



Final grant report: LGBTIQ Safe Relationships Awareness Project

Project title	LGBTIQ Safe Relationships Awareness Project
Grant recipient	Inner City Legal Centre
Project manager	Julie Howes
Position	Safe Relationships Project Solicitor
Law and Justice Foundation awarded amount	\$33,846.25
Grant period	August 2013 – December 2014
Date of this report	5 December 2014

Description of the project

Describe the project in just enough detail so that anyone can understand it. What was the aim of the project, who was the intended audience and what strategies did you implement to achieve the aim?

This project involved the development, delivery and evaluation of community legal education (CLE), including training resources, about domestic violence in LGBTIQ relationships. The acronym LGBTIQ refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer and is an inclusive reference for people of diverse sexualities, gender identities and expressions, and intersex people.

The intended target audience was workers or volunteers from mainstream domestic violence services, the NSW Police Force, health workers, the community sector, government agencies and LGBTIQ services who work with vulnerable LGBTIQ people who may be experiencing or escaping domestic violence.

The CLE sessions were approximately 4 hours in duration and were delivered face to face to the thirteen locations around NSW:

- Kings Cross
- Parramatta
- Albury-Wodonga
- Port Macquarie
- Ashfield
- Bega
- Nowra
- Penrith
- Gosford
- Port Kembla

- Lawson
- Marrickville
- Lismore

The aim of the project was to develop resources and provide information and referral sources to workers through CLE about domestic violence in LGBTIQ relationships.

We partnered with a local CLCs, domestic violence services, LGBTIQ services or government agency in each location.

The training presentation was presented on Prezi and had a number of visual and audio resources embedded into it. One of the training resources was the audio recording “a typical SRP client telephone conversation” which was developed in-house. This resource was used toward the end of the training to draw together all the knowledge the participants may have gained and to apply it to a practical activity.

The project – what happened?

How did the project come about?

The project came about as a result of ICLC's Safe Relationships Project finding that LGBTIQ people experiencing and escaping domestic violence accessed DV services at significantly lower rates than people in cis-gendered¹ heterosexual relationships. This finding is in stark contrast to peer reviewed research showing that LGBTIQ people experience domestic violence at the same rates to that of the mainstream community (Shannon Little, ‘*Challenging Changing Legal Definitions of Family in Same-Sex Domestic Violence*’ [2008] 19 Hastings Women’s Law Journal 259, 261).

Discussions with the SRP Advisory Board, organisations providing similar services, mainstream DFV services and ICLC solicitors working with both LGBTIQ and non-LGBTIQ clients experiencing domestic violence provided anecdotal evidence supporting the research. These findings led to the recognition that LGBTIQ people are vulnerable and at risk of not receiving messages about safe relationships.

The SRP Advisory Board recommended that as well as other promotional activities (eg attending the Local Courts and distributing posters and brochures) further training and legal education work with mainstream services was (and still is) required so that workers who work with vulnerable LGBTIQ people are more aware of the issues and have resources targeting LGBTIQ people to work with.

Briefly set out the project stages and what happened in each stage.

Stage 1: two month period

Consult, research, plan the CLE sessions and training resources

- Liaise with key stakeholders
- Research and gather information and content for the CLE sessions and resources
- Start to lock in / organise dates, venues, catering, accommodation, transport
- Collate email and contact list of potential workers/services to advertise the CLE to
- Source and refer to NACLC best practice guide for CLE
- Schedule Test Group session and venue

- Seek feedback / input / report to SRP Advisory Committee (Steering Committee)
- Fortnightly meetings with Project Manager

Stage 2: one month period

Develop the CLE sessions and training resources

- Develop CLE plan outline
- Develop the CLE content and training resources
- Develop CLE promotion advert and related materials
- Conduct knowledge survey of test group
- Seek feedback / input from Steering Committee
- Solicitor/Project Manager to check legal information / CLE content and resources

