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1. Introduction

1.1 About Refuge

Refuge is the UK’s largest single provider of specialist support for survivors of violence against women and girls (VAWG), supporting over 3,800 women\(^1\), children and men on any given day.\(^2\)

Refuge’s network of services operates nationally across 53 local authority boroughs and district and county councils, and includes more than 40 refuges. Refuge also runs independent domestic violence advocacy services; culturally-specific services – including programmes for Vietnamese women and Eastern European women; community outreach programmes; and single-point-of-access services – which act as the first point of contact for anybody experiencing gender-based violence across the whole of a local authority area. The National Domestic Violence Helpline is run by Refuge in partnership with Women’s Aid and receives more than 200 calls every day. In addition, Refuge runs award winning pro bono prevention and awareness raising campaigns.

Refuge operates a three-pronged approach to address domestic violence, which includes:

- **Provision**: Providing a national network of high quality services that support abused women, children and men in regaining control of their lives and move forward in a positive way.
- **Protection**: Advocating for improvements in policy and practice aimed at addressing domestic violence and other forms of gender-based violence, and the implementation of legislation to meet the needs of abused women and children.
- **Prevention**: Helping to prevent domestic violence through campaigning, education, training and research, and working in partnership with other agencies to raise awareness of domestic violence, its causes and solutions.

The following four Refuge services form the focus of this report:\(^3\)

- Integrated services and emergency housing
- Community outreach
- Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs)
- Services for victims of sexual violence\(^4\)

1.2 Overview

Refuge appointed NEF Consulting (the consultancy arm of the New Economics Foundation think tank) to prepare a social valuation of its services for survivors of domestic violence. An initial report was produced in 2013 based on engagement with Refuge service users and

---

\(^1\) Refuge provides services for both men and women who are victims of domestic abuse. However, as men make up a very small minority of clients this report focuses exclusively on women and their children (of the 3,800 individuals supported each day approximately 1,500 are women, 2,250 are children and 50 are men).


\(^3\) See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation of these services.

\(^4\) Note that the outcomes measured in this model are focused on victims of VAWG and do not perfectly represent the impacts of the service for victims of sexual violence (ISVA). For this reason, the social return may appear disproportionately small compared with the other services in this report.
data from Refuge’s case management information system, which used an integrated outcomes framework, known as REMIT. In January 2016, Refuge requested an updated report to reflect their enhanced service provision, using the more comprehensive data made possible by an updated version of REMIT, now renamed IMPACT.⁵ (See Figure 1)

The research in both reports follows a Social Return on Investment (SROI) methodology – a framework that measures the social, environmental and economic value created for both service users and wider society. SROI helps organisations to understand and manage their impact across all stakeholders, rather than simply focusing on revenue or cost savings for one stakeholder.

⁵ IMPACT®. 2015. UK0000302942 and UK00003115256, Refuge, UK.
2. Methodology

Social Return on Investment (SROI) evaluates the return on investment for non-monetary endeavours by assigning financial proxies to non-financial outcomes. It requires a robust methodology\(^6\) which has been applied as summarised below:

- **Engage stakeholders to identify outcomes:** SROI makes no assumptions about the impact of a service, it only measures the outcomes that stakeholders feel are important to them. Therefore, a workshop was conducted with Refuge clients in 2013 to understand the changes they experienced as a result of accessing support, and how they feel about them. The results of this engagement, together with input from Refuge staff and management, informed the development of a Theory of Change (see Figure 2) and the identification of primary outcomes for this study.

- **Evidence outcomes through data:** Outcomes are measured for three stakeholder groups: women, their children, and the state, using appropriate data indicators to show progress towards, or the achievement of, key outcomes. These outcomes are grouped into four primary domains aligned with the goals of the organisation: safety, health, social wellbeing, and economic wellbeing. Refuge uses a bespoke electronic case management information system (IMPACT), which holds anonymised aggregated data on over 48,000 cases and is capable of generating high-resolution reports on outcomes, as well as ‘distance travelled’ for each client between intake and exit.\(^7\)

  Data extracts covering the period 1 April, 2015 to 31 March, 2016 provide the basis for this report.

- **Model and calculate Social Return on Investment (SROI)** using contextual data to understand the value of the change created by Refuge. This process disentangles the net effect of Refuge’s services, deducting the cost of improvements that stakeholders would have experienced in the absence of Refuge’s intervention.

