Dear [Name]:

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act [JPS/3/2019]

On January 11, 2019, the Department of Justice and Public Safety (JPS) received your request for access to the following records:

“Information notes, decision notes, analyses, and/or other background or briefing materials - in any and all formats, including paper and electronic - related to the Family Violence Intervention Court pilot project in Stephenville and its possible expansion to other areas of the province. Date range of request is Jan. 1, 2018 to the present.”

On January 22, 2019, you confirmed that when you referred to background material you were seeking information on how the court has been working and where they are thinking of expanding.

Please be advised that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister of JPS to provide access to some of the requested information. However, access to the remainder of the information/records has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

29. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that would reveal
   (a) advice, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for a public body or minister;

35. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information which could reasonably be expected to disclose
   (c) plans that relate to the management of personnel of or the administration of a public body and that have not yet been implemented or made public;

40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

s.71 of the Children and Youth Care and Protection Act.
Please note:

- The following pages have been withheld in their entirety:
  - p.4-6, 21 - s.29(1)(a) and s.35(1)(c)
  - p.10 - s.29(1)(a)
  - p.105 - s.40(1) of the Act, and s.71 of the CYP Act.
- 4 spreadsheets with information relating to the people who participated in the FVIC Stephenville pilot project have not been provided as they fall outside the scope of the Act:
  - 5.1 This Act applies to all records in the custody of or under the control of a public body but does not apply to (a) a record in a court file, a record of a judge of the Court of Appeal, Trial Division, or Provincial Court, a judicial administration record or a record relating to support services provided to the judges of those courts
- Pages 64-79 and 84-102 relate to interviews with FVIC steering committee members. These were the notes that were taken during those conversations.
- P.75 -- the department of Children, Seniors and Social Development (CSSD) wanted to clarify the following:
  - 2.c. Early Intervention -- the document notes that CSSD, at times, "may have waiting lists". The only service that a CSSD client may be on is a waitlist for is for counselling services. There are no waitlists for FVIC or child protection services.
  - 3. "I don't speak to the victim -- most of CSSD involvement is focus on the Offender." In cases where the victim has involvement with CSSD (i.e. on a Protection Intervention Program caseload), a social worker is assigned to work with the individual and family who is on a PIP caseload. The social worker assigned to FVIC works specifically with the Offender as part of their role in this capacity.

As required by 8(2) of the Act, we have severed information that is unable to be disclosed and have provided you with as much information as possible. In accordance with your request for a copy of the records, the appropriate copies have been enclosed.

Please be advised that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the processing of your access request as set out in section 42 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference). A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

The appeal may be addressed to the Information and Privacy Commissioner as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John's, NL A1B 3V8

Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference).
Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72 hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any questions please contact me by telephone at 709-729-7128, or by email at sonjaelgohary@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sonja El-Gohary
ATIPP Coordinator
Access or correction complaint

42. (1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52 (1) or 53 (1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52.  (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2)  An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3)  Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4)  An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the commissioner’s refusal under subsection 45 (2).
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In 2015, the Department of Justice and Public Safety was mandated to complete a comprehensive evaluation on the Family Violence Intervention Court (FVIC) Pilot Project in Stephenville. The evaluation involved interviewing all stakeholders, reviewing the current process and any changes already made, examining current statistics, reviewing offender and victim exit interviews and providing recommendations to continually improve the court process.
Introduction

About Family Violence Intervention Court and History

The Family Violence Intervention Court (FVIC) is a therapeutic court that is based in restorative justice principles. It deals with criminality by exploring the root causes of the criminal behavior while ensuring accountability.

The Domestic Violence court was established in St. John’s in 2009, however it was closed in 2013 due to budget cuts. In October 2015, the court was reinstated in St. John’s with a satellite pilot project opened in Stephenville. Both courts were under a new name: Family Violence Intervention Court.

FVIC uses a treatment-based approach focusing on offender accountability and treatment as well as victim safety to address the complex issue of family violence. One of the key principles is that the accused must accept responsibility for his or her actions and must participate in programming, while events are recent, in order to have a positive impact.

The Court operates similar to a traditional court in that there are hearings before a judge, a plea, and a sentencing; however, it is an expedited therapeutic court with a team of stakeholders involved throughout the whole process to enhance communication. There is a focus on victim safety, offender accountability, and intervention supports for the offender through programming.
The objectives and principles of the Stephenville Court are to:
- Provide a therapeutic court model outside of St. John’s, using technology to maximize existing resources
- Help break the cycle of intimate partner violence
- Reduce Recidivism
- Mitigate the cost of family violence
- Increase community support
- Enhance victim safety and offender accountability
- Promote early intervention for both victim and offender
- Decrease court processing times vs Traditional Court
- Encourage collaboration amongst stakeholders
- Address criminality and root cause
- Focus on treatment
The team of stakeholders is a group made up of positions chosen for the purposes of meeting the objectives and principles of the FVIC and are as follows:

**Team Members:**
- Provincial Court Judge
- Bail Supervisor (Adult Probation)
- Crown Prosecutor
- Legal Aid Lawyer
- Risk Assessor
- Social Worker
- Specialty Court Liaison
- Victim Services

**Steering Committee:**
- The Team Members (above)
- Chief Adult Probation Officer
- Senior Crown Prosecutor
- Deputy Director Legal Aid
- CSSD Program Supervisor
- Director of Provincial Court Services
- Provincial Manager Victim Services
- Family Division Court Administrator

**Secondary and Other Stakeholders**
- John Howard Society
- Women’s Centre (Empowerment Group)
- Stephenville Court Administrator
- Stephenville Court Clerk
- RCMP Stephenville
- RNC Corner Brook
The Stephenville FVIC operates in the same manner as the St. John’s FVIC, however it incorporates the use of videoconferencing technology for team meetings and when court is in session.

The Policies and Procedures used have been adopted from the original Domestic Violence Court with some minor changes and are more of a set of guidelines rather than a formal set of Policies and Procedures. The Specialty Court Liaison has started implementing changes since the onset of the evaluation, an update will be provided at the end of this section.

The procedure for the FVIC, at the onset of the evaluation, started with the accused being charged by the police following a domestic violence or other type of abuse committed against women or men in a heterosexual or homosexual relationship. Following the charge, a date was set for the accused’s First Appearance (FA) in court. If the charge is eligible for FVIC, and the Crown agrees, the case would remain in FVIC. The Risk Assessment (RA) appointment would be scheduled, held between 1 – 5 weeks depending on the Risk Assessor’s schedule, and the accused would appear in court on the next available FVIC date after the completion of the RA to enter a plea.

The accused may seek legal counsel (Legal Aid or private bar) who would inform the accused of their options including FVIC.  

If there is no disclosure or application to Legal Aid in the FA, then the case would be set over to the next available FA date, and continue to be set over until the application is made, it is approved and a disclosure has been received. This could result in repeated appearances until the conditions are satisfied. Having multiple appearances with no movement delays the process unnecessarily, which is a concern in an expedited court.

On the day of the hearing, the Team Members have a team meeting discussing the accused’s case, conditions of release, and any concerns that may be raised. When
needed, Victim Services (VS) and/or the Department of Children, Seniors, and Social Development (CSSD) representatives may attend to provide feedback.

“Plea Day” is supposed to be held on Wednesdays. The accused should appear with the RA outcome and ideally a plea will be entered at this time. If the Agreed Statement of Facts (ASF) is not read in this hearing, a new recognizance will be issued with conditions set specifically for the situation. Frequently, the plea is not entered on “Plea Day” in Stephenville, with the matter being set over as the ASF may not be ready or may not have been reviewed by the accused. On occasion, the RA was only completed 1 – 2 days prior to court, however the RA is required so that the ASF can be requested/drafted which generally takes longer than 2 days. With no Risk Assessor in Stephenville, there could also be up to a 4-week wait if the accused attends the appointment on time (longer if they miss an appointment). This can lead to wait times that are unnecessary.

Once the plea has been entered with a new recognizance issued and the ASF read, the next appearance date will be scheduled if the accused pleads guilty. The client would see the Bail Supervisor from Adult Probation within 2 business days and a copy of the new recognizance and ASF will be forwarded by the Specialty Court Liaison to the Bail Supervisor.

A referral will also be made to John Howard Society (JHS) for an assessment and to commence counselling. The Bail Supervisor and JHS feel that they should have access
to more information from the RA as to how a score is determined. On occasion, they may re-ask some of the questions to help determine the appropriate level of programming, or if a client reoffends during the course of the program (usually a breach) the Bail Supervisor will redo the RA to make sure the level of risk has not increase to “Very High”. While the Risk Assessor uses some of the same tools as the Bail Supervisor and JHS to assess the client, the results may be different and little information, other than the score, is forwarded to the Bail Supervisor and JHS due to confidentiality issues. The Risk Assessor has access to the full disclosure and some extra tools, however the Bail Supervisor and JHS do not have this access. This could involve a repeat of work, and confusion regarding how the Risk Assessor arrived at the assessed outcome.

Once programming commences, the client appears before the Judge to provide a status update, to set a new date for update or for sentencing. When requesting a date for sentencing, a request will also be made for a Pre-Sentence Report (PSR). At the Sentencing hearing, the new ASF will be read and the Judge will provide a sentence taking into account the offense, the level of participation, the level of improvement and other factors.

The FVIC has an oversight “Steering Committee” that is made up of management level employees including the Chief Adult Probation Officer, Senior Crown Prosecutor, Deputy Director of Legal Aid, Social Worker Supervisor from CSSD, Director of Provincial Court Services, Provincial Manager of Victim Services, and the Team Members. The policies and procedures state that the Steering Committee should meet 5 times per year as needed pending the urgency of an issue; however, they are currently meeting sporadically or at most on an annual basis. Meeting 5 times per year may be more than necessary, however annually may not be enough in order to address issues.
The mandate of the Steering Committee is to:

- Identify and resolve operating issues which arise on a day-to-day basis;
- Ensure that the court process is efficient and streamlined;
- Ensure early intervention for offenders who plead guilty and choose to avail of the Domestic Violence Court;
- Ensure accessibility of services for victims and their children; and
- Provide guidance and expertise regarding strategies and policies.

As the Steering Committee is meant to be an oversight committee, they should not need to be involved in the operating issues, which may arise on a day-to-day basis. These minor issues can likely be resolved at the frontline level and serious issues that cannot be resolved at the frontline level should go to the Committee.
**Update: Several changes have been made since the onset of this evaluation:**

- The Judge now presses to have the RA scheduled for anyone considering FVIC, the application for LA can now be completed during the RA and no financial assessment is required.
- Disclosure is now ready for the FA and can be provided to duty counsel in advance, however the Risk Assessor will still need the Disclosure to score the RA
- The ASF is now being read on Plea Day
- Until June 2018, the Crown was situated in St. John’s and appeared via video and required documentation to be sent electronically from the Stephenville Crown however, the Stephenville Crown was responsible for disclosure, vetting the file and may screen files for cases that were appearing from WASH court or were previously remanded. FVIC is now piloting a new process where new files in Stephenville are now completely the responsibility of the Crown in Stephenville with one file remaining with the St. John’s Crown until sentencing. There are 2 Crowns in Stephenville who have been rotating bi-weekly with specific files
managed separately.

- Team meetings were previously held via video using courtroom #2 at 1pm. This frequently conflicted with court schedules as court commences at 1:30 in Stephenville and resulted in the meetings feeling rushed. In April 2018, the FVIC started piloting a process where the team would meet at 9am via Skype in their individual offices. This has helped by allowing discussions to progress with enough time to make adjustments to release conditions, ASF, etc. or to gather additional information as required.

- Since the Steering Committee Meeting in January, the issue of disclosure being available has been resolved as the Crown now brings the Disclosure to the first appearance court. This has resulting in a “formal” request no longer being required.
- Issues around the Legal Aid application process have been resolved including the financial application piece.
- Since the new Legal Aid Conflict Lawyer from Corner Brook as become involved in FVIC, the overall numbers of Corner Brook cases has increased.
- Steering committee meetings are now being scheduled every 4 months or so. They have met in January, May and are meeting again September 18, 2018. This schedule will continue until the issues have been resolved and the court is running smoothly.
During the 2017/18 fiscal year, 18 people were charged with family violence offences with a first appearance in FVIC. Of these accused all were male, 11 of them had children in their lives and 11 presented with alcohol/substance abuse. With respect to the lengths of time for some of the steps, there was an average 94 days to receive disclosure, 76 days to receive a risk assessment and 132 days to a guilty plea for those that pled guilty.

During the 2016/17 fiscal year, 20 people were charged with family violence offences with a first appearance in FVIC. Of these accused 14 were male, 6 were female, 16 of them had children in their lives and 13 presented with alcohol/substance abuse. With respect to the lengths of time for some of the steps, there was an average 68 days to receive disclosure, 47 days to receive a risk assessment and 127 days to a guilty plea for those that pled guilty.

During the 2015/16 fiscal year (October – March), 12 people were charged with family violence offences with a first appearance in FVIC. Of these accused 9 were male, 3 were female, 6 of them had children in their lives and 9 presented with alcohol/substance abuse. With respect to the lengths of time for some of the steps, the average days to receive disclosure is unknown, there were 121 days to receive a risk assessment and 213 days to a guilty plea for those that pled guilty.

Table 1 - FVIC Stephenville Timeline and Demographic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days to Disclosure</th>
<th>Days to Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Days to Plea</th>
<th># Charged</th>
<th># Male</th>
<th># Female</th>
<th># Accused with Children</th>
<th># Accused with Alcohol/Substance Abuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>122/113/21</td>
<td>213/381/284</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>120/23</td>
<td>127/53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>193/28</td>
<td>132/266/42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - FVIC Stephenville Timeline Averages Graph

Table 3 - FVIC Stephenville Timeline Maximums and Minimums Graph
The Bay St. George Status of Women Council is funded by the Department of Justice and Public Safety to offer the Women Empowering Women support group. In this group there is room for a maximum of 10 women per offering, 3 of which were reserved for FVIC clients. There were 2 groups as well as 1-on-1 counselling offered in 2017-2018 with 21 participants and 3 group offerings in 2016-17 with 17 participants.

