialist courts and their impact on offending behavior.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$200,000 and a timeframe of up to 2 years has been identified for this project.

1.2 Evaluation of specific system responses

Need

Each state and territory in Australia has developed a systematic response to domestic and family violence and sexual assault, which includes the police, courts, corrections and community services. For example, all jurisdictions have developed civil protection orders to increase the protection of women and children experiencing domestic and family violence and as a means of placing restrictions on perpetrators. There is still limited research exploring the commonalities and differences of jurisdictions' system responses. Indeed, there is a need for an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of specific system responses, for example, police responses, court appearances, sentencing options (including sanctions for non-compliance), corrections, and community services (including government and non-government organisations). More specifically, there is a need for a thorough examination of the different system responses in relation to different categories of perpetrators, for example, how jurisdictions address repeat offenders and court and police responses to breaches of protection orders and the effect of mandatory sentencing.

¹⁷ Available from http://www.safeathome.tas.gov.au/review_of_safe_at_home_services

Desired outcomes:

- Contribute to a more thorough understanding of what aspects of a systematic response are effective and within what context.
- The provision of an evidence base regarding systems responses to assist statutory agencies to develop appropriate and effective responses to domestic and family violence and sexual assault.
- Greater understanding of how specific responses can inform other components of a systematic response.
- Evidence to support the development of improved perpetrator pathways through the system, thereby increasing men's accountability.

Methodological considerations

- This research should include the views of practitioners, women who experience domestic and family violence and sexual violence and men who use this violence, inclusive of those from sub populations.
- This research should be comparative and must include more than one jurisdiction.
- This research should analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of specific system responses, for example, police responses, court appearances/sentencing, corrections, and community services. This could include a comparison of sentencing options among jurisdictions, taking into account repeat offenders.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$200,000 and a timeframe of up to 2 years has been identified for this project.

1.3 Evaluation of the National Outcome Standards for Perpetrator Interventions (NOSPI)

Note: This topic is not part of this grants round. Evaluation of the NOSPI will occur through a separate funding process and is included in this pack for information purposes only.

Need

A fundamental component of the Second Action Plan (2013-2016) is the development of national outcome standards for perpetrator interventions. These standards have been developed by Commonwealth, state and territory governments in consultation with community and non-government stakeholders and will be implemented in 2016. The NOSPI will be a set of outcomes-focused standards and associated performance indicators that ensure perpetrator interventions in all parts of Australia have consistent goals and are improving over time.

The NOSPI will not prescribe operational practices or set professional practice or service standards. It is envisaged the NOSPI will guide all states and territories towards establishing and maintaining their own robust and consistent practice and service standards (noting practice standards are in place in several states and territories).

To ensure the continual development and improvement of the NOSPI, a thorough evaluation of their effectiveness is required. An evaluation plan will be developed for the NOSPI which will form the basis of the evaluation. A separate funding process for this research priority will be developed.

Strategic Research Theme 2: Effectiveness of interventions

2.1 Defining and measuring effectiveness

Need

The terms “success” and “effectiveness” are often used interchangeably by researchers when examining perpetrator interventions, but these terms often refer to different outcomes of the intervention. Success is usually described in terms of increasing women’s safety, whereas the term effective can also refer to outcomes related to the broader aims of the intervention e.g. change in attitudes or behaviours. Furthermore, effective often refers to a reduction in violence, whereas the term success often infers cessation of that violence. Attributing success to a particular intervention is difficult, particularly when interventions have ill-defined program logics or program facilitators do not implement the course materials in the manner intended. It is also the case that attributing success or effectiveness to a particular intervention is difficult, particularly in the context of an integrated system where perpetrators can potentially engage with a number of agencies.

More research is needed to clarify definitions and measures of effectiveness. Specifically, to ascertain and consider differences and commonalities in views between different groups including practitioners, men who use violence, and women who experience violence. More nuanced and carefully considered indicators of “effectiveness” and “success” relating to program and “system” level interventions also need to be developed. It is important that these indicators of success and effectiveness can be applicable across jurisdictions.