Stage 3: one month period

Review, test and improve CLE sessions and training resources

- Advertise the CLE throughout networks
- Start recording RSVPs for training attendants
- Present initial sessions to test group, survey test group after session completed
- Evaluate the initial CLE with test group, seek feedback and recommendations
- Implement improvements to the CLE and resources
- Solicitor / Project Manager to check legal information and CLE content and resources
- Seek feedback / input / report to SRP Advisory Committee (Steering Committee)
- Fortnightly meetings with Project Manager

Stage 4: six month period

Deliver, implement, present CLE sessions and training resources

- Continue promoting CLE to networks
- Record RSVPs and confirm venues, travel, accommodation, catering
- Deliver CLE and provide resources
- Maintain database of networks and key contact of CLE participants
- Conduct pre CLE session knowledge surveys
- Conduct post session CLE surveys
- Survey participants about the use of the training resources
- Seek feedback / input / report to SRP Advisory Committee (Steering Committee)
- Fortnightly meetings with Project Manager
- Implement improvements suggested by surveys as appropriate, check all CLE content and training resources amendments with the Solicitor / Project Manager

Stage 5: one month period

Gather evaluation data and recommendations

- Collate pre CLE session knowledge surveys
- Collate end of CLE surveys
- Survey participants about the use of the training resources
- Write evaluation report
- Seek feedback / input / report to SRP Advisory Committee (Steering Committee)

- Fortnightly meetings with Project Manager

Stage 6: one month period

Report evaluation data and recommendations to funding body, ICLC Board, SRP Advisory Committee.

- Seek feedback / input / report to SRP Advisory Committee (Steering Committee)
- Fortnightly meetings with Project Manager
- Final Report to Law and Justice Foundation

Now that the project has concluded, how did the implementation and/or the outcome differ from what was originally intended? Did anything surprise you? Were there any unintended outcomes?

The actual training content, training resources, and delivery did not differ from what was originally intended.

However, we originally selected a number of locations to deliver the training but due to unforeseen circumstances these locations were not appropriate at the time. So we selected other locations.

At each training session the information provided was slightly modified to meet the needs of that community. This occurred through consultation with the partner organisation at each location.

Also, at each session the participants would, through their questions and interactions, steer the focus of the training. Some sessions focused more heavily on LGBTIQ identities, some more on safe relationships, some more on the unique LGBTIQ tactics used by perpetrators to have power and control over victims, and some more of key legal issues.

Some of the surprises include:

- One thing we didn't anticipate was the administrative workload required to deliver this project. We underestimated how much administrative work was involved with this project. We relied on a number of student volunteers to assist with this work.
- The training sessions all ran over time. There was such interest in the content. Many people in their feedback suggested running the training for a full day.
- The initial response to the first training session was overwhelming and we were not prepared to handle so many enquiries. In hindsight we would have benefited from capping training numbers at 20 people per session and on the number of occasions when the interest was high we could have arranged a second session. We did turn away over 30 people for the first session and we had a number of people attend who did not register so numbers on the day we approximately 35 participants.

At each location, there was a moment in the training where participants felt it was safe to “come out” and talk about their lived experience as LGBTIQ people in their local community. In rural regional and remote areas “coming out” is a very big deal and especially in someone’s work environment. This type of disclosure by participants during training not only enhanced the experience of all those at the

training, as it made real and visible the reality of the LGBTIQ local lived experience, but also for the participants coming out it was a significantly proud moment where they were accepted for they are.

Evaluation

What questions did you ask to evaluate whether you had achieved your aim?

Form 1 – Questionnaire to be answered before the training starts

1. What is your workplace or volunteering contact details?
2. What is your role / contact with LGBTIQ people (e.g. community worker, police officer, counsellor etc)? What work do you do with LGBTIQ people?
3. Approximately how many LGBTIQ clients do you see / advise / help each month?
No. _____

Form 2 – Evaluation of the training to be completed at the end of the training session

1. Thinking about what you have learned today, what are the three most important barriers to LGBTIQ people seeking assistance / resolving domestic violence problems?
2. In the last month, how many clients have you referred to another **legal or non-legal** service for assistance with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem?
3. *If you referred clients*, where did you refer them to and for what problems?
4. *If clients were not referred*, what was the main reason for this?
5. Please rate the following:
 - Overall value of the training
 - Your knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships before the workshop
 - Your knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships after the workshop
 - Your ability to identify a LGBTIQ safe relationships issue before the training
 - Your ability to identify a LGBTIQ safe relationships issue after the workshop
 - Your confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before the workshop
 - Your confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem after the workshop
 - Your ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before the workshop
 - Your ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem after the workshop
6. What did you find most useful about this training?
7. What could have been improved?
8. Is there anything else you would like to know about LGBTIQ safe relationships?
9. Any other comments?