JHS delivered the OASIS Program to clients referred by the FVIC. Each program includes a minimum of 40 hours of “moderate risk” group treatment supplemented by three individual sessions. Clients deemed “low risk” were provided individual intervention and clients deemed “high risk” also participated in a 6-session maintenance program. Due to lower numbers, scheduling conflicts, or transportation issues frequently clients in Stephenville attend individual sessions. In 2015-16, 2 clients were referred to the program and both were carried over to the next year. In 2016-17, 16 clients were referred to the program with 7 completing it and 11 continuing into the next year. In 2017-18, there were 11 new referrals with 19 completing the program and three continuing to the next year.
Table 5 - FVIC Stephenville Number of Participant Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Assessed by Risk Assessor</th>
<th>Number Eligible</th>
<th>Number Ineligible</th>
<th>Number Not Interested</th>
<th>Number Completed Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - FVIC Stephenville Number of Participants Graph

It appears that some stakeholders maintain regular unofficial statistics, while others maintain no statistics and that it is generally unknown what is being collecting. There does not seem to be a formal set of standardized statistics collected other than the statistics of numbers that are going through the court. The above statistics were pulled together from several sources.
The objective of FVIC is to keep the offenders accountable with accelerated access to counselling while supporting them to make necessary changes in their lives. In order to proceed with the court, offenders have to take responsibility for their actions by pleading guilty in court. They then access counselling and programming which is taken into account during sentencing at the end of FVIC.

FVIC is offender-centric and while victims are not direct clients of the court, they are extremely important and it is imperative to make sure that they are not re-victimized. They need to feel and remain safe and therefore it is vital to capture and take into account their experience with FVIC. Victims have accelerated access to counselling and there is accessibility of services and supports for victims and their children keeping their safety at the Women’s Centre.

Offenders

The programming and counselling for the offenders is provided by the John Howard Society (JHS). At the end of the program, the offender can complete an exit interview facilitated by JHS. Over the past few years, JHS has been improving their exit interview form, and so the questions have not been consistent however, 100% of the participants have a generally positive review of their involvement with FVIC.

Some of the comments from offenders include:

- “I am a lot better as a person then I use to be - I was angry a lot but this program helped me deal with it.”
- “Able to open up and be honest and letting insecurities out helped a lot. Finding my faults and working on resolutions. Every session was helpful, how a lot of the abuse in the video applied to me in my childhood and now also the addiction talks. Very helpful and understanding helped me see where my behaviours can be changed. She didn't judge me and cared about my intervention, very clear, understood everything.”
- “Heart to heart conversations - real examples of people, stories. All helpful. Learning to apply good habits and learning what the consequences are in the
end. Learning the triggers to my bad behaviour and applying better strategies. No judgement, very informative, help myself and others be better people in society."

- “Learning to understand where/why I ended up here and new tools/skills to shape my way of thinking positively and using them daily. How in-depth we discussed behaviours and ways of changing and dealing with them in a positive attitude. You can only control what you feel and want in everyday life. Covers many aspects of the last few years leading up to where I am - very helpful in making conscious decisions moving forward.”

There were only a couple of negative comments and they mostly revolved around the difficulty of getting to and from appointments and the occasional client that did not resonate with the videos.

Of the offenders who agreed to complete the exit interview, they mostly had a very positive view of the FVIC process and the outcomes they experienced. They felt that it was very valuable and that they were supported in making necessary changes.

*Table 7 - Main Offender Comments Word Cloud*
Victims

Victim Services is a voluntary, free and confidential justice service for victims of crime. At the end of the FVIC program, victims have the opportunity to participate in an exit interview where they are asked:

- Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in FVIC?
- Did you feel your partner/ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
- Would you recommend FVIC to other people?
- Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
- There is also room for comments with each question.

For the most part, the victims answered the exit interviews positively with 93% feeling safe, 80% feeling that their partner/ex-partner was held accountable, 93% would recommend FVIC and 80% felt there was a reduction in violence with the other 20% stating N/A because their relationship has ended.

The majority of the comments were positive such as:

- “He definitely learned a lesson, it was great that he participated in Family Violence Court, there is no violence in our relationship.”
- “I did feel safe. I knew he wasn’t allowed around me and I moved to a new house for safety and to start over in a new home with me and my kids. I felt all services like Victim Services, Women’s Centre, AES, NL Housing were very helpful. He plead guilty and did programming but I feel he could use more programming. I have not continued in a relationship with him and we only speak on the phone regarding the children or he will travel to my home to pick up the kids. He seems calmer and I hope he continues with counselling.”
- “I do feel that he was held accountable. They made it clear why he was put through the program”
- “There is a big difference in our relationship now, there is no fighting anymore, we are happy”
There were a few negative comments or suggestions for improvement such as:

- “I didn’t feel safe until I changed the locks. I feel like he lied, he was leading me on. I feel he lied, everybody fell for it hook, line and sinker, he lies for a living. Our relationship no longer exists. I will never trust him again and I continue to be fearful of him, at the moment there is a no contact order in place. When that expires I will have to consider getting a peace bond.”
- “I know through social media that he is not abiding by his curfew and the RCMP are obviously not completing checks. No longer in a relationship”
- A couple of the victims did feel that the offender should have been in programming longer.

Of the victims who participated in what Victim Services offered and agreed to complete an exit interview, there was a very high level of satisfaction with the outcomes of FVIC and the process as a whole. The main suggestion that the victims provided was that the offender attend more programming or counselling.
About the Interviews

As part of the evaluation, a number of stakeholder interviews were conducted to investigate the views of the team members, steering committee members and other stakeholders. The value of holding stakeholder interviews revolves around the fact that people involved in a process will generally have intimate and inherent knowledge of how the process is working, how it is viewed by those involved and what needs or can be improved.

Interviews were conducted with the following standard set of questions geared toward each of the three levels of stakeholders:

- **All Stakeholders** were asked the following questions:
  - With regards to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
  - Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insights with respect to how offenders view the process? Access to Programming? Early Intervention?
  - Do you feel Victim Safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have Comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process? Access to Programming? Early Intervention?
  - Do you have any data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?
  - Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?
  - Anything else you would like to add?

- **The Team Members** were asked the following questions:
  - With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel needs improvement? DO you have suggested solutions? A) Team Functioning? Composition? Duration and frequency? Information sharing?
Family Violence Intervention Court
Information request February 28, 2018

Background

**Family Violence Intervention Court:**
FVIC provides an opportunity to foster safety and security for individuals and families while holding the accused individual accountable for his/her violent behaviour.

To participate your partner or ex-partner must agree to:

- ✓ A risk assessment to show his/her risk level is appropriate for family violence intervention court
- ✓ Take responsibility by pleading guilty to an agreed statement of facts
- ✓ Information sharing by the FVIC team
- ✓ Follow release conditions set by FVIC
- ✓ Complete family violence intervention prior to sentencing
- ✓ Be supervised by a Bail Supervisor with Corrections and Community Services
- ✓ Attend regular court updates as required

When court was reinstated?

**St. John’s:**
First appearance court commenced October 1, 2015.
First Family Violence Intervention Court session held October 26, 2015

**Expanded:**

**Stephenville:**
First appearance court commenced October 26, 2015
First Family Violence Intervention Court held November 18, 2015
Number of offenders who have gone through the court?

Family Violence Intervention Court

St. John’s

October 21/15 to December 31 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Appearing</th>
<th>Not interested/Eligible</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Waiting Eligibility</th>
<th>Completed/Completing programming</th>
<th>Opted out/Did not Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Violence Intervention Court

Stephenville

November 18/15 to December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Appearing</th>
<th>Not interested/Eligible</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Waiting Eligibility</th>
<th>Completed/Completing programming</th>
<th>Opted out/Did not Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Regarding success of FVIC model?
Recidivism statistics gathered by the Provincial Court (2009-2012) confirmed that, of the offenders that completed the FVIC, 10 per cent were convicted of new domestic violence charges compared to 37.8 per cent of the offenders who appeared in the FVIC but chose to return to traditional court. This signifies a high level of success by the FVIC in reducing the level of recidivism amongst offenders in the family violence stratum.
What programming do participants receive?

Programs are for men and women who plead guilty in FVIC. The Risk Assessment determines the level of programming, the range of sessions may vary. Currently Programming is delivered by the John Howard Society in both St. John’s and Stephenville.

There are three levels:

1. Responsible Choices Men’s or Women’s Program
   Intake and a Range of 3 – 16 sessions
2. OASIS / Turning Points Level 1
   Intake and Range of 16 – 24 sessions
3. OASIS / Turning Points Level 11
   Intake and Range of 24 or more sessions
Family Violence Intervention Court and Emergency Protection Orders

- An Emergency Protection Order (EPO) is an order that sets out provisions and conditions for a respondent in the case of family violence when there is a sense of urgency to ensure the immediate protection of the applicant. This can include communication conditions, possession of personal property, respondent removal from property, etc.
- An EPO may be used as part of Family Violence Intervention Court (FVIC)
- An EPO does not require that a charge be laid, however process for to access FVIC may only start after a charge has been laid and may only be accessed if the accused pleads guilty.

History of FVIC

- FVIC was reinstated in St. John’s on October 1, 2015 and expanded to Stephenville on October 26, 2015.
- As of December 31, 2017, 202 accused have appeared in FVIC, of which 150 appeared in St. John’s and 52 appeared in Stephenville. 108 of these people were eligible, and 98 completed or were completing programming.
- FVIC provides an opportunity to foster safety and security for individuals and families while holding the accused individual accountable for his/her violent behavior.
- To participate the accused must agree to:
  - A risk assessment to show his/her risk level is appropriate for family violence intervention court
  - Take responsibility by pleading guilty to an agreed statement of facts
  - Information sharing by the FVIC team
  - Follow release conditions set by FVIC
  - Complete family violence intervention prior to sentencing
  - Be supervised by a Bail Supervisor with Corrections and Community Services
  - Attend regular court updates as required
- Recidivism statistics gathered by the Provincial Court (2009-2012) confirmed that, of the offenders that completed the FVIC, 10 per cent were convicted of new domestic violence charges compared to 37.8 per cent of the offenders who appeared in the FVIC but chose to return to traditional court. This signifies a high level of success by the FVIC in reducing the level of recidivism amongst offenders in the family violence stratum.
- The Risk Assessor determines the level of programming, the range of sessions may vary. Currently programming is delivered by the John Howard Society in both St. John’s and Stephenville.
- There are three levels:
  - Responsible Choices Men’s or Women’s Program: Intake and a Range of 3 – 16 sessions
  - OASIS / Turning Points Level 1: Intake and Range of 16 – 24 sessions
  - OASIS / Turning Points Level 11: Intake and Range of 24 or more sessions
- Visibility of the FRC setup in

- Judge calls judge would need to add an extra day - extra resources needed re Jit# S. & Adult Probation.
- Cindy feels 15 additional workers would suffice.
- Judge stated comments up that resources needed.
- It is believed this would be higher in
- Technology would be different in no VCE???

- CSSD - only 12-16 currently doing St.John & St'vill
  no additional resources would be needed.

- Pat O'Reilly - likely needs more resources for risk assess

- Judge felt it's a more complex case, international files

  Judge felt would like to see a full day on FVIC
  matters as

  Judge Cale would like to see if JRS has responded to the
  Cuts even they would like to see the FVIC
  expanded to

  better support needed

  Chief Judge waiting

  for response to
  come to fer through
  Chief Judge

Date / time - next mtg.
March 26/19
noon!!
Hi,

In the Steering Committee meeting for Stephenville FVIC the possibility of expanding to [redacted] was discussed as Judge Cole [redacted] and feels it would be beneficial. As you are aware, [redacted] Judge Cole indicated that ‘the feelers’ have been sent out for feedback but I am uncertain who may have been contacted. Just wanted to bring it to your attention so that proper feedback and consideration for our resources can be a part of the discussion.

Please let me know if there is anything that I can do to assist.

Kim

Kimberly Pottle
Acting Regional Manager-Central/East
Corrections and Community Services
Department of Justice & Public Safety
(t) 709-729-1822
(f) 709-729-2288
(c) 709-727-2738

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
Hi Ashley:

Want to give me a call?

1787

Michelle

From: Hardman, Ashley
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 9:55 AM
To: Park, Michelle
Cc: Pottle, Kimberly
Subject: FVIC Stephenville

Hi Michelle,

Apologies for my absenteeism; I have missed the last two meetings for FVIC. I had read through the minutes that were sent out for the September meeting, and Kim has filled me in on what I had missed from the meeting last week.

I noticed in the September minutes that there had been some discussion on [redacted] and I believe this was revisited at the last meeting. [redacted] but think that the concerns need to be considered.

Do you know if expanding is something the court is planning on proceeding with? Are you free to meet to discuss this further?

Thank you,
Ashley
Ashley Hardman
Chief Adult Probation Officer (A)
Corrections and Community Services
Department of Justice and Public Safety
Office: (709) 729-0407
Cell: (709) 631-2006

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. John's</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenville</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are 5 more people scheduled to be assessed in Stephenville this week
### Family Violence Intervention Court - Stephenville Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Assessed by RA*</th>
<th>Number Eligible</th>
<th>Number Ineligible</th>
<th>Number Not Interested</th>
<th>Number Completed Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FVIC Stephenville Stats

- **Number Assessed by RA***
- **Number Eligible**
- **Number Ineligible**
- **Number Not Interested**
- **Number Completed Programming**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Carried Forward</th>
<th>New Referral</th>
<th>Assessed</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not Accepted</th>
<th>Terminated</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Supervision Expired</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Program Completed</th>
<th>Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Behaviour Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-CORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-Regular Court (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-FVIC (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-Regular Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-FVIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Intervention Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifters Awareness Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVIC-Extra Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STATISTICS

### Year: 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Carried Forward</th>
<th>New Referral</th>
<th>Assessed</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not Accepted</th>
<th>Terminated</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Supervision Expired</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Program Completed</th>
<th>Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Behaviour Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-CORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-Regular Court (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-FVIC (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-Regular Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-FVIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Intervention Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifters Awareness Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVIC-Extra Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year: 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Carried Forward</th>
<th>New Referral</th>
<th>Assessed</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not Accepted</th>
<th>Terminated</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Supervision Expired</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>Program Completed</th>
<th>Carry Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Behaviour Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-CORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-Regular Court (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS-FVIC (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-Regular Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Points-FVIC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Intervention Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifters Awareness Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads-WCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Dads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVIC-Extra Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2017 – January 26, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Appeared</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regular court</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Charged Withdrawn</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Not Eligible</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Completed Programming/Sentenced</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pending</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Currently in program</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 26/18 – March 31 18</td>
<td><strong>Appeared</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regular court</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Charges Withdrawn</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Not Eligible</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Completed Programming/sentenced</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pending</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Currently attending</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1 2017-January 26 2018</td>
<td>January 26-March 31 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeared (new)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opted out of FVIC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 1-30 2018

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeared (new)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opted out of FVIC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### St. John’s

April 1, 2018 – Nov 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Appearing</th>
<th>Not Interested/Not Eligible/Charges Withdrawn</th>
<th>Pending Plea</th>
<th>Completed Programming</th>
<th>Currently in Programming</th>
<th>Opted Out/Did not Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stephenville

April 1, 2018 – November 21 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Appearing</th>
<th>Not Interested/Not Eligible/Charges Withdrawn</th>
<th>Pending Plea</th>
<th>Completed Programming</th>
<th>Currently in Programming</th>
<th>Opted Out/Did not Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FVIC Steering Committee meeting minutes
Family Violence Intervention Court: Stephenville
Steering Committee Meeting
January 30, 2018

Present:

Judge Cole – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador (Chair)
Dolores Hutton – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Michelle Park – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Valerie Corcoran – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Julia Smart – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Peter Chaffey – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Brenda Butler – Corrections & Community Services
Anna Olsen – Corrections & Community Services
Kim Pottle – Corrections & Community Services
Ashley Hardman – Corrections & Community Services
Amanda Parsons – Victim Services
Renee Byrne – Victim Services
Anita Stanley – Victim Services
Peggy Newman – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Susan Gallant – Public Prosecutions
Nicole Hurley – Public Prosecutions
Jason House – Public Prosecutions

Regrets:
Brenda Kieffe – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Lauren Chafe – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission

1. Welcome & Introductions
Judge Cole opened the meeting. Introductions were made of all present.

2. Specialty Court Liaison Update
Michelle Park presented the caseload status and provided the attached handout. In 2017/18 there were 26 new cases appearing the court. In general, the number of cases has been dropping. As of January 26th there are no clients actively participating in the programming. Of the 26 new files, four are pending decision on interest/Risk Assessment, 13 individuals were not interested, two were not eligible, and one opted out. Six cases completed programming successfully.