Desired outcomes:

- Contribute to the development of standard measures of “success” and “effectiveness” that can be applied within and across jurisdictions.
- Inform the development of more sophisticated measures regarding the “effectiveness” and “success” of perpetrator interventions. This should not only focus on specific intervention programs, but should examine broader interventions.
- Providing an evidence base of “what works” in relation to different types of perpetrators.

Methodological considerations

- This research should prioritise incorporating the views of women experiencing violence when developing indicators.
- Noting Kelly and Westmarland’s (2015) calls to develop more nuanced measures of effectiveness, this research should examine effectiveness measures that:
 - “integrate children’s safety and well-being throughout the research;
 - include interviews with men to begin to explore how change takes place;
 - work with practitioners without compromising the independence and integrity of data collection and analysis; [and]
 - draw on contemporary gender theory in analysis.”¹⁸
- This research must be conducted in collaboration with women’s services, services providing perpetrator interventions and other service providers that engage with perpetrators.

¹⁸ Kelly, L., & Westmarland, N. (2015). *Domestic violence perpetrator programmes: Steps towards change, Project Mirabal Final Report*. London, UK: London Metropolitan. p.45

- This research should examine a cross section of perpetrator interventions, preferably within different jurisdictions.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$100,000 and a timeframe of up to 1 year has been identified for this project.

2.2 Development of best practice in evaluating perpetrator interventions

Need

Although a number of perpetrator interventions have undergone evaluation, it is still unclear as to what aspects need to be considered when conducting evaluations and which evaluation tools are most appropriate. Therefore, more research is required to develop best practice evaluation principles and guidelines. The development of these would include consideration of:

- individual and group based interventions;
- specific intervention components (such as mandatory attendance, linkages with other services such as mental health and drug and alcohol, and facilitator characteristics);
- timelines for interventions;
- effectiveness of interventions for specific sub populations;
- different philosophical approaches underpinning interventions;
- long-term effectiveness of specific program components, including links between program completion and recidivism;
- adaptable evaluation mechanisms such as pre- and post-assessment tools and quality assurance processes; and
- the development of a National Evaluation Framework.

Desired outcomes

A final report that:

- sets out best practices in evaluating perpetrator interventions based predominantly on a 'state of knowledge' (literature review) report and also the outcomes of qualitative research;
- recommends best practice evaluation principles and guidelines for evaluating interventions and be able to that inform the development of best evaluation practice for intervention programs across jurisdictions;
- makes recommendations for policy in terms of the role of robust evaluations in promoting and developing interventions; and
- contributes to greater understanding of the suitability of evaluation methods and research instruments in relation to perpetrator interventions.

Methodological considerations

- This research, although 'desk-based', should include a qualitative component with women's services and services and agencies delivering perpetrator interventions.
- Careful consideration should be given when exploring recidivism rates of men who complete programs, i.e. the difficulties associated with population based comparisons, e.g. under reporting.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$60,000 and a timeframe of up to 6 months has been identified for this project.

2.3 Evaluation of specific interventions

Need

There is a need to evaluate specific perpetrator interventions to determine effectiveness, including an assessment of safety and accountability and the views of women and children experiencing violence. Furthermore, there is a need to evaluate alternative interventions, for example, the Circles of Support and Accountability program, the Safe and Together child protection model or restorative approaches. In some countries, particularly in the UK, the use of restorative justice for perpetrators of family and domestic violence and sexual violence has been employed, however a number of practitioners and researchers have reservations about this approach. More research is required to establish the effectiveness of specific interventions and their applicability within an Australian context.

Desired outcomes

- Greater understanding of what interventions are effective in producing attitudinal and behavioural change for particular groups of perpetrators and why.
- Greater understanding of what perpetrator interventions are effective in reducing violence, or the impact of violence on women and their children.
- Contribution to the development and/or evaluation of alternative interventions, for example restorative justice approaches.
- Recommendations for policy regarding alternative interventions for perpetrators.