Form 3 – Follow up evaluation of outcomes from the training to be completed 8 weeks after the training

1. What is your role / contact with LGBTIQ people (e.g. community worker, police officer, counsellor etc)?
2. Approximately how many LGBTIQ clients do you see / advise / help each month?

3. In the last month, how many clients have you referred to another **legal or non-legal** service for assistance with a LGBTI safe relationships problem?
4. *If you referred clients*, where did you refer them to and for what problems?
5. *If clients were not referred*, what was the main reason for this?
 - Clients in the month did not have LGBTI safe relationships problems
 - I did not realise that the problems were LGBTI safe relationships issues
 - I did not know where to refer my clients
 - There is nowhere to refer my clients for these issues
 - Other reason (*please specify*)
6. Are you still using the resources / materials provided at the workshop? Yes/No. If not, why not?

What data did you gather to answer your questions?

See evaluation data analysis at end of report

We collected information about:

- the number of participants (178 participants overall)
- what organisations they were from
- the participants overall rating of the training (87% rated the training 4/5 or 5/5)
- the overall value and effectiveness of the training
- how much they learned about LGBTIQ people and relationships from attending the training
- their confidence levels to assist future LGBTIQ people after the training
- their ability to make appropriate referrals in the future
- whether after the training they were still using the resources they received at the training

176 people attended the training at the 13 locations.

87% of participants who completed evaluation forms rated the training 5 out of 5 or 4 out of 5.

Did you achieve your aim? What did you find out?

Yes we did achieve our aim.

The aim of the project was to develop resources and provide information and referral sources to workers through community legal education domestic violence in LGBTIQ relationships.

We continue to use the resources and since the completion of the project we have been approached by other organisations within NSW and around Australia to present the training.

Conclusion and recommendations

What is your conclusion?

This was a really worthwhile project and we thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to develop, implement and evaluate the project.

The majority of participants gained so much knowledge and confidence from attending the training, even people who had well developed knowledge of the LGBTIQ lived experience or who had extensive

knowledge of working with people escaping domestic violence, the responses to the evaluation questions demonstrated the training impacted participants positively.

What are your recommendations for improvements both for the intended audience of your project, and for the strategy you used to achieve your aim? What would you do differently next time?

The first thing we would do differently if we were to deliver this type of training in 13 locations within a 6 months period would be to ensure we had adequate administrative support to assist with enquiries, registrations, and evaluation follow up.

We would cap the training at no more than 20 participants and have the flexibility to run a second session in areas where there is high demand for the training.

Without a doubt, we would do this type of project again at the first opportunity possible.

ⁱ When a person is cisgender, they identify as the gender that matches the sex that they were assigned at birth. A transgender woman is a person who was assigned male at birth but who identifies as a female, while a cisgender woman is a person who was assigned female at birth and identifies as female.

Evaluation data analysis

Table 1 - Number of participants	2
Table 2 - Overall value of the training.....	2
Table 3 - Overall value of training per location - form 2.....	3
Interpretation of low data results:.....	4
Overall effectiveness of the training.....	5
Table 4A - Self rated knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships and ability to refer clients	5
Table 4B - Overall effectiveness of training averages per location	6
Table 5 - number of respondents using materials 8 weeks after training.....	7
Table 6 – List of organisations corresponding by area	8