- **Communicate findings** to prove and improve the value of Refuge’s work. In addition to their aggregate impact, this report provides a breakdown of impact for each stakeholder group, by service type, and according to each measured outcome domain, to help Refuge analyse their key strengths and weaknesses, as well as identifying areas where additional data would be useful.

2.1 Limitations of the data

Calculating SROI is helpful as a tool for evaluating impact and identifying organisational strengths and weaknesses. But like all data-driven approaches, it is an imperfect descriptor of lived experience. It is important to remember that underlying the figures in this report are the experiences of unique individuals with complex lives.

In fact, this SROI is a deliberately conservative estimate of Refuge’s impact on its clients. Several key aspects of domestic violence have been omitted or underplayed, as explained below:

---

\(^6\) See Appendix B for an introduction to SROI.

\(^7\) Further information about IMPACT can be found on the website [impactbyrefuge.org.uk](http://impactbyrefuge.org.uk)
• **Stakeholders:** Refuge provides services for both men and women who are victims of domestic abuse. However, men make up a very small minority of clients and there is limited literature and a lack of robust evidence on this group. For this reason, their outcomes are omitted from this evaluation.

• **Homicides:** Current statistics estimate that two women per week are murdered by either a current or former intimate partner, in England and Wales alone. While Refuge and its clients feel intuitively that Refuge’s services prevent further homicides from taking place, this is difficult to prove. Therefore homicide prevention is not factored into this evaluation.

• **Incidents:** Many financial proxies used in this SROI are based on estimated costs per domestic violence incident; by all accounts, this is likely to be a gross underestimate. Research suggests that most victims of domestic violence will experience 35 incidents of abuse before they seek help, but police statistics cap recorded incidents at five, making it impossible to assess the true extent and cost of the crime.
3. Theory of Change

3.1 Introduction

A Theory of Change describes the process through which change occurs, with those involved in benefitting from a service being actively involved in ‘telling the story’ of how the service affected them. To develop this story, we held a workshop with Refuge service users to discuss their experiences.

The outcomes described below are grouped by Refuge’s impact domains, as recorded via IMPACT, and reflect the outcomes that service users identified as being most important to them – safety, health, social well-being and economic well-being. There is a high degree of overlap and interaction between outcomes, and it was made clear that the path from domestic violence to independence is a complex one.

Figure 2: Theory of Change

3.2 What changes?

3.2.1 Safety

The most immediate concern for most women who come to Refuge is their physical safety and the safety of their children. While fear of physical harm is often the most compelling reason for women to flee their homes, service users reported that many perpetrators also
instil further fear in their victims by isolating them and threatening that their children will be taken away. Perpetrators of violence towards black, minority ethnic and refugee women threaten that the women will be shunned by their communities or will be deported. These are equally powerful modes of control and domination.

Safety is a basic requirement of survival, but of equal importance from the perspective of women and children, is the perception of being safe. Feeling safe generates many benefits in other domains, including: better sleep and associated health improvements; a reduced risk of mental health problems, substance misuse, and self-harm; improved optimism and autonomy; greater ability to undertake daily tasks; and fuller participation in society.

Refuge activities and services that contribute to safety and perceptions of safety include:

- the development and implementation of individual support and safety plans
- help finding new safe accommodation
- support where appropriate to report domestic violence to the police and to seek legal protection

### 3.2.2 Health

Domestic violence impacts negatively on health in a number of ways beyond immediate physical harm. Anxiety and depression are mental health conditions commonly experienced by women and children who have been subjected to abuse. In addition, violence towards women during pregnancy (during which time 30% of abuse begins or intensifies) commonly results in complications, potentially harming the child before it is even born.

Protecting women from violence reduces physical harm and injury; additionally, women who escape the emotional abuse of domestic violence are less vulnerable to developing associated mental health issues.

Women are often disempowered to care for their children, through imprisonment in the home, due to financial control by a partner, and through isolation from systems of care and support. A sense of shame is cited as one reason why some women may not seek medical help for themselves or their children. The State, with its responsibility for providing medical care (to those who suffer from poor mental health) and support (through benefits) for those with poor physical health, has the potential to benefit from a reduction in incidents of domestic abuse.