Methodological considerations

- This research should be conducted in collaboration with men's service providers and services providing assistance and support to women and children experiencing violence.
- Research must include more than one jurisdiction and evaluate more than one program/approach.
- Where possible, comparative evaluations of interventions within different locations and with different groups of perpetrators should be conducted.
- Action research methodologies may be appropriate to support the continued development and implementation of programs and approaches.

Jurisdictions have identified the following interventions to be considered for inclusion as part of this project however proposals examining other programs, approaches are also welcome:

- Evaluation of formalised integrated approaches, including for example:
 - Western Australia's Family and Domestic Violence Response Team model, and Multi-agency Case Management as adopted in the *Common Risk Assessment and Risk Management Framework*.
 - Tweed Heads NSW 'Safer Pathway' site. Unique to the operation of the Safer Pathway in Tweed Heads is the participation of a Men's Behaviour Change Program provider, the Lismore Men and Families Centre (MFC). The MFC attends the Safety Action Meetings as part of the multi-agency/integrated response and receives referrals of perpetrators as part of work to improve victim safety.
- Perpetrator intervention programs which may include consideration of:

- effectiveness and use of the different approaches being used in perpetrator programs for example: Duluth, CBT, RNR and Good Lives and hybrid models;
- mandatory and volunteer perpetrator programs and their effectiveness in improving victims' safety and promoting perpetrator accountability, including a comparison of these approaches;
- approaches to victim support and contact;
- barriers to access, and effectiveness of programs for different population groups and communities (including regional and remote communities) and approaches to overcoming these; and
- comparison of perpetrator interventions post the completion or cessation of domestic and family violence and sexual assault perpetrator programs including, for example, the use of maintenance programs for sexual assault perpetrators
- Some perpetrator intervention programs to be considered for evaluation include:
 - Tasmania's Family Violence Offender Intervention Program;
 - New Directions Sex Offender Program;
 - Challenging Abusive Behaviours; and
 - Communicare's Breathing Space men's behaviour change program currently operating in WA.
- Real-time emergency response systems that allow monitoring and rapid response to crisis situations in a timely manner and link essential services to those in need. Particularly, as a tool within an integrated or wrap-around system response.
- Interventions/ approaches by first responders (e.g. police, hospitals, mainstream NGOs) that facilitate and promote access to pathways to safety for victims and perpetrator accountability. Such programs may include pathways to both legal/justice systems and community based pathways (for example, early and active referral to programs).
- Approaches connect primary prevention and tertiary interventions¹⁹.
- The effectiveness and capacity of domestic and family violence helplines/web-based support for perpetrators.
- Restorative justice approaches including, for example:
 - approaches adopted in Indigenous communities; and
 - Family Dispute resolution.²⁰

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$100,000 and a maximum timeframe of up to 18 months has been identified for this project.

2.4 Effectively engaging and retaining perpetrators in interventions

Need

Most men are not intrinsically motivated to attend perpetrator intervention programs and attend for a variety of extrinsic reasons, including: to comply with a court order; to obtain access to their children; or prevent a partner from leaving. Studies have consistently revealed that drop out rates for

¹⁹ For more information refer to the following report - Centre for Innovative Justice, 2015, *Opportunities for Early Intervention: Bringing perpetrators of family violence into view*. RMIT

²⁰ Centre for Innovative Justice, 2015, *Opportunities for Early Intervention: Bringing perpetrators of family violence into view*, RMIT, pp 76-78

perpetrator intervention programs are high, regardless of the program's format or duration. Indeed, researchers have identified the need for more research on program attrition, paying particular attention to a participant's learning styles, cognitive abilities, therapeutic relationships, past experience of witnessing family violence, as well as anger and depression.

Further research is needed to identify the best ways to address potential attrition points in all types of interventions. Research is also required to deepen our understanding of when it is most appropriate to engage men who use violence and the most effective means to engage them.