These numbers are trending lower than previously years and are of some concern. Statistics from the RCMP indicated that they had 36 documented cases of domestic violence in 2017. It may be that not all of these cases are appearing in First Appearance Court in Stephenville.

It was noted that at times potential candidates are appearing in first appearance court numerous times without a referral to have a Risk Assessment or commitment to the court. There was some concern raised that some individuals may be using this court to delay court.
a. **Options to increase numbers**

Discussion of options to improve followed with suggestions to ensure RCMP improves referral, provisions to improve court process for clients set for first appearance at a time other than Monday afternoon, consider stronger inclusion of clients from Corner Brook court.

**ACTION** - Michelle to follow up with RCMP regarding referrals.

**ACTION** – Continue to monitor and follow up as needed.

**ACTION** – any team member seeing a client appearing in a “regular” court time will note and follow up with Michelle.

b. **Improving efficiency**

General discussion on how to improve court processes in several areas:

i. **Disclosure** – Public Prosecutions noted that the Disclosure will now be ready for First Appearance court as is the practice in the St. John’s Court. Vetting of the Disclosure will be completed by the Office in Stephenville. Susan Gallant noted that while the Crown’s office has been understaffed for many of the past months it has made every attempt to have the disclosure ready for the Defence. The accused can request this disclosure to provide to counsel to allow for expedient review of case and referral to Risk Assessment. Fine details relating to process is being finalized.

**ACTION** – Jason House will finalize process and advise team.

ii. **Legal Aid Application process** – it was noted that particularly in the past number of months clients in first appearance court are having their matters set over repeatedly at times to enable them to make an application to Legal Aid. The client has made no decision with regard to continuing with FVIC until they have made this application. This process if different from the process in St. John’s causing delays for clients and additional appearances. General discussion was held by the committee on how to adjust/change process for efficiency. Lauren Chafe of Legal Aid was not present to provide input. It was agreed that typically during first appearance the client would make a decision with regard to continuing with FVIC or returning to traditional court, regardless of their Legal Aid status.

**ACTION** – Michelle Park to meet with Lauren Chafe to discuss Legal Aid processes for Stephenville to ensure that the process is defined and clearly communicated to the team in Stephenville.

iii. **Team Meetings** – the team typically meets just prior to the FVIC court session on Wednesdays but there have been difficulties at times to have enough time to discuss cases and follow up. It was discussed moving the time of the team meeting to Wednesday morning rather than at 1:10 right before court. This will allow the Crown/Defence time to work out details if required with regard to the wording of the ASF or release conditions. Technology options will also be explored including use of Skype in addition to telephone or video as have been used in the past.

**ACTION** – Michelle Park will follow up with the team to look at coordinating a better time/means to hold the team meetings on Wednesdays.
3. **Evaluation of FVIC Stephenville**
   Kelly Ryan (Program and Policy Development Specialist with the Department of Justice and Public Safety) is the lead on the evaluation. To date the majority of the team members have been interviewed and information gathering continues. It is anticipated that this report will be completed in April 2018.

4. **Policies and Procedures Manual Update**
   The Policy and Procedure Manual that is being used now by the Family Violence Intervention Court was developed when the St. John’s Court was in operation from 2009-2013. This manual is draft only and has been slated to be updated. It is anticipated that an updated draft will be ready in May for feedback from the team. It was requested that if feedback was provided previously to Elaine Mayo it be forwarded to Michelle Park as in most cases this information is no longer accessible.

   **ACTION** – Team to forward any feedback to Michelle Park ASAP.

   **ACTION** - Michelle will work on the updated Policies and Procedures Manual and will provide to the team for feedback when the draft is ready.

5. **Check In**
   a. **Public Prosecutions**— Jason House noted that the FVIC file numbers at Stephenville are concerning as they are very low, particularly for the past few months. The Stephenville office will work closely with the St John’s office to ensure that the disclosure is ready for first appearance. Other than this, the Crown did not have any issues at this time with regard to FVIC in Stephenville.

   b. **Legal Aid** – Julia Smart reported that she is looking for clarification on the process for new applicants in the FVIC court. The previously discussed issue of not having the disclosure for court has been a contributing factor to the delays seen in some cases. It is hoped that with these two points clarified things from Legal Aid will see improved efficiencies.

   Risk Assessment Officer, Valerie Corcoran reported that the Consent Waiver has been finalized and that further details can be released to the team on clients participating in FVIC. This will improve information exchange between the team as well as with John Howard Society. The issue of not having disclosure for scoring the risk assessments has caused delays in some cases. It is hoped with the improved process this will be resolved.

   c. **Victim Services**

   Amanda Parsons reported no issues from Victim Services at this time.

   d. **Corrections/Community Services**

   Brenda Butler agreed that the implementation of the waiver for the Risk Assessment Officer will be very beneficial. She noted that in the past the Bail Supervisor has not received the Agreed Statement of Facts (ASF) in a timely manner which is required to do their intake/referral to counselling. Given the very fast turnaround it was agreed that this information should be received by the Bail Supervisor as soon as it was ready on the day of court. Kim Pottle suggested that the process used in St. Johns in which the ASF and FVIC Recognizance be forwarded by the Specialty Court Liaison be followed.
ACTION: Michelle Park will send ASF and recognizance via email and will continue to do so where possible within one day of court.
Brenda also noted that the John Howard Society program and staff continue to be outstanding providing excellent service to clients. Local partnerships in Stephenville continue to be strong and have worked very well for the court and participants.

e. Children, Seniors & Social Development
Peggy Newman reported that things overall are going well. She is getting most information regarding potential FVIC cases. It is much less common that this information is not forwarded to her.
She voiced her concern that at times there are scheduling issues if the court scheduled for Wednesday is moved to another day as her position is part time so she is not always available to be present and participate.

6. Other Business
It was discussed that meetings of the Steering Committee would be more frequent. Steering committee meetings will be held 3-4 times a year or as needed.

7. Date and time of next Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 1, 2018 12:00 – 1:15pm.
Further details will be forwarded prior to this meeting.
Family Violence Intervention Court: Stephenville
Steering Committee Meeting
January 30, 2018

Present:

Judge Cole – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador (Chair)
Dolores Hutton – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Michelle Park – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Valerie Corcoran – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Julia Smart – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Peter Chaffey – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Brenda Butler – Corrections & Community Services
Anna Olsen – Corrections & Community Services
Kim Pottle – Corrections & Community Services
Ashley Hardman – Corrections & Community Services
Amanda Parsons – Victim Services
Renee Byrne – Victim Services
Anita Stanley – Victim Services
Peggy Newman – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Susan Gallant – Public Prosecutions
Nicole Hurley – Public Prosecutions
Jason House – Public Prosecutions

Regrets:
Brenda Kieffe – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Lauren Chafe – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission

1. Welcome & Introductions
Judge Cole opened the meeting. Introductions were made of all present.

2. Specialty Court Liaison Update
Michelle Park presented the caseload status and provided the attached handout. In 2017/18 there were 26 new cases appearing the court. In general, the number of cases has been dropping. As of January 26th there are no clients actively participating in the programming. Of the 26 new files, four are pending decision on interest/Risk Assessment, 13 individuals were not interested, two were not eligible, and one opted out. Six cases completed programming successfully.

These numbers are trending lower than previously years and are of some concern. Statistics from the RCMP indicated that they had 36 documented cases of domestic violence in 2017. It may be that not all of these cases are appearing in First Appearance Court in Stephenville.

It was noted that at times potential candidates are appearing in first appearance court numerous times without a referral to have a Risk Assessment or commitment to the court. There was some concern raised that some individuals may be using this court to delay court.
a. Options to increase numbers
Discussion of options to improve followed with suggestions to ensure RCMP improves referral, provisions to improve court process for clients set for first appearance at a time other than Monday afternoon, consider stronger inclusion of clients from Corner Brook court.

ACTION - Michelle to follow up with RCMP regarding referrals.
ACTION - Continue to monitor and follow up as needed.
ACTION - any team member seeing a client appearing in a "regular" court time will note and follow up with Michelle.

b. Improving efficiency
General discussion on how to improve court processes in several areas:

i. Disclosure - Public Prosecutions noted that the Disclosure will now be ready for First Appearance court as is the practice in the St. John's Court. Vetting of the Disclosure will be completed by the Office in Stephenville. Susan Gallant noted that while the Crown's office has been understaffed for many of the past months it has made every attempt to have the disclosure ready for the Defence. The accused can request this disclosure to provide to counsel to allow for expedient review of case and referral to Risk Assessment. Fine details relating to process is being finalized.

ACTION - Jason House will finalize process and advise team.

ii. Legal Aid Application process - it was noted that particularly in the past number of months clients in first appearance court are having their matters set over repeatedly at times to enable them to make an application to Legal Aid. The client has made no decision with regard to continuing with FVIC until they have made this application. This process is different from the process in St. John's causing delays for clients and additional appearances. General discussion was held by the committee on how to adjust/change process for efficiency. Lauren Chafe of Legal Aid was not present to provide input. It was agreed that typically during first appearance the client would make a decision with regard to continuing with FVIC or returning to traditional court, regardless of their Legal Aid status.

ACTION - Michelle Park to meet with Lauren Chafe to discuss Legal Aid processes for Stephenville to ensure that the process is defined and clearly communicated to the team in Stephenville.

iii. Team Meetings - the team typically meets just prior to the FVIC court session on Wednesdays but there have been difficulties at times to have enough time to discuss cases and follow up. It was discussed moving the time of the team meeting to Wednesday morning rather than at 1:10 right before court. This will allow the Crown/Defence time to work out details if required with regard to the wording of the ASF or release conditions. Technology options will also be explored including use of Skype in addition to telephone or video as have been used in the past.

ACTION - Michelle Park will follow up with the team to look at coordinating a better time/means to hold the team meetings on Wednesdays.
3. Evaluation of FVIC Stephenville
Kelly Ryan (Program and Policy Development Specialist with the Department of Justice and Public Safety) is the lead on the evaluation. To date the majority of the team members have been interviewed and information gathering continues. It is anticipated that this report will be completed in April 2018.

The Policy and Procedure Manual that is being used now by the Family Violence Intervention Court was developed when the St. John’s Court was in operation from 2009-2013. This manual is draft only and has been slated to be updated. It is anticipated that an updated draft will be ready in May for feedback from the team. It was requested that if feedback was provided previously to Elaine Mayo it be forwarded to Michelle Park as in most cases this information is no longer accessible.
ACTION – Team to forward any feedback to Michelle Park ASAP.
ACTION – Michelle will work on the updated Policies and Procedures Manual and will provide to the team for feedback when the draft is ready.

5. Check In
a. Public Prosecutions— Jason House noted that the FVIC file numbers at Stephenville are concerning as they are very low, particularly for the past few months. The Stephenville office will work closely with the St John’s office to ensure that the disclosure is ready for first appearance. Other than this, the Crown did not have any issues at this time with regard to FVIC in Stephenville.

b. Legal Aid – Julia Smart reported that she is looking for clarification on the process for new applicants in the FVIC court. The previously discussed issue of not having the disclosure for court has been a contributing factor to the delays seen in some cases. It is hoped that with these two points clarified things from Legal Aid will see improved efficiencies.
Risk Assessment Officer, Valerie Corcoran reported that the Consent Waiver has been finalized and that further details can be released to the team on clients participating in FVIC. This will improve information exchange between the team as well as with John Howard Society. The issue of not having disclosure for scoring the risk assessments has caused delays in some cases. It is hoped with the improved process this will be resolved.

c. Victim Services
Amanda Parsons reported no issues from Victim Services at this time.

d. Corrections/Community Services
Brenda Butler agreed that the implementation of the waiver for the Risk Assessment Officer will be very beneficial. She noted that in the past the Bail Supervisor has not received the Agreed Statement of Facts (ASF) in a timely manner which is required to do their intake/referral to counselling. Given the very fast turnaround it was agreed that this information should be received by the Bail Supervisor as soon as it was ready on the day of court. Kim Pottle suggested that the process used in St. Johns in which the ASF and FVIC Recognizance be forwarded by the Specialty Court Liaison be followed.
ACTION: Michelle Park will send ASF and recognizance via email and will continue to do so where possible within one day of court.
Brenda also noted that the John Howard Society program and staff continue to be outstanding providing excellent service to clients. Local partnerships in Stephenville continue to be strong and have worked very well for the court and participants.

e. Children, Seniors & Social Development
Peggy Newman reported that things overall are going well. She is getting most information regarding potential FVIC cases. It is much less common that this information is not forwarded to her.
She voiced her concern that at times there are scheduling issues if the court scheduled for Wednesday is moved to another day as her position is part time so she is not always available to be present and participate.