Refuge activities and services that contribute towards health benefits include:

- support with immediate urgent health needs
- the opportunity for women to discuss the emotional effects of domestic violence on themselves and their children
- the provision of information about community-based specialist services

### 3.2.3 Social wellbeing

Isolation is a universal theme of domestic violence, common to the experience of all service users. Perpetrators deliberately isolate their victims in order to facilitate their own behaviour and escape punishment. The shame that many victims feel means that their isolation is compounded as a result. Women report feeling isolated from other members of their family, who may not understand the gravity of their situation, and who in some cases may actively shun the victim of abuse.
Social isolation is distressing, and also has practical impacts. Isolated women and children are unable to access information, advice or support, cannot build trust in other people or community services, have no ability to build a support network and experience many barriers to securing successful employment and education.

By escaping a violent partner, and overcoming the stigmatisation that many women and children feel as victims, space is created for friendships to grow or become re-established. Through Refuge services, many women forge a strong connection with others who have been victims, where mutual understanding of a shared experience is quickly apparent. For young people, school attendance and participation are likely to improve if abuse ends.

Refuge activities and services that contribute to social well-being include:

- support in reconnecting with supportive friends and family
- provision of information about social activities for women and their children

3.2.4 Economic wellbeing

Financial abuse is a common feature of domestic violence. Limiting access to funds, monitoring expenditure, as well as reducing the woman’s ability to make financial decisions provides the perpetrator with a high degree of control over all aspects of her life. Women in this situation often have no understanding of how to manage their finances, what sources of funds might be available to them, or what it costs to maintain a certain standard of living. This makes them fearful of living independently and binds them to the perpetrator.

Helping women into financial independence allows them to better care for themselves and their families, which can be a prerequisite for giving women the confidence to escape abuse. Often this may be achieved through advising women on their entitlements to benefits or support services. Ultimately, returning to work increases self-esteem and extends social networks, which then has positive effects on other aspects of women’s lives.

From the State’s perspective, the ability of women to achieve financial independence and to support their families, can mean increased tax revenue from earnings as well as a reduction in benefits payments – though in the short term expenditure may rise as women take up entitlements.

Refuge activities and services that contribute to economic empowerment, include support with:

- reviewing survivors’ financial situation
- obtaining, clarifying and changing financial documentation
- assistance in claiming benefits for women and their children
- support to obtain new employment
4. Results

4.1 The bottom line

The Social Return on Investment (SROI) for Refuge is calculated to be 4.94:1. This means that for every £1 invested, clients, their families and society-at-large reap a reward equivalent to £4.94.

4.2 Key findings

Key findings from this SROI analysis highlight:

- **The extraordinary value of Refuge’s services**: Through its four service streams: refuge housing, community outreach services, independent domestic violence advocacy services, and sexual violence services, Refuge generates an average of £4.94 in social value for every £1 invested. For some services this ratio is even higher: Outreach services generate £6.92 and IDVAs generate £7.14.

- **The impact of refuge housing**: Although carrying high unit costs, refuge housing has the greatest impact of all Refuge’s services. While only 21% of Refuge clients use the housing service, it accounts for 54% of the total social return in this study. The SROI ratio for refuge housing is also an impressive £4.07 for every £1 invested.

- **The burden of VAWG on society**: A stark finding of this study is the overall burden of intimate partner violence, not only on the victims and their families, but on society at large. Counting only those families who used Refuge’s services in the year 2015/16, savings of £1.7 million of public funds were made in the criminal justice system, and £4.2 million were made in healthcare costs. Whereas, during the same period gains of £3 million were made, through economic productivity and reduced benefit payments. These savings are indicative of the heavy costs associated with abusive crimes.

- **Distribution of benefits**: Of the three stakeholders groups, women, their children, and the State, women capture the largest share of benefits at 63%. Children capture 30% of the value and the State receives 7%. As mentioned above, refuge housing accounts for 54% of the impact experienced by Refuge’s clients, with IDVAs contributing 39%. Outreach services claim the remaining 7%. Sexual violence services do not feature in this comparison owing to the current scale of the service. The distribution of benefits by outcome domain is unequivocal: safety takes a full 71% of the SROI; health and economic wellbeing take 13% and 14% respectively; with social wellbeing accounting for the remaining 2%. Though small, this social wellbeing percentage should not be trivialised, as former Refuge clients’ emphasised vehemently that social wellbeing was central to their ongoing quality of life.