Desired outcomes

- Greater understanding of the factors that lead men to engage with, or disengage from programs.
- Evidence to support improvements in the level of safety and security of women experiencing violence.
- Contribution to the development of more appropriate interventions programs for particular perpetrators, including the professional development of program facilitators.
- A more comprehensive understanding of how different components of an integrated system can help facilitate and support perpetrator engagement with interventions.
- Deepened understanding of the pathways of sexual assault and domestic and family violence perpetrators through the criminal justice system, other legal processes, and community-based pathways in all states and territories.
- Evidence to support the development of appropriate contact points for perpetrators and effective means of engagement.

Methodological considerations

- This research should be conducted in collaboration with men's referral services and services and agencies providing support to perpetrators.
- This research should also take into account the views of women experiencing violence, particularly when exploring aspects relating to intervention drop out.
- A comparative approach, across jurisdictions, may be appropriate for this research.
- An advisory group will be established by ANROWS to provide input into this project. Once researchers are identified a detailed research design (including a refined methodology), strategies to ensure project feasibility (including ethic requirements for the chosen programs/communities) will be negotiated with the researchers. This will occur with input from an advisory group and will be part of the contract negotiations with ANROWS.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$300,000 and a maximum timeframe of 2 years has been identified for this project.

Strategic Research Theme 3: Models to address diversity of perpetrators

3.1 Best practice models for sexual assault perpetrators

Need

The majority of sexual offender programs in Australia and overseas adopt a Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) approach. Overall, programs aim to enhance an offender's self-control, critical reasoning skills, decision making and empathy. The CBT approach also helps offenders identify situations of high risk and how they can implement strategies to avoid reoffending. In addition, a number of programs adopt the Risks, Needs and Responsivity (RNR) model, where the intervention is effectively tailored to an offender's risk level, i.e. low-moderate or moderate-high risk of reoffending.

There is need for research to evaluate what are the best practices for sexual assault perpetrator interventions in Australia including the effectiveness of maintenance programs for men who have completed other sex offender programs. Research is also needed to explore alternative/hybrid models such as the Good Lives Model.

Desirable outcomes

- Strengthen the evidence base for the applicability of particular intervention models within the Australian context, including the effectiveness of mixed model approaches (i.e. those that target both adult sex offenders with adult victims and child sex offenders) and those targeting only adult sex offenders with adult victims.
- Greater understanding of the suitability of targeting interventions to risk.
- Increased knowledge regarding the applicability and efficacy of various models in relation to different types of violence.
- A clearer perspective regarding the practicality of the RNR model in Australia, given small numbers of perpetrators in remote area programs and potential language barriers.

Methodological considerations

- This research must be conducted in collaboration with correctional services that deliver programs for sex offenders.
- This research should include the views of practitioners and men who use this violence and, where possible, women who experience sexual violence.
- Where possible, a comparative analysis of programs adopting different models should be conducted.
- This research must be conducted in more than one jurisdiction and preferably include cross jurisdictional analysis.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$150,000 and a timeframe of up to 2 years has been identified for this project.

3.2 Best practice models for family and domestic violence perpetrators

Need

The Duluth model is the most enduring and prominent model of domestic and family violence perpetrator intervention. However, the Duluth model has been criticised by some scholars for being a “one size-fits all” approach to violence against women which lacks empirical support and has stymied innovation in the area of perpetrator interventions. These criticisms have resulted in some practitioners adopting the Risk, Needs and Responsivity (RNR) model.

There is a need for research to examine whether RNR or Duluth-informed models are best practice for perpetrators of family and domestic violence, considering practical issues relevant to the Australian context, such as numbers of perpetrators in remote area programs. This research should also examine the use of alternative/hybrid models.

Desired outcomes

- Strengthen the evidence base for the applicability of particular models within an Australian context.
- Greater understanding of the suitability of targeting interventions to risk.
- Greater understanding of whether particular intervention models are appropriate for certain groups of domestic and family violence perpetrators.
- A better understanding of the relationship between different program models and attrition rates.
- Greater understanding of the effectiveness and use of individual interventions and on-line technology for domestic and family violence perpetrators, especially where access to a face to face Men’s Behaviour Change Program (MBCP) may not be appropriate or geographically possible.