6. Other Business
It was discussed that meetings of the Steering Committee would be more frequent. Steering committee meetings will be held 3-4 times a year or as needed.

7. Date and time of next Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 1, 2018 12:00 – 1:15pm.
Further details will be forwarded prior to this meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April 1 2017- January 26 2018</th>
<th>January 26 – March 31 2018</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeared (new)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opted out of FVIC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**April 1-30 2018**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeared (new)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opted out of FVIC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2 didn't attend*

*2 not likely coming*
Meeting Committee meeting

Dolores
One-By-One victim services
Anita Stanley victim services

Peggy
Kim
Ashley - Prob.
Julia
Due

May/June 2017

Adopt minutes - Yaf
Julia

Specialty Cares - Beacon - State - clients

26 new people April - last week
13 not interested
1 person - charges dismissed
3 ppl not suitable/risk level or not continue
9 people - 7 ppl participated - 5 completed last year. Some trained through
one new person - 3 pending R.P.'s decision
overall #5 are down. RPM starts for family violence. 3 - 34 referred to court
Last fall - 1/2 pleas all fail - few progress - people finished up.
Hoping some people - not always think to act if one.
Pattern - once early - mid fall - referrals are decreasing - app to consider it.

plea day - get people mixed by police.

new ppl. changed. December - few new ppl.

- could be

30-45 days disclosure
not in Hub's desk - trying to do in fac. - all colour.
domestic - note on setting sheet - trying to make note
of these files

getting ppl. from Corner Brook - service available
in Corner Brook.

60 km away - AES - not f E1 clients
piggy back on other services

R.A can be computed before counsel assigned
- info sent to the lawyer - off rat - private
lawyers. Will does Q1. assessments - @ 1st
appearance

new ppl on docket - predicting next trip - at R.A. time
need min. of one week - she goes when trip is scheduled.

she can travel as often as necessary.
who legal and accept in St. John's vs. Stephenville

appl'n can be done via Vel

scheduled to week, automatic app in St. John's

legal aid intake works don't answer to Jullian's email to lawren - all confused in St. John's/Stephenville

Judy McDonald - area director

court in court - back up judge

Impose conditions

Internally - who can get out

ASC of R.A.

documentation -

meeting 11pm onwards

Policy procedures manual Brenda

Wed - Monday (CSSO) Tues, Wed, Thurs. - hurry for le

2 who to get documentation more resolved (email PLS?)

sealed envelope in basket @ court
Family Violence Intervention Court: Stephenville
Steering Committee Meeting
May 1, 2018

Present:

Judge Cole – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador (Chair)
Dolores Hutton – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Michelle Park – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Lauren Chafe – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Pat O’Reilly – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Valerie Corcoran - Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Julia Smart – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Anna Olsen – Corrections & Community Services
Kim Pottle – Corrections & Community Services
Ashley Hardman – Corrections & Community Services
Amanda Parsons – Victim Services
Cindy Molloy-Butt – Victim Services
Renee Byrne – Victim Services
Peggy Newman – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Susan Gallant – Crown Attorney’s Office
Nicole Hurley – Crown Attorney’s Office
Shawn Patten - Crown Attorney’s Office

Regrets:

Peter Chaffey - Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Brenda Kiefte – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Anita Stanley – Victim Services

1. Welcome & Introductions
   Judge Cole opened the meeting. Introductions were made of all present.

2. Minutes
   January 20, 2018. Accepted as read. Moved by Julia Smart, Seconded by Nicole Hurley

3. Specialty Court Liaison Update
   a. Options to increase numbers Michelle handed out statistics summary of 2017-18 and year to date. A note on the stats – prior to November first appearances were not counted as an appearance in FVIC. They are now. Opted out would mean a client isn’t interested in FVIC at all, could be with or without RA. The numbers making appearances have improved greatly since we last met in January. And in April we had 6 people make appearance, 3 of whom were referred for RA. Follow up with RCMP may have helped, as have attention from the Crown’s office in Stephenville to direct files to this court (eg. remanded then released). Thanks to the team for their efforts.

   We still only have 2 clients involved in the program but there are 6 others with RA completed that are candidates who hopefully FVIC in the coming weeks.

   b. Team meetings - The team has moved to a new model for the team meetings using Skype Business for meetings instead of video conference. Additionally we have moved the meeting time to 9:00am to provide the team time between the meeting and court to sort out potential issues. Feedback from the team has been very positive and we will continue using this model for our team meetings. Skype

Note to applicant: JPS does not have a copy of the attachment referenced in part 3 of this page.
removes the requirement of coordinating with the courts and allows the team to connect from their office. Thanks to the departments involved who expedited requests for equipment to make this happen quickly.

4. Evaluation update
Kelly Ryan continues to work on this. The last interview was completed in Mid-March. There is no date at this time when it will be completed. The process was very positive and timely from my position. I will advise when further information is available.

5. Policies and Procedures Manual Update
Some team members have re-sent feedback from when Elaine was in the role of Liaison. A full overhaul of the manual will be completed and at this time it is not ready to review. I would anticipate further consultation with the team in the next few months on the draft version.

6. Check In
   a. Crown Attorney’s Office
      i. Susan Gallant noted things have been running more smoothly since the last meeting. Communication has improved and all disclosures are vetted and ready for first appearance court on Mondays to be received as requested. Typically someone from the Crown will be present to facilitate this.
      ii. Nicole Hurley felt that the processes in place have been working better since last meeting. Disclosure is available. She did note that the receipt of the video equipment to facilitate the use of Skype for team meetings improved efficiency. There was some discussion with regard to the recently sent out summer schedule during which some Wednesday court times were set to Mondays. Of particular concern was ensuring the voice of CSSD was present on these days.
   b. Legal Aid
      i. Julia Smart remarked that the issues relating to the disclosure availability has been resolved and she is getting it very quickly. Once received she is able to forward it to the Risk Assessment Officer (Valerie Corcoran) so the Risk Assessment can be scored and finalized without delay. The previous issue of FVIC clients completing full Legal Aid applications including Financials has now been resolved and delays for this reason are no longer occurring. Finally, the Conflict Lawyer (Peter Chaffey) has actively been sending potential clients to this court (one already forwarded this week).
      ii. Lauren Chafe mentioned that the Risk Assessment Officer position is in transition. Pat O’Reilly is currently in this role. Additionally Lauren noted that the Stephenville office has a new contractual lawyer hired for Stephenville. That position may also be able to help Corner Brook as well with regards to conflicts.
   c. Victim Services
      i. Cindy Molloy-Butt reported that referrals from the police are a work in progress. RCMP are the main referral source and there is a good relationship with the police. Cindy is constantly checking with the police as well as the docket. Victims are being referred as soon as possible. She expressed concern with regard to the low numbers and hopes we will see these increase.
      ii. Renee Byrne observed that overall the FVIC initiative is working well. She noted that recently the RCMP Staff Sergeant and that it would be important to continue to work with the new Staff Sergeant once he/she is appointed.
d. Corrections/Community Services
   i. Anna Olsen stated that the transition to meeting Wednesday mornings was working well from her perspective. The transition of clients to John Howard Society Programming continues to be effective and timely.

e. Children, Seniors & Social Development
   i. Peggy Newman advised from her perspective things were going well. She had no concerns to bring forward at this time.

7. Other Business
   a. [Redacted]
      s. 40(1)

   b. Welcome – Judge Cole and the team [Redacted] to the FVIC team.
   c. Potential face to face meeting for the core team – this matter will be tabled until Judge Cole can consult with Chief Judge Goulding on this concept.

8. Date and Time of next meeting
   Next meeting of the steering committee has been set for Tuesday, September 18, 2018 12:00noon – 1:15pm. Courtroom #1 for Stephenville, Court Services Boardroom for St. John’s.
Family Violence Intervention Court: Stephenville
Steering Committee Meeting
September 18, 2018

Present:
Judge Cole – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador (Chair)
Michelle Park – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Pat O’Reilly – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Julia Smart - Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Peter Chaffey - Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Barbara Barker (for Lauren Chafe) - Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Anna Olsen – Corrections & Community Services
Kim Pottle – Corrections & Community Services
Cindy Molloy-Butt – Victim Services
Peggy Newman – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Brenda Kiefte – Children, Seniors and Social Development
Susan Gallant - Public Prosecutions

Regrets:
Pamela Ryder-Lahey – Provincial Court of Newfoundland and Labrador
Adam Sparkes - Public Prosecutions
Timothy Leatch - Public Prosecutions
Renee Byrne – Victim Services
Anita Stanley – Victim Services
Lauren Chafe – Newfoundland and Labrador Legal Aid Commission
Ashley Hardman - Corrections & Community Services

1. Welcome & Introductions
Judge Cole opened the meeting and thanked all for their participation. Introductions were made of all present.

2. Minutes
The minutes from May 1, 2018 were distributed for review. Accepted as read. Moved by Cindy Molloy-Butt, Seconded by Anna Olsen.

3. Specialty Court Liaison Update
   a. Statistical Update Michelle handed out statistics summary of year to date. To date this fiscal year there has been 22 first individuals making a first appearance. Twelve of whom opted out of the court and went through the regular court process, five were not eligible and one had the charges withdrawn by the crown. At this time four cases were pending, four currently involved with programming, one failed to complete and four others successfully completed and have been sentenced. (See attached). The number of participants in the court has been steady for most of the fiscal year but are still lower than they have been in the past for this court.
   b. Team meetings - The Skype Business for meetings instead of video conference continues to work well. There was some discussion of the primary team members with regard to timing of the meetings on Wednesdays or an alternate day such as Tuesday prior to FVIC. It was agreed that the team meeting would be held at 9:00am on the Wednesday of FVIC unless otherwise agreed upon in advance. The team members committed to attending and agreed that full team participation was critical to the continued high functioning of the team.
   c. FVIC Docket - Where possible all agreed that logistically it caused issues when this occurred. Unless no other option, matters involving plea, status or sentencing will be set only to Wednesdays and not to Mondays. However it was noted that at times it may be required depending on the needs of the court.

FVIC Steering Committee September 18, 2018

Note to applicant: JPS does not have a copy of the attachment referenced in part 3 of this page.
4. Evaluation update
Kelly Ryan continues to have this file and is working to complete the final report. There is no date at this time when it will be completed but it is anticipated it would be ready this fall.

5. Policies and Procedures Manual Update
The draft version is in process of being developed. As it is prepared the team will be consulted for input and changes. It is likely to be a working document at this stage.

6. Check In
   a. Public Prosecutions
      i. Susan Gallant – The Crown is proceeding through the process and continues to be on a learning curve on the processes and expectations of Family Violence Intervention Court. Things have been going very well over all. With time hoping that things will be even more fluent.
   b. Legal Aid
      i. Julia Smart - Felt overall things going well. Did find at time challenging to make meetings at 9:00am – particularly when matters being heard on Mondays as court is particularly busy due to plea day.
      ii. Barbara Barker - Nothing to add.
      iii. Pat O’Reilly – Would like to keep Risk Assessments only for those clients legitimately interested in the Family Violence Intervention Court. May open up issues if completing assessments on accused that have no interest in continuing with this court.
   c. Victim Services
      i. Cindy Molloy-Butt – Reported no pressing issues for Victim Services. But want to reinforce that this court proceed matters in a timely matter minimizing delays as time waiting to enter the court is often difficult for families. Want to make sure that the team operates as smoothly as possible with open communication regarding active files.
   d. Corrections/Community Services
      i. Anna Olsen - No issues at present
      ii. Kim Pottle - No issues but any potential expansion would be something that her department would wish to discuss prior to agreeing.
   e. Children, Seniors & Social Development
      i. Peggy Newman - At the start of the summer with transition of the role to the Stephenville Crown there were some glitches in her receiving information from the crown on FVIC files. This has been resolved with no current issues.
      ii. Brenda Kieffe – Nothing to add

7. Other Business
   a. Discussion of options to increase numbers - There was general discussion about looking at options for expansion.
      i. Stephenville - It was felt that the Stephenville Court was currently capturing the majority of the Family Violence files from Stephenville, particularly since the local Crown assumed the court. Barbara Barker remarked that the Susan Gallant noted that she is presently involved with this group on an advisory basis and confirmed they are aware of the court and what its principles are.
      ii. Corner Brook – The Legal Aid office in Corner Brook continues to be proactive in reviewing and referring potential files to the FVIC. However it was noted that the office only would receive the file after the client applies for Legal Aid and has their intake session meaning there is often a delay.
iii. The consensus was that the high incidence of family violence in this region was reflected in the number of files the court and Crown saw Logistical issues relating to distance were identified which would require further discussion. In particular Kim Pottle of Corrections and Community Services In addition, logistics with regard to the provision of counselling to potential clients by John Howard Society would have to be considered.

b. **Risk Assessment** – Judge Cole wondered if there are cases where the accused uses FVIC and the process to purposely delay proceeding. It was agreed that the team should be aware of this possibility and try to keep things moving without added delays.

c. **Inclusion of John Howard Society at Steering Committee** – An invitation to John Howard Society will be extended to attend the next meeting. It was felt that their input was important and should be included.

8. **Date and Time of next meeting**

Next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, December 3, 2018 12:00noon – 1:15pm. Courtroom #1 for Stephenville, Court Services Boardroom for St. John’s.
Feedback questionnaires
Potential Questions for All Members

Jan 9/18

[Primary and Secondary Stakeholders as per Stakeholder List]

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
   a. Can operate from a distance – can be part of the team without being physically in the same place as the other members. Creates a readiness to get together quickly as required.
   b. 

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?
   a. Accountability – yes – they have to plead guilty. Those choosing to be part of this process realize the importance of what they have done. There are more eyes on them, more people to answer to. There is more accountability. At the end hopefully there will be a more positive outcome. In the sense that they have completed programming, personal growth, decreased recidivism.
   b. Vs Traditional system – sentencing/charges recidivism – decreased though don’t know the specific stats. Haven’t looked specifically at comparison group on this.
   c. Access to programming? – JHS runs the program, and has services available to clients. (LRP, CSTEP)
   d. Early intervention? – I don’t. I would like to think that the court process is not stalled for the offender. Curious to know numbers of offenders reoffending and coming through the program again.

3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? - yes – I think that there would be some parallel with regard to victim safety – increased awareness for the victim.
   a. Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?
   b. Access to programming? – I can’t respond to this.
   c. Early intervention?