**LQBTIQ Safe Relationships Awareness Training
Evaluation data analysis**

Table 1 - Number of participants

Location	Total number of participants in each area	Number of completed evaluation form 1	Number of completed evaluation form 2	Number of completed evaluation form 3
Sydney	35	28	30	17
Parramatta	6	6	3	1
Albury	10	9	9	1
Port Macquarie	21	15	13	0
Ashfield	13	13	13	0
Bega	5	5	5	0
Nowra	6	6	6	0
Penrith	22	15	21	2
Gosford	7	4	6	0
Illawarra	17	10	4	1
Blue Mountains	13	11	10	0
Marrickville	8	5	8	3
Lismore	13	13	12	1
Total	176	140	140	26

Table 2 - Overall value of the training

Total number of '5'	Total number of '4'	Total number of '3'	Total number of '2'	Total number of '1'	Number of participants who did not answer
66	56	13	2	0	4

Table 3 - Overall value of training per location - form 2

Location	Total number of '5'	Total number of '4'	Total number of '3'	Total number of '2'	Total number of '1'	Total number that did not respond	Total form 2 responses
Sydney	3	18	6	2	0		
Parramatta	1	2	0	0	0		
Albury	3	6	0	0	0		
Port Macquarie	7	4	1	0	0		
Ashfield	11	1	0	0	0		
Bega	3	2	0	0	0		
Nowra	4	2	0	0	0		
Penrith	12	4	5	0	0		
Gosford	4	2	0	0	0		
Illawarra	3	1	0	0	0		
Blue Mountains	5	4	1	0	0		
Marrickville	5	2	0	0	0		
Lismore	5	7	0	0	0		
Total	66	55	13	2	0	4	140

Interpretation of low data results:

There were two people who scored '2'. Both showed no or minimal improvement in knowledge about LGBTIQ safe relationships and knowledge about proper referral services. They attributed this to two reasons:

1. They already had a lot of knowledge about LGBTIQ relationships and wanted the legal side of the training
2. They self identified as not part of the target audience

There were 13 people who scored '3'. There were various reasons for this score:

1. Six people indicated that environment/place/logistics factors could be improved i.e. no air-conditioning. These people were all from the Sydney training
2. Two people indicated that they wanted more of a practical approach or how to apply their knowledge to a given scenario i.e. how to counsel a victim
3. One person wanted more of the legal side of the training. This is supported by the absence of improvement in knowledge about LGBTIQ relationships and knowledge about relevant services
4. Four people did not provide reasons on why they scored the training a value of '3'.

Overall effectiveness of the training

Table 4A represents people’s scores on their knowledge about LGBTIQ safe relationships and their ability to refer clients to relevant services before and after training.

Table 4B shows averages per location.

Table 4A - Self rated knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships and ability to refer clients

Respondents knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships prior to training	Respondents knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships after training	Respondents ability to identify LGBTIQ safe relationships issue before training	Respondents ability to identify LGBTIQ safe relationship issue after training	Respondents confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before training	Respondents confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem after training	Respondents ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationship problem before training	Respondent's ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before the training
2.84	4.33	3.01	4.37	2.99	4.28	2.75	4.5