Methodological considerations

- This research must be conducted in collaboration with services providing perpetrator interventions.
- This research should include the views of practitioners, women who experience family and domestic violence and men who use this violence.
- This research should adopt a comparative approach and examine interventions delivered within both custodial and community settings and consider key program features such as program length, frequency of sessions and interaction with perpetrators
- This research must be conducted in more than one jurisdiction and preferably include cross jurisdictional analysis.
- This research should take into account the diversity amongst perpetrators.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$150,000 and a timeframe of up to 2 years has been identified for this project.

3.3 Models to address diversity

Need

There should be an evaluation of relevant models to address the different needs of sub-populations of perpetrators. This includes the need for further research into the effectiveness of, and best practice approaches to ‘mainstream’ interventions and programs responding to culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) perpetrators as well as evaluation of the effectiveness of programs specifically targeting CALD perpetrators, including immigrant and refugee perpetrators.

Similarly, there is a need for further research on models focused on intervening early to prevent younger perpetrators from re-offending or to prevent offending by young men and adolescents where risk factors are identified. This includes for example, those that perpetrate dating violence and child to parent violence, commonly referred to as ‘adolescent violence in the home’ (AVITH).

Further research is also needed with regard to similar models or identification of best practice principles for interventions with further sub-populations, such as:

- rural and remote perpetrators – including consideration of how program integrity can be maintained whilst ensuring sufficient flexibility in service provision;
- perpetrators with disability;
- older perpetrators; and
- lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ) perpetrators, specifically where the violence includes lesbian, bi and/or trans women as victims.

Desirable outcomes

- Provide an evidence base for appropriate/effective interventions for perpetrators from sub-populations including approaches and models focused on prevention and early intervention.
- Greater understanding of the similarities and differences regarding the models adopted for sub-populations and those utilised within “mainstream” interventions and the benefits and potential risks for both mainstream and targeted models and approaches.
- Research should explore system barriers for effective interventions responding to CALD perpetrators of domestic and family violence and sexual assault, including barriers perpetrators from CALD backgrounds face when accessing programs and how these can be overcome.
- Greater understanding of effective interventions for adolescent perpetrators of domestic and family violence and sexual assault, where the victims are women and girls.
- Recommendations for policy regarding the role of specifically targeted interventions for perpetrators from sub-populations and analysis of the opportunities for, and effectiveness of, interventions at different points of the service system (e.g. opportunities in the justice, child protection and education systems for younger perpetrators).
- Provide an evidence base for effective interventions for focused on intervening early to prevent younger perpetrators from re-offending or to prevent offending by young men and adolescents where risk factors are identified.

Methodological considerations

- The research must be conducted in collaboration with violence against women organisations and organisations that support and work with perpetrators from sub population groups.
- Researchers when engaging with sub populations should adopt appropriate and inclusive methodologies that are culturally responsive and are cognisant of the multiple factors and influences on people's cultural identity.
- All research must specifically consider and address specific ethical considerations for research involving the relevant population groups.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$200,000 and a timeframe of 2 years has been identified for this project.

Strategic Research Theme 4 - Interventions developed by, with and for Indigenous communities

Please note the additional selection criterion will be applied for both priorities in this SRT:

- These projects must be Indigenous led²¹ and/or linked to a network of Indigenous researchers in a manner which builds the capacity and experience of early career Indigenous researchers.
- This research must be conducted in collaboration with one or more Indigenous communities and/or organisations.
- Demonstrated experience/expertise within the research team in the following:
 - Violence against women in Indigenous communities.
 - Conducting research with Indigenous people/communities.
- The research must demonstrate adherence to the AIATSIS [Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies](#).

Once the preferred researchers for the below projects are identified a detailed research design (including a refined methodology), strategies to ensure project feasibility (including ethic requirements for the chosen programs/communities) will be negotiated with the researchers. This will occur with input from an advisory group and will be part of the contract negotiations with ANROWS.