4. Do you have data needs? Recidivism rates - # of repeat offenders coming through the program. Who and why (what happened) are coming back. Maybe comparisons from the Domestic Violence Court with regard to recidivism and # of people going through DVC
a. What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?
   i. Peggy keeps stats – adhoc stats collected (can provide). Would need to look at this. Interested to know the longer term impact of FVIC on child protection. Nothing like this looked at before.
   Policy development/procedure/facilitation

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?
   Improve – clear understanding with regard to sharing of information.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Potential Questions for Steering Committee Only

[Chief Adult Probation Officer, Senior Crown Prosecutor, Legal Aid - Deputy Director – Legal, Social Worker Supervisor?, Director of Provincial Court Services, and Provincial Manager of Victim Services, etc.]

1. What do you view is your role in the FVIC process? Come together to work out the kinks.
   Policy development/procedure/facilitation
   Role is high level and not at the ground level.
   Participant attendance, voice concerns and provide a level of respect if others have concerns with CSSD
   Provide updates

2. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what needs to be improved? Do you have suggested solutions?
   Staffing levels and sharing of information have been issues in the past
   a. Steering Committee functioning? Composition? Scheduling, duration and frequency of meetings? Information sharing?
      i. Not many meetings, very short.
      ii. Hope if that most issues are ironed out at the team level and hope that most issues do not need to rise to higher levels.
      iii. Ad-hoc meetings help to keep steering meetings short

   b. Use of Videoconferencing? Geographical location?
      i. Efficient way to make the Sville site work. Means that the process is transportable.
3. Have you been involved in any Ad-Hoc Committees? Maybe...... If yes:
   a. What do you see is the role of the committee?
      i. Address issues that need to be resolved that can’t be done at the team level.
   b. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what needs to be improved? Do you have suggested solutions?
      i. No – meet/resolve move on as needed.
   c. Committee functioning? Composition? Scheduling, duration and frequency of meetings? Information sharing?

4. Do you think the level of communication is adequate between the team members and the steering committee? Any other comments about communication, what is working well? What could be improved?

   Yes – for myself, [redacted] make court or whatever dynamic may be playing out will come to me and give me a heads up. Can’t speak for other departments but at CSSD this is working well.

   More information about the team bi-weekly meetings.

   Provide more frequent updates (bi-weekly) with regard to the courts so am more aware of what is happening. (email would be fine). Stats/updates (meeting/court) for more knowledge about what is happening Gaps in court need to be avoided.

   Nothing else to add.
Potential Questions for All Members

[Primary and Secondary Stakeholders as per Stakeholder List]

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
   - No issues with anyone on the team and [redacted].
   - Works well with [redacted] to come to reasonable compromise with regard to ASF and sentencing.
   - No issue with Victim services.

Example – Christmas – one family needed an undertaking revised to allow family to spend time together. Victim services, bail supervisor, cssd, crown, defence and court all worked together quickly to revise to allow father to spend time [redacted].

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot?
   - Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?

Yes – I feel they are held accountable. More sanctions during the program, less after. In traditional system the focus is at sentencing and after. In our court they are being rehabilitative counselling during the court. The end result (at sentencing) is reflective of this. They have done many steps during the program (ie RA, Bail Supervisor, counselling, repeated court appearances). Consideration is given for all the work that they have done throughout the program.

Many will have probation at sentencing – so they can continue counselling as required.

There are more discharges in our court – such files are low risk, they have been involved in intensive counselling and made significant progress, this is especially true for those receiving an absolute discharge. (discharge – finding of guilt, not a conviction)

Many others will received a Suspended sentence with probation (a conviction – where the sentence is suspended while a period of probation is served).

No insight to the offender perspective.

   a. Access to programming?
JHS provides services to clients. Condition of the court. See no issue with their access.

b. Early intervention?
Most offenders see significant difference in pre-post counselling based on the intervention received.

3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?

I feel like it is – victim services are very involved with the victims as is adult probation. If they chose to be involved they are canvassed and the results of the updates are relayed to them. Victim services is in regular ongoing intensive contact with the victim.

a. Access to programming?
Some victims think takes too long – one complaint that have heard. Ie – from guilty plea to sentencing the victim felt should have been a shorter period.

This especially true for victims and offenders that want to reunite (often conditions will prevent them from having a relationship as had prior to offence).

In general do not get a lot of victim impact statements in this court. Feel that there are more received in regular court. Only hear from victims who are unhappy with the process and to date only 2 have made that contact. Some frustrations with regard to the process (ie trial vs FVIC, access to services, ASF was modified from the police information)

b. Early intervention?
Again, feel Victim Services do a good job maintaining contact with victims from onset to end.

4. Do you have data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?
Not collecting data.

Like to see recidivism rates. Follow up survey.

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?

Lessons learned
Use what SJ is currently doing is the better model. Easier to have everyone in the same location. There is a disconnect with Sville because of the physical separation.

This may be some of the issues that is happening with the disclosure. First appearance day is some of this issue.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Putting matters over to Mondays was difficult for the team (ie CSSD). As Mondays are supposed to be first appearance and Wednesday plea and progress summaries. The schedule has been adjusted especially in the fall to have matters that should be held on a Wednesday set to Monday.

Keeping Wednesdays consistent and first appearance consistent for the team is important. Plea day in practice should be separate from First appearance.

Team meetings before court sometime an issue – meetings at times an issue. Meeting at 1:15 means lose lunch and there is a gap between the team meeting and court. Perhaps could be via telephone or skype. Or perhaps move to 1:30 or to Wed mornings @9. In that case (wed @ 9) could have a little more time to sort out ASF or other such matters.

Recognize the timeframes need to be set for making changes (ie undertaking) that requires the full team to be involved (ie victim service,
adult corrections, court, etc...). it is a formal process – policy and procedures need to be tightened up.

Some staff are part time. (bail supervisor/cssd) so schedules need to be reflective of this.

Transition in staff at times an issue with staff being overwhelmed

Some growing pains – ie change in staff. Have seen some issues related to the flow.

Ie disclosure not ready for first appearance court. Team is very good at working together to resolve matters. Legal aid has been waiting to request disclosure until they were solicitor of record. So there have been delays waiting for the request. These delays hopefully have been resolved in the last few days. Sville crown will now provide these at first appearance to duty counsel.

From there the RA can be done with the full disclosure available. Once RA completed then ASF can be ready to send to counsel and VS. Once getting to ASF there doesn’t tend to be many issues.

Disclosure (flow) in SJ: s.40(1)
Crown – defence – (RA/score) – specifics of RA to defense – back to defense

In Sville this process has been interrupted in the first stage. (disclosure to defense) which has caused interruption with RA being referred and scored.

Important to note that once client starts in this court they plead guilty. They can choose not to go through our court but unless they apply to have the guilty plea withdrawn it will stand and the person will be sentenced in regular court. When things are not by consent there is a formal process in place. There are all still formalities in place.
Team is very good at communication and at times is able to work quickly on issues. Good and bad with the informality – team able to get things done on the fly but not always can this occur. There are often formalities that are critical and can’t be overlooked.
Potential Questions for Team Members Only

[Judge (Stephenville), Bail Supervisor, Crown Prosecutor, Legal Aid Lawyer, Risk Assessor, Social Worker, Specialty Court Liaison, and Victim Services]

We suggest that you review the Policy prior to the interview.

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel needs improvement? Do you have suggested solutions?

See above

   a. Team functioning? Composition? Duration and frequency? Information sharing?

Function well – first appearance date seems to be the main issue.
Clear directives on what happens when.
See above

At times hard to hear in sville. Not sure how to fix. At times statically, cutting out.

Switching for the team meeting is at times confusing.

Provision of work phones helpful – now able to communicate directly with defense via phone even while in court.

   c. Risk assessments?

Setting up RA is a time commitment – feels that lawyer should have the opportunity to review prior to sending clients for RA.

No issue with counsel taking more time to review circumstances with client before committing to attending RA. The RA takes time and requires client to disclosure

   d. Referral of files processes?
s.29(1)(a), s.35(1)(c)

Make sure the crowns and defense are aware and given access to information.

Provide tel number to advise next steps?

2. Are potential candidates open to accessing the court? Are potential candidates effectively educated on the pros/cons, process of FVIC? Are all stakeholders involved effectively educated in order to provide candidates with the best information?

Can't speak on this. s.40(1)

Other to add – new people coming and going. Since May there has been a lot of changes in the team. Everyone doing their best to pull their weight. And once we work out the bugs things will work really well.

Need to identify where efficiencies need to be made. Good program and should continue.
1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
Team approach – ongoing dialogue with the team members particularly with the bail supervisor (for those involved in the court) or with the bail supervisor (with regard to the details on the family).

Ability to join by telephone to be part of the conversation. Otherwise would have to travel to the St John’s office to participate in the meeting which is time consuming. The introduction of video will hopefully further improve things.

Having ready access to files makes things much more efficient.

Having open conversations with the case managers (in Sville) between the Bail Supervisor helps all involved as well.

Now receiving information quickly and efficiently particularly from the Crown and the courts to ensure have the information for meetings as well as to ensure that children as safe and that

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot?
   a. Yes – research on effectiveness. Also receiving information and support regarding intimate partner violence. They have to do the work that hopefully will improve their families into the future. PSR gives us information and therapeutic value to how the programming helps them. Without this court they wouldn’t be doing this. It’s a big commitment to be engaged in this process.

Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?
   Very little contact with the offender. The case manager would be the one that would have direct contact with the family. Feedback from social workers involved has been very positive and see it as highly beneficial. The counselling summary is used by the social worker as background to close the file.

   b. Access to programming?
   Family Center Action Plan – CSSD plan to help families. This treatment plan actually can be part of this plan and the programming may be received more expediently. The social workers find this program very helpful.
c. Early intervention?
CSSD at times may have waiting lists – The FVIC programming is immediate (upon acceptance to the court) and may speed up the process of closing the file. There is no waiting list with FVIC.

The fact that the treatment is so close to the occurrence of the incident is very critical in the effectiveness. Provides participants with the information that they need to understand family violence. Some clients voluntarily continue with other resources with JHS even after the court is concluded. (ie caring dads or addictions)

3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?

From child protection perspective – the no contact order is very helpful...... at times after an incident the offender tries to reunite with the victim (cycle of violence). This court helps to ensure that the contact is stopped/controlled for a period of time at least. The victim often needs this.

I don’t speak to the victim – most of CSSD involvement is focus on Offender.

But if the victim has any questions with regard to access she could speak with the CSSD social worker. As needed this could be addressed with the team/lawyer/bail supervisor.

   a. Access to programming?
   Nothing to add

   b. Early intervention?
   Nothing to add

4. Do you have data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?

Collecting data regarding referrals – based on referrals received from crown, the number of Police referrals made compared to the number of files that are opened. Perspective of CSSD is that ALL family violence cases should be opened.

Beneficial – involved in CSSD but opt out of FVIC #'s etc. Some opt out right away. Not always know if there are children involved.
5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?

Whole idea of how to access the information – privacy etc needed to be addressed to make sure all those involved have the information needed. Working out the process that the Crown gives all information to CSSD took a while but now that it’s in place critical that it remains in place.

Video conference/telephone – much better use of my time and government financial resources (cost of travel/parking).

Therapeutic court – changes people’s lives. Hope is to prevent people to change their behaviour from coming back. This court works – have seen many examples of how it works

The court liaison is very helpful

Having access to IPCIS is very imp – helps give the relevant info to run the family info through.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Potential Questions for Team Members Only

[Judge (Stephenville), Bail Supervisor, Crown Prosecutor, Legal Aid Lawyer, Risk Assessor, Social Worker, Specialty Court Liaison, and Victim Services]

We suggest that you review the Policy prior to the interview.

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel needs improvement? Do you have suggested solutions?

In policy manual it indicates that SW should attend all court sessions – do not attend first appearances as there is not enough time. But would be helpful if could.

The more in the courts the higher the workload. Would flow much better with more time dedicated.

Overall going well – sees that the numbers need to be increased. Not sure how – constant contact with RCMP? Not my area of expertise....

a. Team functioning? Composition? Duration and frequency? Information sharing?

Already addressed above. Bringing team together more frequently outside of court is always helpful. Would like to see quarterly meetings. FVIC scheduled to a Monday (instead of Wed) is sometimes a difficulty as that is not a day that typically is worked by CSSD. My involvement is very positive with regard to the team members. Challenge – how to handle when I’m away – team members helpful (ie bail supervisor) to make contact directly with the social workers.

Works well – see my role working in any area in any part of the province. Effectiveness of role wouldn’t change.

Would like to have resources to go to another region (ie St John’s) to do presentation on role, court and how will interact. Right now communication is via telephone/email only.

Do it in St John’s but haven’t been able to do in St John’s region.

c. Risk assessments?
Positive relationship from RA officer. Exchange of relevant information is ongoing. On child protection level very positive as well.

d. Referral of files processes?

Not really my area. There have been some concerns in getting the files. Think we have done most of what we can to increase these numbers.

2. Are potential candidates open to accessing the court? Are potential candidates effectively educated on the pros/cons, process of FVIC? Are all stakeholders involved effectively educated in order to provide candidates with the best information

Not an area I would have any information about.

I do provide the info to the social worker which can be passed on to the clients. Important that clients know some of the background of the court (programming, access to Legal Aid lawyer etc). Engaging in programming much better for the family from CSSD perspective.