---

4.3 Discussion

The SROI methodology attempts to translate social outcomes into financial returns, which necessitates a leap in deductive reasoning. For this reason, it is especially important to ensure that every step of the process is documented, each decision is based on well-founded research, and that the most conservative estimates are used in order to avoid inflation of results. Below is a summary of the measures taken to ensure that the findings in this report are as representative as possible.

- **Attribution**: The majority of women receive help from more than one source. Refuge refers most of its clients to multiple services for social or medical support, to ensure that their specific needs are met. While help from friends or family may not be forthcoming at first, Refuge also helps women to think about who might be able to offer assistance and, where possible, could support them in connecting to other community opportunities. As such, ‘Attribution’ accounts for the proportion of good outcomes that should be credited to these other factors of support.

- **Cherry picking**: Naturally, some results are more flattering than others. This report takes care to represent the benefits as well as the financial implications of Refuge’s work. Specifically, full attention is given to the costs borne by the welfare system in supporting women who require financial help as a result of fleeing the family home.

- **Conservative estimates**: Where there is a range of possible options in any of the SROI domains, the most conservative estimate has been chosen. For example, the value of family relationships was given a proxy equivalent to the recreational spending of a family with only one adult and one child, in the lowest income decile.

- **Deadweight**: This acknowledges the possibility that some people who escape from abusive relationships might do so without ever contacting Refuge. While evidence on this counterfactual outcome is understandably elusive, research suggests, for example, that a small proportion (about 14%) of perpetrators will spontaneously cease their abuse without any intervention. As such, 14% of overall impact has been discounted for the relevant outcomes.

- **Displacement**: This SROI values the impact of services provided by Refuge not only on its clients, but also on the broader societal scale. For this reason it is necessary to assess whether a good outcome for a Refuge service user might, as a consequence, prevent a positive outcome for another victim of domestic violence. For most outcomes, this is not the case – one person’s improvement in confidence does nothing to stifle another’s. However, in some situations, such as needing refuge housing, limited availability does mean that one family’s gain will be another’s loss. This is accounted for in the calculations.

- **Double counting**: Some of the outcomes assessed in this SROI are overlapping. A key example is the financial proxy used to quantify personal safety: people were asked what they would be willing to pay to avoid serious injury. It may be assumed that their calculus included anxiety about lost income from work, long-term health consequences or disability, isolation from friends and family, depression etc. This
financial proxy was therefore diminished significantly, to ensure that the health, social and economic components of the safety domain were not being accounted for multiple times.

- **Drop-off:** While positive changes supported by Refuge’s work may endure long into the future, other factors may also play an increasing role as time goes by. For example, a woman’s safety in the first year may be completely dependent on a refuge service, but as she reintegrates into her community and builds resilience through work, study, and personal care, these latter components will deserve greater credit for sustaining this outcome. The model therefore discounts the impact of Refuge over time.

- **Net Present Value:** The impact of Refuge’s work lasts beyond the timeframe of the actual intervention, and is valued in this model over a period of three years. In order to prevent inflation from skewing the calculations, the final numbers are reduced to a net present value, determined at the current rate of inflation. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) is used as the relevant inflation rate, as it most closely represents the average spending, per person, on common household goods. The CPI currently stands at 0.3% and is not likely to show significant movement over the medium term.⁹

- **Sensitivity testing:** Translating human experience into data will inevitably require some decisions or assumptions to be made – about how to account for counterfactual outcomes, for example. It is therefore important to run alternate scenarios to check that these decisions do not unduly affect the outcome of the model.

### 4.4 Breakdown of findings

The following section provides a high-level overview of the findings of the SROI evaluation. Table 1 provides some key facts and figures used in the calculations. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show Refuge’s impact – by stakeholder group, outcome domain and service type. Tables 5, 6 and 7 explain the indicators and financial proxies used in the model. A summary of the stages and principles of SROI is provided in Table 8.

Additional notes and calculations can be found in Appendix D.