4.1 Determine best practice principles for program delivery for Indigenous perpetrators

Need

It is important to determine best practice principles for program delivery for Indigenous perpetrators, by drawing on what is already known from extensive consultation with Indigenous leaders, researchers, service providers and community members. In conducting this research, it should be acknowledged that the needs of Indigenous perpetrators may intersect with issues linked to the effects of colonisation, such as health, economic, and housing concerns.

Desired outcomes

- The provision of a stronger and more robust documented evidence base for the development of best practice principles in relation to interventions addressing Indigenous perpetrators.
- Indigenous women's perspectives inform the development of best practice principles.
- Recommendations for policy and systems improvements so that Indigenous programs and/or culturally responsive practices are embedded within an integrated response to family violence.

Methodological considerations

- Ideally, research will explore both sexual assault and family violence, however applications to address either sexual assault or family violence will be considered.
- This research must be Indigenous-led and/or linked to a network of Indigenous researchers in a manner²², and conducted in collaboration with one or more Indigenous communities and/or organisations.

²¹ This means the Principal Chief Investigator is an Indigenous Australian or an Indigenous controlled organisation is the administering organisation.

²² Refer to the full list of selection criteria for SRT 4 above.

- Where possible, comparative evaluations of different approaches in Indigenous communities should be conducted to identify key best practices that may apply across contexts.
- Participatory action research methodologies may be appropriate, because of their potential to empower communities and to capture their perspectives.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$150,000 and a timeframe of 18 months has been identified for this project.

4.2 Understanding role of lore and culture in interventions with Indigenous perpetrators

Need

Further research is needed to document what it looks like in practice for Indigenous perpetrator interventions to be developed by Indigenous communities, and how to place lore, law and culture at the centre of Indigenous perpetrator interventions. This research should also consider how healing practices and accountability of Indigenous men to women and community are best balanced with ensuring the safety of Indigenous women who experience violence.

Desired outcomes

- A better understanding of how interventions can be developed by Indigenous communities and how these can incorporate culturally appropriate aspects and maintain accountability of Indigenous men to women and community.
- Greater understanding of the potential crossover between interventions developed by Indigenous communities and those developed and delivered by “mainstream” services. For example, whether certain components of “mainstream” interventions are suitable for Indigenous programs and vice-versa.
- Policy recommendations regarding the importance of culturally specific programs in a systematic response to family violence and sexual assault, particularly in remote areas of Australia.

Methodological considerations

- Ideally, research will examine sexual assault and family violence interventions; however, projects which address either sexual assault or family violence will be considered.
- This research must be Indigenous led and/or linked to a network of Indigenous researchers in a manner²³, and conducted in collaboration with one or more Indigenous communities and/or organisations.
- Where possible, comparative evaluations of different Indigenous programs should be conducted.
- Participatory action research methodologies may be appropriate, because of their potential to empower communities and to capture their perspectives.

Cost and timeframe

A maximum budget of \$200,000 and a timeframe of 2 years has been identified for this project.

²³ Refer to the full list of selection criteria for SRT 4 above.

Section 3 – Selection process

Selection stages

Projects are selected for funding by ANROWS following assessment by peer assessors drawn from an expert pool of researchers, government officers, academics and senior practitioners. This enables ANROWS to review project applications and select successful projects based on merit against the project selection criteria. Final decisions about project funding rests with the ANROWS Board.

Peer assessors must adhere to principles and guidelines covering conflicts of interest and confidentiality, which have been developed in accordance with national and international standards. These are available at <http://anrows.org.au/research-program/peer-assessment>.

The process for assessing and selecting successful projects for ANROWS Research Grants is outlined below.

1. Initial processing of applications

Applications are processed by ANROWS staff to ensure project requirements are met and to group them across Strategic Research Themes for peer assessment panels.

2. Selection of projects for recommended funding

Peer assessors within each panel review applications before meeting. Panels then determine which projects should be recommended to the ANROWS Board for funding, based on merit assessed against the Selection Criteria, and following referee checks.