Feel we need to be more active advertising/marketing the court. We have posters but maybe need to sit on committees or engaged with those involved with victim groups. Public relations for the court needs to be increased! Let’s make this court as common as an epo. Even the social workers do not know about the court – they should all should be more aware. How to do that not sure. Maybe lunch and learn, etc.
Maybe need to discuss further as a team on this. Even though 2 years in need to put this out there.
FVIC Evaluation Questionnaire Summary

All Members:

1. With regards to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
   a. General consensus that video-calls are working well – although face-to-face always preferred.
   b. Impromptu meetings through distance good.
   c. Communication and Teamwork; Easy access to team (comment)
   d. Higher accountability, and accessibility/consistency
   e. Quicker and more responsive
   f. Great comments about team members throughout
   g. Those who avail appear to appreciate service and learn
   h. Family unit reunited quicker (comment)

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insights with respect to how offenders view the process? Access to Programming? Early Intervention?
   a. Overall feeling that offenders held accountable, or more accountable because of monitoring (et al.)
   b. JHS is very engaged helps with early intervention
   c. Early intervention relative to traditional court; not necessarily early. (comment)
   d. Counselling really appears to help and keep accountable.
   e. Certainly an increase in access to programming.
   f. Do people just want a better sentence – not accountable (minority opinion)
   g. Sentence too light (minority opinion) – minority opinion
   h. No complaints from clients availing / clients impressed
   i. 95% regret and improve.
   j. Early access to counselling and plead guilty while still feeling guilty…

3. Do you feel Victim Safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have Comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process? Access to Programming? Early Intervention?
   a. Program focuses on offenders, less contact with victims
   b. No contact order very useful for safety.
   c. Yes, offenders monitored more and have better understanding of healthy relationships
   d. Concerns about victims access to programming? Resources for Victim Services?
   e. FVIC breaks the cycle, gives offender tools and helps victim safety.
4. Do you have any data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?
   a. Most are not collecting data
   b. Need: Recidivism Rates (near universal)
   c. Exit Interviews?
   d. Victim Impressions/thoughts
   e. Need: evaluation frame works. What is everyone else collection?
   f. Need: Basic stats - # referred, # who go through
   g. Long-term follow up? 6 months?
   h. Collecting data regarding referrals
   i. Can run a crime type check in PROS to provide numbers

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?
   a. Resources
   b. Need more, better suited, space. Victim separation from offender
   c. Need procedures on escalation, more direction on moving forward
   d. Quicker access/more access to R/A. Local?
   e. Aboriginal needs?
   f. Need more info on crime upfront to advise client
   g. PIS sheet on first appearance?
   h. Pamphlet is too wordy; inaccessible
   i. Need clear timeline policies
   j. Less emphasis placed on group sessions b/c of travel restrictions...
   k. Info sharing needs to be streamlined.
   l. St. John’s system appears to be working better

6. Anything else you would like to add?
   a. Busy; Under resourced; Overwhelmed
   b. More meeting time with team and clients needed.
   c. Increase awareness amongst RCMP
   d. Increase awareness amongst RCMP
   e. Would like to see expanded.
   g. Are victims being neglect? How is Victim resources dealing
   i. Need a Prosecutor Info Sheet for first appearance
   j. Workload prevents proper workflow; FVIC supposed to take 50% of case load, only receives about 10%.
   k. Need more steering committee meetings…. Quarterly?
   l. More awareness needs to be created of FVIC
   m. Pilot nature makes it hard to keep Full-time, well trained staff. Seen as “temporary”
n. Information cards and better pamphlets? RCMP can hand cards out to offenders and victims? [REDAKTED]

\textbf{s.40(1)}

\textit{Team Members Only:}

   a. (B) Some difficulties with audio, and movement during conferencing.
   b. [REDAKTED] [\textbf{s.29(1)(a), s.35(1)(c)}]
   c. Social worker should attend all court appearances ideally, often miss first appearance.
   d. Steering committee and team meet more frequently.
   e. Information is needed prior to first appearance
   f. [REDAKTED] [\textbf{s.29(1)(a)}]
   g. First appearances need to be more productive.
   h. PIS sheet on first appearance
   i. Need better directions for first appearance
   j. Risk assessment is a time commitment. Lawyers should get review before R/A

2. Are potential candidates open to accessing the court? Are potential candidates effectively educated on the pros/cons, process of FVIC? Are all stakeholders involved effectively educated in order to provide candidates with the best information?
   a. Actively advertise court! Victim groups? PR releases?
   b. Clients have no idea how FVIC system works – uneducated
   c. Don’t understand sentencing or the risk assessment – R/A seen as condescending
   d. RCMP should provide information immediately? Do they understand?
   e. Some people just not aware of its existence.

\textit{Secondary Stakeholders:}

   a. Victim more involved in process
2. Do you think the level of communication is adequate between the team members and the service providers? Any other comments about communication, what is working well? What could be improved?
   a. Seems to be working well. More meetings?
3. Other:
   a. RCMP given cards to supply to victims and offenders on program?

Steering Committee Only:

1. What do you view is your role in the FVIC process?
   a. Policy Developing, High level not ground level
   b. Represent the courts; mediate/conduit. Work for common good
   c. Assess for suitability; if enough evidence; Refuse for public safety
2. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what needs to be improved? Do you have suggested solutions?
   a. Resources needed. More resources promised originally than there are now.
      Splitting resources with St. John’s
   b. Need R/As more often. Local options?
   c. Police presence on Committee?
   d. Revise policy
   e. Steering committee needs to meet more often. Quarterly? Catch issues before big.
   f. Need good stories/press and news
   g. Need demographic, exit interviews…
   h. [redacted] s.29(1)(a), s.35(1)(c)
   i. Inconsistent with the court in St. John’s why?
   j. More staffing – what we have is competent
3. Have you been involved in any Ad-Hoc Committees? If yes: What do you see is the role of the committee?
   a. To solve specific issues
   b. Solve issues the steering committee could not
4. Do you think the level of communication is adequate between the team members and the steering committee? Any other comments about communication, what is working well? What could be improved?
   a. Need to meet more frequently,
   b. Potential is there, need more meeting time.
   c. Make a meeting schedule?
   d. Scheduling issues because of misunderstandings between team players
Potential Questions for All Members

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?
   Process – better communication. Previously didn’t have current information felt disconnected. Felt that when went to court was on the outside looking in. Feels that this is changes and no longer feeling that way.

   Treatment working well – but ind vs group because of the numbers this is the only option. If wait till numbers are high enough for a group there would be a delay for the offender.

   Feels better way to address risk. I.e. ability to avail of treatment while incarceration or on probation order. Higher level of accountability. Higher difficulty to have a person address their behaviours then to simply go to court and accept a sentence. Brings higher level of accountability.

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?
   a. Access to programming?
   b. Early intervention?

   How info gets to offender going through the process – i.e. can jhs help to inform with regard to the process. Chances of doing programming are high – lay out to offender early on so they understand that it is the same treatment program regardless of FVIC. If there are such a high number of domestic charges why are the numbers so low. Should be higher.

   Once in process – period of adjustment for the offender. Takes a while for staff to motivate to engage. Once they do the outcome is generally positive. Earlier to intervene the better with regard to programming. The longer there time the greater the disconnect.

3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?
   a. Access to programming?
   b. Early intervention?

   Victim safety – limited contact. For partners that do stay together they attend court for the update as there is a high level of engagement.
Feedback at that perspective there is an enhanced level of safety. No real deep understanding of the victim side as role is with the offenders.

4. Do you have data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?
   # referrals, # sessions # completions (all in reports submitted to gov)
   # of additional program referrals to help to support that person
   # of children impacted

   Love to see long term data longitudinal studies (recidivism studies) see anecdotal data only with nothing scientific to back this up.

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?
   Moving outside St Johns the RA may be an issue. Proximity to the Risk assessor is sometimes an issue (ie miss an apt with the risk assessor – have to wait 30 days to see again.

   Does the RA need to be done to the level it is being done at the front end? Once deemed eligible could then do the RA.

   Perhaps missing something at the legal end (ie under privledge). Feels should be done by the service provider, perhaps probation.

   Regular client (prob) – get Iscni. Maybe will have to check. Staff trained in this as well.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?
   CSSD – person in St John’s is liaison

   Would like to have the number of referrals increased.

   Discussions with RCMP – start at arrest stage to increase awareness.
   How better to communicate information to offender to see the benefit of FVIC vs traditional courts.

   Key piece – expansion – relationships between players are critical for success.
Risk – concerned about number of low risk client (high #) and best practices and research indicates that a formal treatment program (versus information and support) more what they need? Why?

Feels that the very high risk offenders (or high high) would be individual session. Higher the risk the more interventions that are required. Ideally would group the level of risk.

Particularly an issue for low risk clients and being mindful of the need. Try not to mix low risk with high risk.

**Potential Questions for Secondary Stakeholders Only**

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what needs to be improved? Do you have suggested solutions?
   a. Information sharing?
      Feels much better now. Feels part of the process
   b. Use of Videoconferencing? Geographical location?
      Have done RA with sex offenders via video – not ideal but have done this in the past
      Video conferencing for treatment not an option – body language, ind contact,
      Video for court seems to be very effective.
   c. Risk assessments?
      Should be done locally. Holding things up at time unnecessarily. Meet people where they are, expedite process. Causing time delays in some cases.
   d. Referral of files processes?
      can’t comment

2. Do you think the level of communication is adequate between the team members and the service providers? Any other comments about communication, what is working well? What could be improved?
   Already covered.
Potential Questions for All Members
[Primary and Secondary Stakeholders as per Stakeholder List]

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?

Biggest issues – when started had [redacted] – she was available for consultation when needed. She could intervene with other partners as needed and help come up with options and how to better fast track issues. [redacted] Ad hoc committee at times also has issues

More meetings for the steering committee (policy says 5x) only know of one meeting. Need to meet more often.

Strength is the people. [redacted] are all excellent.

Offsite where there is often the issue. [redacted] now seems to be better. As is [redacted] Once the file starts all seems to be fine. Getting to that point is a challenge – fine tuning things is often the challenge.

LA – previously was fast tracked. But now at times there seems to be an issue. And at times the process is slowed down waiting for this to be sorted out.

RCMP – made significant progress with scheduling – clients meeting the criteria (under the CCC) would not always be scheduled for Monday afternoons. Now that seems to be much better. [redacted] look at the docket and may catch clients scheduled for other times. This is much less of an issue now then it has been in the past.

However, when clients show for the Monday afternoon clients appear to be overwhelmed and don’t always have the information with regards to FVIC.

Delay in first appearance is positive. (Waiting 2 weeks before first appearance).

ASF – clearer now then have been in the past. More concise. Literacy an issue for many clients (and staff) and JHS to help with the counselling piece. Need to have this info expeditiously. May see client day of plea if distance is an issue. Has to be done in 2 days.
Transportation – over 60k and can request AESL to pay for transportation – At times those closer also have barriers. Also advocate for housing or whatever it requires.

Stephenville known for the community strengths and networking together.

JHS – can’t get any better. Client focused – focus on accommodating the needs of the client.

Doing really well because of on-site team members. The changes with the crown was an issue, however and are good. At the start-up there was an issue with scheduling meetings, RAs and decisions, but there has been some fine tuning. There is more coordination now, especially with VS. Helps to work through various systems (?)

Most clients have done well (only 1 breach so far) and seem to prosper from the Judge’s feedback. Clients generally accept responsibility, seek help, and are hopefully getting a boost. They seem more relaxed and being held accountable but have more support

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?

When referred to Legal Aid, and either pled or found guilty, this is voluntary so acknowledgement is there. In traditional counselling may be delayed because we have to prepare the client mentally, in FVIC, the client is ready to accept the change. There is also no progress review with traditional court and therefore less accountability and no reappearance

a. Access to programming?

Clients accepting responsibility. Getting a boast and a pat on the back. More relaxed court and therapeutic while being held accountable for behaviours. Support to the clients through the process.

Clients are a bit frustrated until intake, don’t feel like they are getting clarity beforehand. Seem to not get enough plain language beforehand,
don’t get to see probation until they get to a guilty plea. Probation is viewed as a team/aid to the client.

Comparison to traditional system? –

FVIC -client has power – is voluntary. There is acknowledgement by the client. Mandatory counselling – no negotiation. Response is immediate and involvement in the programming happens right away. Progress reviews gives feedback.

Trad stream – less onus on the client – wording of the order is “looser” so clients in denial prep work to the get them to JHS causing another delay to avail of programming. No updates to the courts unless breached.

Most clients have done well. One breach with new charges out of the 25. Clients report being validated by positive feedback from the judge.

Constant interaction between probation, and CSSD. Expedient addressing the issues with the team. (ex – young mother need $$ - advocate)

Offenders’ view of the process – feel there is confusion and frustration until they do intake. Go over in simple/plan language. after plea is entered. Wonder if sometimes may be over the clients head. “Clicks” once meets with the bail supervisor and set goals for selves and understand what is required of them.

Some may have questions of the commitment to the programming. Ind very different from group commitments.

b. Early intervention?

Counselling - Zero waiting time. Client focussed within reason to start.

Some find the court process is too slow. Frustration with dealing with lawyers. Still working on fine tuning things.

Conflict file – more conflict files than regular files – the conflict lawyer didn’t have any dedicated time for FVIC. Delays resulted. Particularly when clients have limited resources (no phone)
Stress about level of programming and time commitment. Maybe different for individual vs. group. Usually quick to meet with JHS and client focused. Doesn’t always find it fast enough, especially start-up, better after meeting with probation. Issues with LA conflict files delays, LA conflict lawyer not dedicated, frustrated.

Does exit interview with clients

3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?

Victim/child safety my priority – importance of working with Always working together with these agencies. Providing regular communication with these agencies on a regular and as needed basis.

No contact orders and the needs of the victim to make sure safety is first priority. Apprehensive when varying conditions prior to FVIC as don’t have the info from a supervision perspective.

Victim having a voice. AP connecting w/ VS & CSSD constantly and tries to assist family. Focus on safety, especially contact. Apprehensive about variance prior to FVIC

a. Access to programming?

b. Early intervention?

4. Do you have data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?

Each client as finish will give a feedback form. Only for FVIC. Standard for FVIC – may not be able to release. Unsure. Overall positive feedback on experience.

Ie client did low risk programming after finished with discussed with and agreed to return to do the oasis program.
Not directed to collect data (keeps own general info)

Would like to see recidivism rates. Knows only 1 case (of 25) that has come back into the system.

[Redacted] has kept a detailed listing of clients. For own perspective only. Not required. Started when noticed that lost a lot of female clients. Opted out after first appearance or RA. Looking for patterns (feel the issue was child care/other issues/level of commitment/travel). Seems to be doing better now.

[Redacted]

Keep own numbers, but nothing formal
Would like recidivism rates
JHS provides quality counselling
Communicates Obstacles

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?

[Redacted]

The policy needs to be updated
Each party should have a set timeframe for their contribution

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

[Redacted]

Policy manual – needs to be updated
There are changes required – page 9 – now have a directive for CBIP.

Chain of command – [Redacted] (sville) – [Redacted] (regional) – provincial ( [Redacted]).
[Redacted] – covering for the entire the province [Redacted]
Brings challenges.

[Redacted]

Started with many females who opted out, unsure why, possibly due to time commitment. Better now, reconciliation of co-accused

Supposed to be dedicated 50%, but spend less than 50% with FVIC, tough role for part-time position

People tend to drop out due to travel issues and work commitments.
Timelines can be restrictive for both offender and workers. Can be restrictive for staff, as you need to be present for the commitments, which can affect personal life (i.e., vacation)

Manual is a priority, very outdated. Probation submits a Progress Report. Used to have [REDACTED] as a go-to to help with issues and communication but now left in limbo, which has caused issues. Trouble with the upper level not getting consensus on issues and not enough steering committees.