Table 4B - Overall effectiveness of training averages per location

Location	5a. Overall value of the training (scale 1-5)	5b. Your knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships before the workshop (scale 1-5)	5c. Your knowledge of LGBTIQ safe relationships after the workshop (scale 1-5)	5d. Your ability to identify a LGBTIQ safe relationships issue before the training (scale 1-5)	5e. Your ability to identify a LGBTIQ safe relationships issue after the workshop (scale 1-5)	5f. Your confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before the workshop (scale 1-5)	5g. Your confidence in assisting someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem after the workshop (scale 1-5)	5h. Your ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem before the workshop (scale 1-5)	5i. Your ability to make an appropriate referral for someone with a LGBTIQ safe relationships problem after the workshop (scale 1-5)
Sydney	3.63	3.1	4.1	3.45	4.12	3.17	4.17	3.17	4.43
Parramatta	4.33	2.33	4.33	2.67	4.67	2.67	4.33	1.67	4.33
Albury	4.33	2.89	4.37	2.78	4.56	3.11	4.56	2.67	4.81
Port Macquarie	4.5	3.5	4.58	3.67	4.75	3.67	4.27	3.27	4.72
Ashfield	4.92	3.17	4.58	3.33	4.67	3.33	4.33	3	4.75
Bega	4.6	2.2	4.4	2.6	4.6	2.8	4.4	2.6	4.4
Nowra	4.67	2.83	4.33	2.67	4	3.17	4.17	2.83	4.83
Penrith	4.33	2.4	4.31	2.95	4.31	2.64	4.24	2.55	4.31
Gosford	4.67	2.83	4.67	2.5	4	2.5	4.33	2.33	4.33
Illawarra	4.75	2.25	4	2.25	4.25	2.75	4.25	3	4.67
Blue Mountains	4.4	2.7	4.1	2.6	4.1	2.5	3.9	2.4	4.2
Marrickville	4.71	2.86	4.29	3	4.29	3.14	4.43	2.86	4.71
Lismore	4.42	2.71	4.46	2.79	4.54	2.83	4.37	2.58	4.42

Table 5 - number of respondents using materials 8 weeks after training

Location	Total	Yes	No
Sydney	17	17	0
Parramatta	1	1	0
Albury	1	0	1
Port Macquarie	0	0	0
Ashfield	0	0	0
Bega	0	0	0
Nowra	0	0	0
Penrith	2	2	0
Gosford	0	0	0
Illawarra	1	1	0
Blue Mountains	0	0	0
Marrickville	3	3	0
Lismore	1	1	0
Total	26	25	1

Table 6 – List of organisations corresponding by area

Location	Organisation
Sydney	Barnardo's BCS Lifecare Relationship Services Bondi CHC, POWH, SESCHD Community and Family Services - D.V. Line Elsie's Women's Refuge Family Relationships Centre Liverpool Women's Health Centre Mission Australia NSW Domestic Violence Line Relationships Australia RLC SWDVCAS South Sydney WDVACS Stimulant Services St Vincent's Hospital The Wayside Chapel Twenty 10 UNSW USYD UTS
Parramatta	Parramatta Mission
Albury-Wodonga	Charles Morgan and Associates Hume Riverina Community Legal Centre NSW Police Skinner and Associates Thurgoona Community Centre
Port Macquarie	Hastings Football League Hastings Macleay Medical School Headspace Interrelate Lifeline Mid-North Community Legal Centre Mission Australia North Coast Medicare NSW Department of Health Port Macquarie Community Health Centre Tafe NSW
Ashfield	Bondi Beach Cottage Burwood WDVACS Department of Police and Justice Family Planning NSW Neami, Darlinghurst NSW Police Relationships Australia

Location	Organisation
Bega	Far South Coast Family Support Centre University of New England Women's Resource Centre
Penrith	Aftercare Anglicare Nepean Centre for Addiction Medicine Nepean Hospital – Drug and Alcohol Clinic – ‘Gateway Clinic’ Penrith Women's Health Centre San Miguel Family Centre Wentworth Community Housing Western Sydney WDVCS Wimlah Refuge – Blue Mountains
Gosford	CCDVCS CCHAS – Special Mental Health Services for Older People Toukley Women's Refuge Whole Family Team
Nowra	Community Corrections Nowra Shoalcoast Community Legal Centre Shoalhaven Local Council
Illawarra	Access Community Group Acute Mental Health Ward Wollongong Hospital Catholic Care CRS Australia Illawarra Legal Centre Illawarra Local Health District Illawarra Women's Health Centre Warilla Women's Refuge
Blue Mountains	Blue Mountains Community Outreach Service Blue Mountains Women's Health and Resource Centre Elizabeth Evatt Community Legal Centre MCRN NSW Police Penrith WDVCS Phoenix Cottage Tafe NSW
Marrickville	City of Sydney MTC Australia NSW Police We Help Ourselves

Location	Organisation
Lismore	ACON Compacker FACS Family Support Network Jansen Newman Institute Mullumbimby and District Neighbourhood Centre North Coast Medicare Local Women's Resource Service