ANROWS sends notices of offer to successful applicants.

ANROWS sends feedback reports to unsuccessful applicants.

3. Preparation and signing of funding agreements/contracts.

Once ANROWS receives acceptances to the notices of offer, funding agreements are prepared and signed by both parties. These agreements include a schedule containing budgets, reporting milestones and payments, and expected project outcomes.

4. Publication of successful grants on the ANROWS website

Successful projects are announced publicly and published on the ANROWS website.

Selection criteria

Submitted grant applications will be assessed on merit by a peer assessment panel against the selection criteria listed below. The online application form that can be accessed at <http://anrows.org.au/research-program/grants/current-grants> has been constructed in a way that ensures applicants have the opportunity to address each of these selection criteria within the application.

1. Research project

- The value of the project's contribution to knowledge, including whether it fills a genuine gap in the literature.

- The likelihood of the project resulting in evidence that may inform or influence government policy, programs and practice concerning domestic violence, family violence and/or sexual assault.
- The merit of the project, including its cost-effectiveness.
- Response to any specified additional criteria for the project, such as active collaboration with, or involvement of, specific groups or populations where appropriate (e.g. certain types of service providers or policy-makers, Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander communities or organisations, women with disability).

2. Desirable features for ANROWS projects

- Incorporation of elements of the desirable features for ANROWS research projects (e.g. capacity building, multi-jurisdictional, or innovative methodology).

3. Methodology and timelines

- The validity of the methodology and its consistency and appropriateness for the project in terms of anticipated outcome and proposed timeframe.
- The consideration of possible alternative methodologies for the project and identification of limitations of the methodology.
- The likelihood that the research can be completed within the proposed timelines.
- Ethical considerations regarding the methodology, including the likelihood that it will receive approval from an appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee.
- Identification of appropriate mechanisms within the project design to maintain the safety of, and support for, women and children affected by the research.

4. Budget

- Provision of a detailed and itemised budget.
- Consistency between the budget and the methodology.
- Justification for a reasonable and cost-effective budget.

5. Proposed dissemination strategies

- Identification of proposed dissemination strategies.
- Explanation of why these strategies are best suited to the project, including the likelihood that they will reach and engage the intended audience(s).
- Identification of how these strategies will result in the best knowledge transfer and impact on policy and/or service delivery.

6. Track record of applicants

- The project team demonstrates sufficient expertise and relevant experience to successfully complete the proposed research.
- The applicants' track record and referees' reports reflect their capacity to complete the proposed project on time and on budget.
- At least one referee provided by the applicant must support the project team's capacity to engage with the relevant target group or audience. For example, where the project concerns government

agencies or a specific population group, at least one referee should be from government or that population group respectively.

Funding agreement

Successful applicants must be able to enter into a funding agreement with ANROWS. These agreements, including the schedules outlining outcome milestones and payments, will be negotiated following the determination of successful projects.

Intellectual property

Intellectual Property arising from project work during the life of the project, including reports, publications, webinars, community events or other dissemination strategies, is retained by ANROWS. Researchers will have unrestricted license to access any project material, and can use this material for further research purposes, publications or dissemination activities, following completion of the project.

Incomplete or misleading information

Any projects which are found to contain false, misleading or inaccurate claims or information will be withdrawn from consideration for funding under the ANROWS Research Grants.

If ANROWS discovers an application has been assessed on the basis of false, misleading or inaccurate claims, ANROWS reserves the right to terminate funding in accordance with the Funding Agreement governing the project.

Appeals

ANROWS decisions in regard to project funding may be appealed on administrative process grounds, however any recommendations made by ANROWS staff, Peer Assessment Panel or the ANROWS Board in relation to project eligibility or merit cannot be appealed. Appeals based on administrative process grounds can be lodged with the ANROWS CEO, within 28 days of receipt of the application outcome. These should outline the issues which are considered as grounds for appeal.

Further information

For further information about the application process, or for assistance with developing research partnerships, please contact ANROWS at enquiries@anrows.org.au or (02) 8374 4000.