RCMP were putting offenders in the wrong time slot or missing pieces of information, however they are improving. At First Appearance, the offender generally is not informed of FVIC.

Court and an introduction to FVIC is an immediate big change to the offender (first intro to court) who may need time to absorb the information in order to be able to make a decision, can be overwhelming.

Probation is dependent on other parties’ roles. They need a consensus on the Agreed Statement of Facts. They are getting more fine-tuned and clearer.

2 days from plea to meet with the client, sit with the file, sent them up with JHS. The Court Representative should have the Agreed Statement of Facts at the plea and send it to Probation.

Probation may have to see clients face to face regularly and sometimes have to spend time helping with basic needs.

The risk level may be low, however, the case need may be high.
Potential Questions for Team Members Only

[Judge (Stephenville), Bail Supervisor, Crown Prosecutor, Legal Aid Lawyer, Risk Assessor, Social Worker, Specialty Court Liaison, and Victim Services]

We suggest that you review the Policy prior to the interview.

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel needs improvement? Do you have suggested solutions?
   a. Team functioning? Composition? Duration and frequency? Information sharing?

   s.40(1)
   Hiccups – working well overall. 
   ___________________________ – for the team – dedicated person

   s.40(1)
   Hiccups in the beginning, right now there is good representation but would like to see ___________________________

   Transportation issues need to improve

   Normally Court is held in Courtroom # 3, which is sometimes utilized by a visiting judge. Who is responsible for the scheduling?

   Sometimes there is a videoconferencing delay, who is responsible for setting it up? If a staff member is missing, how to get it set up? May need access to email/lync/skyp/phone to contact another source

   Mic system can be an issue with respect to set up and the ability to hear people speaking (paper rustling/interference)

   Can’t always access court for meetings because Sheriff’s won’t open court before 1:00pm

   Have to leave court and come to the office to access information that can’t be access in court

   Losing time with Mondays being first appearance which can cause delays, there can be frustration if everything else is completed and families can be tied up waiting for closure
There was supposed to be a waiver for RA release of information (started talking about 2 years ago?), right now only snippets of the RA can be released and would like to see more.

Probation is accountable for other people’s work without all of the information sometimes have to re-ask questions (ie RA) that have already been asked

Personal information can change which can be challenging

Lawyer/Client privilege can be an issue

Family dynamics can change

c. Risk assessments?

No issues.
LA sets it up – comes out monthly to do the RA.

Waiver – waiting to have documentation to allow RA officer to release details to bail supervisor. At the higher level for some time.
The more information available the better to reasonably supervise for risk and refer appropriately.

CSSD – if need more details will go directly to the local person. Use first.

d. Referral of files processes?

Meetings at 1:30 – on wed – scheduling #1 for court. Nowhere to meet. When in use. Not held on the docket.

Court room #2 ok space wise when available. During court – no way to connect to SJ. No way to communicate with crown or anyone in SJ. Feedback on the video bad at times. Difficult to hear at times. Access to court floor not until 1:05 (sheriff’s lunch 12-1). Delays in court – i.e. fall schedule. Rescheduling Wed to Mondays at times frustrating – causes delays.
Private lawyers/legal council find that it is more work, so do not always like it. However, repeat private council usually sees the value in FVIC. There is a level of comfort in knowing the process and parties need to be engaged.

2. Are potential candidates open to accessing the court? Are potential candidates effectively educated on the pros/cons, process of FVIC? Are all stakeholders involved effectively educated in order to provide candidates with the best information.

Strengths – file process – are we missing people to first appearance court – Hear legal counsel sometimes do not advocate always for this court. Sometimes

- JHS – educated some lawyers
- [Redacted] – provides info to lawyers as much as possible.
- Some private that are familiar with the court will bring new clients back.

Once private counsel has had experience in this court more likely to see them come back with another client.

Clients – who explains the process so they understand the difference between FVIC and traditional court? Not sure how much RCMP tells clients. [Redacted] may be the first point of contact with FVIC.

Start time for 1:30 for first appearance is difficult. – [Redacted] also may give her speak on FVIC.

Could we do provide more opportunity to provide info? Jhs has volunteered to help- some issues – should legal counsel be present? Is this appropriate?

Timeframes for all parties on the team – (reflect in policy)

4/25 females.
3 co-accused. Possibly reconciliation
1 not

Only one of these reconcile.

Historically from personal experience find, most offenders move on and do not continue.

[Redacted] – restrictive – commitment to the court – have to meet those. Set schedule of Mondays and alternate Wed. [Redacted] Takes commitment
Clients hear the information from different sources, but unsure if it is effectively being communicated. Many times, first contact with Legal Aid is during first appearance. RCMP may not be effectively or completely explaining the program. The potentials experience a high level of stress when first introduced to court. Could Legal Aid speak to the potential client a bit earlier? JHS is also available to explain.
Potential Questions for All Members

[Primary and Secondary Stakeholders as per Stakeholder List]

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel is working well (strengths)?

Police/crown – all referrals need to come to VS – regardless of FVIC or not VS is there for the victim if they wish

Partnerships - in cville – historically has excellent partnerships within the community. The infrastructure and networking is strong in the community. Vs always had excellent relationships with police jhs wcc wbh women’s center crown. Could hit the ground running in this regard. High level of trust and boundaries already in place.

Bail supervisor work together historically – very healthy relationship – can work out any issues as they arise. Lots of respect for each other.

Crown at present is excellent - accessible, invested organized. BUT in court cannot speak with crown or st john’s unless prearranged.

Judge very supportive in feedback with the participants. Very interactive with them. Very open to the team – addressing VS/JHS/Bail whomever feels needs to. Positive feedback to the offenders are very well received.

Some very good positive outcomes client wise.

Challenge –

Partnerships (always had excellent partnerships), networking with government organizations, police, crown, women’s centre, JHS, WCCC, etc. Relationship with Adult Probation, open communication, respect. Crown now is great, accessible, invested, organized. Stephenville having capacity for conversation with St. John’s and victim in adjournment

2. Do you feel offenders are being held accountable in the FVIC pilot? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how offenders view the process?
Another came back but was appropriate – program was appropriate and successful.

A group have manipulated FVIC (ie drag-on, opt-in, go for RA, get accepted, show up then stop coming, have excuse, opt out, waited for date, health issues, then opted back in, had to go to hospital, drag on, wanted to go to ON and is now actually in ON)

Difficult to have a Judge with so many hats. Judge is great with feedback and progress helps client as well as potentials present.  is very interactive.

Nice success stories, low recidivism rates.

a. Access to programming?
Pleased with what is made available to them – empowerment group from women’s centre – individual or group as required. Excellent relationship with at the women’s centre. Women who start with this center tend to stay involved. Sometimes the children as well. Mobilizes women to know what is available.

Money available for childcare/transportation – gas card or care for the children (Family Resource centre)

b. Early intervention?

Comparison to traditional – more accountability. Programming is serving the clients well (JHS) – helpful to have court at the same time of the programming.

In trad court – takes a year to go through – often not willing to take responsibility for their actions.

Addictions – may be an issues concurrent with the family violence. how manage this with clients.
3. Do you feel victim safety is being enhanced in the FVIC? Do you have comparisons to the traditional system? Do you have any insight with respect to how victims view the process?

Victims more informed – sharing of information – programming and update can call bail supervisor or jhs directly of indirectly with VS.

Exit interviews – many have y/n responses (ie do you feel safer). Kept in file – not all provided but many did. just for fvic. (copy provided)

Every case in FVIC VS provided updates. There were a few that made no contact with VS. directive – now – give deadline – if don’t can close. Up until now would maintain contact throughout the FVIC regardless.

Victims are more informed, empowered, by having access to what offenders are doing, can keep up to date with offenders’ progress

a. Access to programming?

b. Early intervention?

4. Do you have data needs? What are you collecting? Is the right data being collected? Anything else you would like to see collected?

25 through FAM court
Interesting to see why clients are opting out –

Delays in FVIC – frustrating for victims – particularly when families wish to reunite. Financially a strain to have 2 households. Balance between safety and financials.

Why are people opting out?

Programming flexible –

Sign upstairs/ brochures/ cards?

5. Have there been lessons learned or best practices identified in the pilot that should be considered prior to expanding to new regions?
Still need to fine tune issues (ie delays/timelines)
Adher to timelines – how many times an accused can appear before the plea
Why people are opting out? Think can review notes with Brenda to look at
trends.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Sample case
Sept 2016 – sept 23/16 1st appear
Nov /16
Jan 9/17 – opted out FVIC
Jan 23/17 – reg court
April 3/trial
April 3 – opt back into FVIC
June 8 – didn’t appear.
June 27 – reg court not guilty plea
Aug 15 – no show
Nov 24 trial - no show
Potential Questions for Team Members Only

[Judge (Stephenville), Bail Supervisor, Crown Prosecutor, Legal Aid Lawyer, Risk Assessor, Social Worker, Specialty Court Liaison, and Victim Services]

We suggest that you review the Policy prior to the interview.

1. With regard to the FVIC pilot in Stephenville, what do you feel needs improvement? Do you have suggested solutions?
   a. Team functioning? Composition? Duration and frequency? Information sharing?
      Info sharing – very good
      More consistent meetings – more time needed.
      Need more time
      At times court room #2
      Can’t access room during lunch – issue at court.
      Period of time with no one as a leader.
      Frustrating when there are delays.
      ASF – what the victim reports – what the offender agrees to
      VS will check in with the crown if there are issues. Acts as a go-between.
      Victims appreciate the contact. Nicole being offsite not an issue.
      Canvass the victim when the conditions of the order. At times when the conditions are varied before FVIC (in reg court) to allow contact or return home may feel that is not in the victim best interests.
   c. Risk assessments?
      Not being on site is challenge. Could do RA faster and immediate. Cost associated with travel vs a salary?
   d. Referral of files processes?
      We were missing files but now doing better.
      RCMP doing better. Occasionally miss a few.
      Intimate partner violence liaison – RMCP – check status. Open to going over to keep the members updated on VS and FVIC

2. Are potential candidates open to accessing the court? Are potential candidates effectively educated on the pros/cons, process of FVIC? Are all stakeholders involved effectively educated in order to provide candidates with the best information
Some choose to attend court. Some don’t. judge will address the victim.

Unsure if how Victim impact statements compare between fvic and traditional court
Other records (with no date)
Community Based Intervention Program (CBIP) - Client Feedback & Evaluation Form

Counsellor(s): ___________________ Program: ___________________

On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 being completely disagree and 10 being completely agree), please rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Strongly Disagree
- Completely Agree

1. Your counsellor(s) presented information well (information presented clearly and in a way that you understood)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

2. Your counsellor(s) was/were respectful of you, your thoughts, feelings and opinions?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

3. Your counsellor(s) was/were approachable?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

4. Your counsellor(s) was/were available to speak with you when approached?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

5. Your counsellor(s) listened well?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

6. Your counsellor(s) helped you to problem solve?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A
7. Your counsellor(s) was/were knowledgeable about the program and its contents?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  N/A

8. Your counsellor(s) was/were helpful in enabling your own self-awareness and process of change?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  N/A

9. Your counsellor(s) was/were resourceful in connecting you with other agencies/services if applicable?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  N/A

10. You are likely to use the Community Based Intervention Program as a support in the future if needed?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  N/A

11. Overall, this program helped me make positive changes in my life?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  N/A

12. Any other information/comments you would like to share about your counsellor(s) or the program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Community Based Intervention Program (CBIP) - Client Feedback & Evaluation Form

Counsellor(s): __________________________ Program: __________ OASIS

On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 being completely disagree and 10 being completely agree), please rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Strongly Disagree Completely Agree

1. Your counsellor(s) presented information well (information presented clearly and in a way that you understood)?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

2. Your counsellor(s) was/were respectful of you, your thoughts, feelings and opinions?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

3. Your counsellor(s) was/were approachable?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

4. Your counsellor(s) was/were available to speak with you when approached?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

5. Your counsellor(s) listened well?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

6. Your counsellor(s) helped you to problem solve?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A
7. Your counsellor(s) was/were knowledgeable about the program and its contents?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

8. Your counsellor(s) was/were helpful in enabling your own self-awareness and process of change?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

9. Your counsellor(s) was/were resourceful in connecting you with other agencies/services if applicable?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

10. You are likely to use the Community Based Intervention Program as a support in the future if needed?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

11. Overall, this program helped me make positive changes in my life?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

12. Any other information/comments you would like to share about your counsellor(s) or the program?

---

yes the program was really good. I felt good about talking with [s.40(1)] and comfortable
Community Based Intervention Program (CBIP) - Client Feedback & Evaluation Form

Counsellor(s): ______ Program: ____________ OASIS ______

On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 being completely disagree and 10 being completely agree), please rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Strongly Disagree

1. Your counsellor(s) presented information well (information presented clearly and in a way that you understood)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

2. Your counsellor(s) was/were respectful of you, your thoughts, feelings and opinions?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

3. Your counsellor(s) was/were approachable?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

4. Your counsellor(s) was/were available to speak with you when approached?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

5. Your counsellor(s) listened well?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

6. Your counsellor(s) helped you to problem solve?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A
7. Your counsellor(s) was/were knowledgeable about the program and its contents?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

8. Your counsellor(s) was/were helpful in enabling your own self-awareness and process of change?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

9. Your counsellor(s) was/were resourceful in connecting you with other agencies/services if applicable?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

10. You are likely to use the Community Based Intervention Program as a support in the future if needed?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

11. Overall, this program helped me make positive changes in my life?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 N/A

12. Any other information/comments you would like to share about your counsellor(s) or the program?

NO
Participant Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions to help us provide effective services.

1) What did you like the most about this program?
   - Helped me focus on my issues, helped to begin a resolution.

2) What did you like the least about this program?
   - Nothing in particular.

3) What do you think can be done to improve this program?
   - Nothing, sessions were perfect.

4) How do you think this program will affect your intimate relationships in the future?
   - For the better.

5) Any other comments / concerns / questions?
Participant Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions to help us provide effective services.

1) What did you like the most about this program?
   - My counsellor really helped open my eyes. Friendly conversations and open-minded talks.

2) What did you like the least about this program?
   - That I had to drive an hour to get here.

3) What do you think can be done to improve this program?
   - Nothing at all. Really organized program.