---

Table 1: Key facts and figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVAs</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Number of women included in this study: 2,636
- Number of children included in this study: 3,821
- Investment in services (£ p.a.): £8,641,076
- Unit costs of services (£ p.a.): £2,581

Table 2: Social return on investment for women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Net value generated by service type (£)</th>
<th>Aggregate net value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>£8,374,784</td>
<td>£48,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£887,671</td>
<td>£63,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social wellbeing</td>
<td>£331,086</td>
<td>£55,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic wellbeing</td>
<td>£7,024,948</td>
<td>£510,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Social return on investment for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Net value generated by service type (£)</th>
<th>Aggregate net value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>£8,374,784</td>
<td>£48,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£253,041</td>
<td>£170,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social wellbeing</td>
<td>£35,861</td>
<td>£435,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Social return on investment for the State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Net value generated by service type (£)</th>
<th>Aggregate net value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>£777,153</td>
<td>£168,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£1,358,925</td>
<td>£435,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic wellbeing</td>
<td>(£2,778,249)</td>
<td>(£84,489)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Indicators and proxies – Women

The table below shows the assessed value for each measured outcome for the women who use Refuge services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Proxy description</th>
<th>Proxy value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Being safe</td>
<td>Freedom from violence (classed as serious according to severity, duration and/or frequency of incidents)</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid serious injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£29,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom from violence (classed as moderate/mild according to severity, duration and/or frequency of incidents)</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid moderate injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom from threatening and controlling behaviours</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid mild injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Improved physical health</td>
<td>Enabled to seek appropriate medical care</td>
<td>Value of moving from moderate pain to no pain, equivalent to 20.4% of a £30,000 quality-adjusted life year (QALY)</td>
<td>£6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved mental health</td>
<td>Improvement in psychological assessment score</td>
<td>Value of moving from severe mental illness to mild/no mental illness, equivalent to 35.2% of a £30,000 quality-adjusted life year (QALY)</td>
<td>£10,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value of moving from moderate mental illness to mild/no mental illness, equivalent to 9.8% of a £30,000 quality-adjusted life year (QALY)</td>
<td>£2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social wellbeing</td>
<td>Improved social connections</td>
<td>Improved family relationships</td>
<td>Half of family culture and recreation expenditure</td>
<td>£497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved confidence</td>
<td>Confidence to access support</td>
<td>Value of support from Citizens Advice (assessed through independent SROI exercise)</td>
<td>£362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic wellbeing</td>
<td>Economic sufficiency</td>
<td>Freedom from financial abuse</td>
<td>Financial self-sufficiency, equivalent to a net full-time annual salary at minimum wage.</td>
<td>£11,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome domain</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Proxy description</td>
<td>Proxy value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom from violence (classed as serious according to severity, duration and/or frequency of incidents)</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid serious injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£29,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom from violence (classed as moderate/mild according to severity, duration and/or frequency of incidents)</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid moderate injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Being safe</td>
<td>Freedom from threatening and controlling behaviours</td>
<td>Willingness to pay to avoid mild injury (discounted to avoid double counting)</td>
<td>£68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enabled to seek appropriate medical care</td>
<td>Value of childhood vaccinations against rubella, mumps and measles, equivalent to 9.95% of a £30,000 quality-adjusted life year (QALY)</td>
<td>£2,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social wellbeing</td>
<td>Improved social connections</td>
<td>Connected to appropriate social and community activities</td>
<td>Half of family culture and recreation expenditure</td>
<td>£497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Indicators and proxies – Children

The table below shows the assessed value for each measured outcome for the children of women who use Refuge services.
Table 7: Indicators and proxies – The State

The table below shows the assessed value for each measured outcome for the State. It accounts for revenue added or lost through the tax system as well as costs incurred or avoided due to Refuge’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Proxy description</th>
<th>Proxy value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Being safe</td>
<td>Reduction in criminal justice system costs</td>
<td>Estimated cost to criminal justice system per domestic violence incident</td>
<td>£2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Improved physical health</td>
<td>Reduced healthcare costs</td>
<td>Estimated cost to healthcare system per domestic violence incident</td>
<td>£3,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved mental health</td>
<td>Reduced mental health care costs</td>
<td>Estimated cost to mental health care system per domestic violence incident</td>
<td>£589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic wellbeing</td>
<td>Financial sufficiency</td>
<td>Increased tax base</td>
<td>Income tax and national insurance contributions on full-time minimum wage salary (employer and employee shares)</td>
<td>£1,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to appropriate benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of income support, housing and child-related benefits (assuming only half are new claimants)</td>
<td>(£6,418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in benefit payments to women who find employment</td>
<td>Clawed-back income support, housing and child-related benefits for full-time workers (assuming only half were new claimants)</td>
<td>£5,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clawed-back income support, housing and child-related benefits for part-time workers based on two days a week (assuming only half were new claimants)</td>
<td>£2,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: The Refuge services

The Refuge services on which this study focuses are briefly described below.