4) How do you think this program will affect your intimate relationships in the future?
   - It will do good for sure. I learned to listen and walk away when.

5) Any other comments / concerns / questions?
   - Nope.
Participant Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions to help us provide effective services.

1) What did you like the most about this program?
   
   Venting with elaborate conversations that related to my problem

2) What did you like the least about this program?
   
   The hassle and pressure of making appointments

3) What do you think can be done to improve this program?
   
   Nothing the program worked perfectly with me

4) How do you think this program will affect your intimate relationships in the future?
   
   A little more insight on how to identify a bad situation

5) Any other comments / concerns / questions?


Participant Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions to help us provide effective services.

1) What did you like the most about this program?

2) What did you like the least about this program?
   
   It is a great program.

3) What do you think can be done to improve this program?
   
   Not sure if anything need to be done to improve the program.

4) How do you think this program will affect your intimate relationships in the future?
   
   It will (has helped) help my intimate relationship a great deal.

5) Any other comments / concerns / questions?
Participant Questionnaire

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions to help us provide effective services.

1) What did you like the most about this program?

Loved talking to counselor easy to talk to about anything

2) What did you like the least about this program?

I liked everything about it

3) What do you think can be done to improve this program?

Nothing

4) How do you think this program will affect your intimate relationships in the future?

I never needed to use or take program to help me in relationships, I treat my partner with respect.

5) Any other comments / concerns / questions?

None.
1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - [ ] CORE
   - [ ] Male Violence Program
   - [ ] Sex Offender Intervention
   - [ ] WCCC - Anger Management
   - [ ] / OASIS
   - [ ] Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - [ ] Other (specify blank)

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - [ ] Information provided
   - [ ] Discussion
   - [ ] Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - [ ] Information provided
   - [ ] Discussion
   - [ ] Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behavior?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - [ ] No
1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE:
     - Male Violence Program
     - Sex Offender Intervention
     - WCCC - Anger Management
     - Shapeshifters' Awareness Program
     - Other (specify: [redacted])
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: [redacted] Nothing

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behavior?
   - Yes
   - No
   - [redacted]

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - Yes
   - No
   - [redacted]

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - Yes
   - No

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - No

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

How helpful it was to discuss issues with my Program Facilitator

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes

If yes, give an example:

Using time outs when I feel upset about something and using constructive conversation to solve those issues.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes

Comments:

Very helpful and understanding without judgement. Presented many useful solutions to issues.

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes

Comments:

Always look forward to our discussions.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE:
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specify OASIS):

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. This intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? (Yes  No)
   - Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? (Yes  No)
   - Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - Not at all.

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
2. Comments:

I found being able to open up and be honest and let my insecurities out helped me a lot. Sounding my faults and working on resolutions with [s.40(1)] was really good.

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

The video I had watched, and how a lot of the abuse in that video applied to me, in my childhood and now, also the addiction talks [s.40(1)] and I had.

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes

If yes, give an example:

When I get upset, I take time outs. I ask before reacting. I don’t use body language or loud voice to intimidate. I try to think things through.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes

Comments:

[s.40(1)] was very helpful very understanding and a great educator to me. She helped me see where my behaviors can be changed. She didn’t judge me, she was sincere and cared about my intervention, and she’s a great beautify soul. 😊

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes

Comments:

Very clear, understood everything.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specify ___________)
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? □ Yes □ No
   - If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? □ Yes □ No
   - Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? □ Yes □ No
   - Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
2. Comments:

I found it to be informative and provided with tools to help deal with anger I otherwise did not know existed,

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

What I learned about types of violence/abuse in everyday life. Many types that I would bot have thought was abuse until now.

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes

If yes, give an example:

I realized that even yelling is abuse and I feel I have the tools to curb this behaviour going forward.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes

Comments:

She was not judgemental and listened to me. Took the time to understand where I was coming from.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specify _OASIS_)

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: [redacted]

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: [redacted] Nothing

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - [redacted] Controlling my anger and emotions

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors? Yes No
   If yes, give an example: [redacted] Help me think better

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes No
   Comments: [redacted] helping me build a better relationship in my life

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes No
   Comments: [redacted]

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   [redacted] No
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
☐ CORE
☐ Male Violence Program
☐ Sex Offender Intervention
☐ WCCC - Anger Management
☐ Shoplifters' Awareness Program
☐ Other (specify _OASIS_)

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
☐ Information provided
☐ Discussion
☐ Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
☐ Information provided
☐ Discussion
☐ Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? □ Yes □ No
   Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? □ Yes □ No
   Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   □ No it was perfect

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
3. Comments:

Everything I found help full an could relate to it. So nothing I found least helpfull

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

Moving forward with a positive outcome and learned how to look at things defferently and How to deal with it in a civil natter.

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes

If yes, give an example:

I think now before I react and put myself in there shoes to see it from a defferent point of view.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes

Comments:

Yes in every way she could help she was there [s.40(1)] desirves a metal and when no one was there she was, so glad I done this program.

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes

Comments:

Yes it was clear and really understandable and also [s.40(1)] goes the extra mile an would sit there and talk about problems. Shes the real deal.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - OASIS
   - Other (specify) 

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - Helped me control my actions and helped me understand the signs of a healthy relationship

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours?
   - Yes

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - Yes

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - Yes

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - [ ] CORE: Male Violence Program
   - [ ] Sex Offender Intervention
   - [ ] WCCC - Anger Management
   - [ ] Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - [ ] Other (specify) [OASIS]
   - [ ] Group
   - [ ] Individual

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - [ ] Information provided
   - [ ] Discussion
   - [ ] Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - [ ] Information provided
   - [ ] Discussion
   - [ ] Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

   [ ] Take PPL on walks instead of watching movies maybe.
Community Based Intervention Program
Clinical Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE:
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Other (specify: ____________)

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: [Redacted]

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: N/A

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviour(s)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If yes, give an example: [Redacted]

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments: [Redacted]

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments: [Redacted]

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
2. Comments:
I found [s.40(1)] didnt make you feel like you were doing a program, she made you understand

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
Understanding your partner

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes
If yes, give an example:
If my behaviour is bad I will have bad things come with it

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes
Comments:
She made me realize things and she seemed to be very humble, she seemed like she truly understood

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes
Comments:
Great job.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE: Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specifyOMB)
   - OASIS

   - GROUP
   - GROUP
   - GROUP
   - GROUP
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL
   - INDIVIDUAL
   - INDIVIDUAL
   - INDIVIDUAL
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

   - Nothing

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - [Redacted]
   - [Redacted]

   - It was helpful

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors? 
   Yes _ No
   - [Redacted]
   - [Redacted]

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? 
   Yes _ No
   - [Redacted]
   - [Redacted]

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? 
   Yes _ No
   - [Redacted]
   - [Redacted]

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - [Redacted]
   - [Redacted]

   - No not a thing

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below.

I am alot better person then I was I use to be angry alot but this program helped me with it.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE: Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specify ____________) [OASIS]

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: ____________________________

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: ____________________________ [Movies]

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? __________
   - Yes ______ No
   - If yes, give an example: ____________________________

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? __________
   - Yes ______ No
   - Comments: ____________________________

7. Did the Program Facilitators present information in a clear and understandable manner? __________
   - Yes ______ No
   - Comments: ____________________________

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - No

The fact that I learned why I done the things I done
Made me aware of why I done things I've done
one on one talks really helped (Trust)
Community Based Intervention Program
Clinical Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - [ ] CORE:
   - [ ] Male Violence Program
   - [ ] Sex Offender Intervention
   - [ ] WCCC - Anger Management
   - [ ] Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - [ ] Other (specify): [ ]

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided:
   - Discussion:
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided:
   - Discussion:
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - Yes: [ ]
   - No: [ ]
   - Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
2. Comments:
Heart to heart conversations, real examples of peoples stories

3. Comments:
It was all helpful!

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
Learning to apply good habits and learning what the consequences are in the end.

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes
If yes, give an example:
Learning the triggers to my bad behaviour and applying better strategies.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes
Comments:
Very informative, knowledgeable and smart. Haves a good heart and don’t judge you!

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes
Comments:
Always asked if I understand.

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
Great program and I believe it will help myself and others learn and be a better person in society.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
- CORE:
- Male Violence Program
- Sex Offender Intervention
- WCCC - Anger Management
- Shoplifters' Awareness Program
- Other (specify)

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
- Information provided
- Discussion
- Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
- Information provided
- Discussion
- Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors?  Yes  No
   If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?  Yes  No
   Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?  Yes  No
   Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
2. Comments:
Learning to understand where/why I ended up here and new tools/skills to change my way of thinking positively and using them everyday.

3. Comments:
No negative response

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
How in depth we discussed behaviours and ways of changing and dealing with in a positive attitude.

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes
If yes, give an example:
You can only control what you feel and want in everyday living.

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes
Comments:
Covered many aspects of the past few years leading up to where I'm at so very helpful in making conscious decisions moving forward

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
Not that I can think of. Very helpful and direct program.
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - OASIS
   - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
   - Other (specify)
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors? Yes No
   If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes No
   Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes No
   Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below or on the next page.
2. Comments:

Having someone to completely talk to that doesn’t judge me on what I say but rather give me a more positive outlook.

3. Comments:

Not a thing everything was more than help ful

4. What is one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?

Finally I got help

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes

If yes, give an example:

My behaviour had a lot of violence that had got to come to a stop so I can become more successful part of society and myself

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes

Comments:

Great listener and awesome feed back

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?

More sessions and less movies although they are helpful to an extent. But more paper work on working on yourself to identify your issues.
1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE
   - Male Violence Program
   - Sex Offender Intervention
   - WCCC - Anger Management
   - Shoplifters’ Awareness Program
   - Other (specify)
   - OASIS
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments: videos

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - this is to help me

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviours? Yes  No
   If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? Yes  No
   Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? Yes  No
   Comments: very descriptive and helpful

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
Community Based Intervention Program
Client Evaluation of Intervention

1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE:
     - Male Violence Program
     - Sex Offender Intervention
     - WCCC - Anger Management
     - Shoplifters' Awareness Program
     - Other (specify):
   - GROUP
   - INDIVIDUAL

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided
   - Discussion
   - Comments:

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - The videos

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If yes, give an example:

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments:

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments:

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - No
1. What intervention(s) did you attend?
   - CORE: [ ]
   - Male Violence Program [ ]
   - Sex Offender Intervention [ ]
   - WCCC - Anger Management [ ]
   - Other (specify) [ ]
   - OASIS [ ]

2. What did you find most helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided [ ]
   - Discussion [ ]
   - Comments: [ ]

3. What did you find the least helpful about this intervention?
   - Information provided [ ]
   - Discussion [ ]
   - Comments: [ ]

4. What is the one thing that really stands out in your mind about this intervention?
   - [ ]

5. Has this intervention helped you to have a better understanding of your behaviors? [ ]
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - If yes, give an example: [ ]

6. While in this intervention, did you find the Program Facilitator(s) helpful? [ ]
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Comments: [ ]

7. Did the Program Facilitator(s) present information in a clear and understandable manner? [ ]
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Comments: [ ]

8. Is there anything you would like to see done differently in either group or individual sessions?
   - No [ ]

Note to applicant - the handwritten responses have been removed for privacy concerns. However, the text has been printed below.
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   Yes, he definitely learned a lesson

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   Yes definitely, it was great that he participated in Family Violence Court

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   Yes definitely, there is no violence in our relationship
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   yes I would definitely

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   yes there has been
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court? Yes

2. Did you feel your partner/ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship? Yes definitely

Not really, I felt he should of had another six of drinking. He is still in counselling with [s. 40(1)] @ John Howard Society
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   No, not until I changed the locks.

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   No I feel like he lied, he was leading me on.

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   No I feel he lied, everybody fell for it hook, line and sinker. He lies for a living.

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   Yes, our relationship no longer exists. I will never trust him again and I continue to be fearful of him. At the moment there is a no contact order in place. When that expires I will have to consider getting a peace bond.

   Interview Completed on [Redacted] [s 40(1)]
FILE #: [Redacted] s.40(1)

FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   [Redacted] yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   [Redacted] yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   [Redacted] I would

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   [Redacted] Absolutely

[Signature]

Completed by [Redacted]
FILE # S.40(1)

FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?

Yes and he plead guilty and did programming but I feel he could use more programming.

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?

Yes I would and I have

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?

Yes because I have not continued in a relationship with him and we only speak on the phone regarding the children or [s.40(1)].
He seems calmer and I hope he continues with counselling.
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   No not really. I know through social media that he is not abiding by his curfew and the RCMP are obviously not completing checks.

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   Yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   N/A. No longer in a relationship
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes definitely, the entire time.

2. Did you feel your partner/ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   Yes, in fact I felt that the consequences were more than I thought were required for this Incident.

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   Unsure, There are both positive and negatives to this process as we have experienced it. I feel
   This court was not suited to our needs.

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   There has not been a history of violence in our relationship. Since this incident and Court process
   there has been more tension in the household.
FILE #: ____________ s.40(1)

FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   - [ ] yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   - [ ] yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   - [ ] yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   - [ ] yes
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   
   yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   
   yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   
   yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   
   yes
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   I do feel that he was held accountable. They made it clear why he was put through the program.

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   Yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   Yes because I haven't had to deal with him at all.

Completed: via telephone

s.40(1)
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner/ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   Yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   Yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   Yes there is a big difference in our relationship now, there is no fighting anymore, we are happy.
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?  
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?  
   Yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?  
   Yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?  
   Yes

Exit Interview completed s.40(1) via telephone.
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   Yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   Yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   There was no contact between us while his matter was going through court. We have had one
   telephone contact since his sentencing. I am feeling hopeful that he has learned a lot from FVIC.
FAMILY VIOLENCE COURT

VICTIMS COMMENTS

QUESTIONS:

1. Did you feel safe while your partner/ex-partner was in Family Violence Court?
   yes

2. Did you feel your partner ex-partner was held accountable for their actions?
   yes

3. Would you recommend the Family Violence Court to other people?
   yes

4. Has there been a reduction of violence in your relationship?
   N/A “what relationship”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>FV10/15-03/16</th>
<th>FV 04/16-09/16</th>
<th>FV 10/16-03/17</th>
<th>FV 04/17-09/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

s.40(1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASSESSED</th>
<th>FVIC</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>RECIDIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA M F</td>
<td>Total M F</td>
<td>LA PL</td>
<td>FVIC (T18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (6M)</td>
<td>12 9 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 4 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>20 14 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 15 2 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (6M)</td>
<td>8  8 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 5 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40 31 9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 24 3 1 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>