Refuge integrated services and accommodation

Refuge runs 42 refuge-integrated services and accommodation in 16 different local authority areas providing emergency accommodation for women and children fleeing domestic violence.

Specialist Refuge staff provide a range of practical and emotional supports to women and their children, including help with accessing benefits, addressing personal financial issues, and securing permanent housing in a safe area.

Outreach services

Trained Refuge staff also meet women in their homes, or arrange to meet in a discreet public place, to offer confidential practical and emotional support. This may include advice on how best to escape a perpetrator, or the development and implementation of a safety plan. Refuge runs 17 outreach services, which supported 299 women and their children in 2015/16.

Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs)

Refuge’s Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) provide expert guidance to women going through the civil and criminal court system. The support may include accompanying women to court, requesting special measures (for example, the use of screens to conceal women giving evidence), and liaising with all the statutory agencies involved.

Services for victims of sexual violence

Refuge’s Independent Sexual Violence Advisory (ISVA) services support anyone who has experienced, or is at risk of experiencing, sexual assault or rape. It provides a range of services and a tailor-made support plan to suit the client’s needs.
Appendix B: Summary of Social Return on Investment (SROI)

SROI is a form of cost–benefit analysis recognised by the Cabinet Office in the UK.\textsuperscript{10} The method helps organisations to manage the intangible, hard-to-measure, social and environmental value they create. Rather than simply focusing on cost savings, the methodology takes into account the full range of impacts that matter to the main stakeholders.

The SROI methodology identifies every stage of a robust, outcomes-based, impact evaluation. Its stages and guiding principles are summarised in Table 8. It surpasses conventional reporting frameworks, which tend to start by focussing on outputs and things that can be easily counted. Instead, SROI seeks to measure the actual changes experienced by key stakeholders.

Once the key changes have been identified, they are valued by providing an equivalent monetary value for each of the social and environmental benefits (or costs). By putting all the outcomes into the same metric it is possible to provide a measure across different domains of value, in a common and relatable form.

\textit{Table 8: Stages and principles of Social Return on Investment (SROI)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The stages of an SROI analysis</th>
<th>SROI guiding principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishing scope and identifying stakeholders</td>
<td>• Involve stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mapping outcomes</td>
<td>• Understand what changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value</td>
<td>• Value what matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establishing impact</td>
<td>• Include only what is material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calculating the SROI</td>
<td>• Avoid over-claiming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reporting, using, and embedding</td>
<td>• Be transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Verify the result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} For full details of the SROI methodology, see the Cabinet Office guide to SROI: www.neweconomics.org/publications/guide-social-return-investment
Appendix C: Glossary of terms

**Stakeholder:** An individual, a group of people or an organisation that affects or is affected by an intervention.

**Outcome:** The change that occurs as a result of an activity (e.g. improved well-being of training participants).

**Deadweight:** The amount of change that is likely to have happened anyway (this might be positive or negative).

**Attribution:** The amount of change that is attributable directly to the project being evaluated – considering the input of other stakeholders – especially where a project is a catalyst of change. For example: support from other services or family and friends.

**Displacement:** Considers whether value is actually moved from one place to another, rather than a new value created, particularly in a zero sum situation. For example: there are only a limited number of jobs to go round.

**Benefit period:** The length of time during which the outcomes are expected to endure.

**Drop off:** The rate at which benefits decrease over time.

**Investment:** The full cost or value of total inputs to the programme, including volunteer time, or time ‘in-kind’ where appropriate. If looking at only one project within an organisation, this will be the ‘share’ of inputs provided for that project (Full Cost Recovery).

**Impact:** The difference between the actual outcome for participants and what would have happened anyway, taking into account the contribution of others, and the length of time the outcome lasts.

**Financial proxy:** An approximation of value where it is impossible to attain an exact measure.

**Theory of Change:** A specific type of methodology for planning, participation, and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors, to promote social change. Theory of Change defines long-term goals and then maps the process backwards from the outcome to the starting point, to identify necessary preconditions.

**Primary data:** Data that were previously unknown and which have been obtained directly by the researcher for a particular research project.
Appendix D: Additional notes and calculations

Proxies for valuing the cost of domestic violence, especially with regard to the State, are based on figures calculated by Sylvia Walby\textsuperscript{11} as shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9: Estimated costs of domestic violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001 estimate</th>
<th>2008 updated estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal justice system costs</strong></td>
<td>£1,017,000,000</td>
<td>£1,261,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which, female</td>
<td>£884,384,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health service costs</strong></td>
<td>£1,396,000,000</td>
<td>£1,730,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical health costs</strong></td>
<td>£1,208,504,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which, female</td>
<td>£912,881,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental health costs</strong></td>
<td>£176,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which, female</td>
<td>£176,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Estimated cost to State per domestic violence incident

- Estimated 2012 criminal justice system costs, females only £2,959
- Estimated 2012 physical health costs, females only £3,054
- Estimated 2012 mental health costs, females only £589

Additional calculations fed into the model were based on various information sources, as shown in Figures 3 to 6.

The willingness-to-pay discount

The proxy for safety is discounted. This is to avoid double counting of any factors that may play a part in the willingness-to-pay calculus, but which are already accounted for elsewhere in the model, as well as factors that are not relevant to this analysis. Through this exercise, the baseline figure is reduced to 28% of the original number, which is then applied to all willingness-to-pay proxies. The calculation is as follows:

Figure 3: The willingness-to-pay discount

Willingness to pay to avoid injury (severe) £104,300

\textit{Less} (figures cited in Walby):
- Lost economic output £15,150
- Legal cost of injunction £1,976
- Child care £13,000
- GP visits, prescriptions, travel, time £121

\textit{Subtotal:} £74,053

\textit{Less benefit of} (figures derived through SROI):

Refuge: A Social Return on Investment Evaluation

Feeling safe £240
Help with health needs £6,120
Help with mental health £10,560
Social connections £497
Confidence accessing support £362
Help to assess finances £11,463
Help to access benefits incl. housing £12,819
New employment £2,292.69

Total: £29,699.23

Discounting percentage: 28%

Discounted willingness to pay (severe) £29,699.23
Discounted willingness to pay (moderate) £2,175.48
Discounted willingness to pay (non-violent) £68.34

Means-tested benefits

The following calculation is based on the weekly benefits of one adult and one child.

Figure 4: Means-tested benefits

Income support £71.70
Housing£12 £90.10
Child tax credit £64.02
Child benefit £20.70

Annual income from all benefits: £12,819.04

Take-home salary

The following calculation (Figure 5a) is based on the lower minimum wage (to include workers under the age of 21), using a 35-hour work week, for 52 weeks per year.13

Figure 5a: Take-home salary – Full-time work

Minimum hourly wage rate £6.70
Hours per week 35
Weeks per year 52

Total annual gross income £12,194.00

12 Average weekly rent for one adult plus children ('Table 2.7 Housing expenditure by household composition' in ONS Family Spending, 2014. Crown copyright.)
PAYE income tax payable £235.20
NI – employee contribution £495.36
NI – employer contribution £563.04
Total NI deduction £1,058.40
Net salary: £11,463.44

The following calculation (Figure 5b) is based on the lower minimum wage (to include workers under the age of 21), using a 14-hour work week for 52 weeks per year.

*Note: This annual income (£4,877.60) falls below the threshold for income tax and National Insurance contributions.*

*Figure 5b: Take-home salary – Part-time work*

Minimum hourly wage rate £6.70
Hours per week 14
Weeks per year 52
Total annual income £4,877.60

**Leisure spending**

The proxy for improved family relationships is based on a family’s average spending on recreational activities, with half attributed to the adult and the other half to the child.

*Figure 6: Leisure spending*

Lowest decile leisure spend per week £19.10
Spending over 52 weeks £993.20
Annual leisure spend per family member (half each) £496.60