

National performance indicators for safe-houses

This publication is protected by copyright law. When quoting from it, make sure to identify the source. Reproduction of pictures, photographs and illustrations requires the consent of the copyright holder.

Article.no
Published

2015-8-2
www.socialstyrelsen.se/english

Foreword

The National Board of Health and Welfare was commissioned to conduct a unified analysis of safe-houses for threatened people and develop a guidance document for the relevant target groups. The commission included defining the term “safe-house” as well as mapping the extent and quality of the safe-houses currently operating in Sweden. Furthermore, it was requested that a model was proposed for how the quality of the services offered at safe-houses could be developed, followed-up and evaluated regularly at a national level.

This report presents the 35 national performance indicators that can provide the basis for safe-house service development, follow-up and evaluation on a national level. The indicators may also be used by local municipalities, non-governmental organisations and volunteer associations that will develop the quality of the services offered at safe-houses on a local level.

This report was written by Dick Lindberg. The project leader was Cristina Josefsson and the responsible unit head for the commission was Mary Nilsson.

Lars-Erik Holm
Director-general

Contents

Foreword	3
Summary.....	7
Background	8
The commission.....	8
Why performance indicators?	8
How were the indicators developed?	8
The indicators	9
Next step	10
Performance indicators.....	11
Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.....	11
Accessibility	24
Autonomy and integrity	28
Knowledge-based practice.....	32
Holistic approach, coordination and consistency	37

Summary

The National Board of Health and Welfare has developed a set of performance indicators for safe-houses for abused people as commissioned by the Swedish government. The indicators are for use in national follow-ups and evaluations of service provision by the safe-houses. They can also be used by local municipalities, non-governmental organisations and companies who wish to follow-up and develop the services offered on a local level.

The principle that underpins these performance indicators is “good treatment and care in the social services”. In practice, this means that the services provided must meet the required targets set by legislation, regulations and guidelines as well as be:

1. based on respect for individuals’ autonomy and integrity,
2. grounded in a holistic approach, well-coordinated, and characterised by consistency,
3. knowledge-based,
4. accessible, and
5. secure and safe, as well as be characterised by respect of individuals’ legal rights.

A total of 35 performance indicators have been developed, all of which relate to at least one of these five performance areas.

Background

The commission

The National Board of Health and Welfare was commissioned to conduct a unified analysis of safe-houses for threatened people and develop a guidance document for the relevant target groups (Swedish government decision 11:5 S/2011/8989/FST). The commission included defining the term “safe-house” as well as mapping the extent and quality of the safe-houses currently operating in Sweden. Furthermore, it was requested that a model was proposed for how the quality of the services offered at safe-houses could be developed, followed-up and evaluated regularly at a national level. This report presents the 35 national performance indicators that can provide the basis for safe-house service development, follow-up and evaluation on a national level.

Why performance indicators?

The National Board of Health and Welfare (NBHW) has developed many indicators for the evaluation of quality in the health- and medical services, as well as the social services. These indicators are developed within the framework of the open comparisons conducted by the NBHW. On the whole, the NBHW’s experiences of developing indicators have been positive. Through publishing the indicators, the NBHW gives a clear message as to which quality areas it considers to be central. The indicators can be used to conduct national evaluations of quality development in safe-houses. They provide the basis for regular evaluations and follow-ups of safe-houses throughout Sweden.

These indicators will be able to be compiled and compared on national and county-levels, by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public-, not-for-profit or private sector).

In addition, local municipalities, not-for-profit organisations and other safe-house operators can use the indicators as a tool in their own quality development work.

How were the indicators developed?

The point of departure for these indicators was the knowledge and experiences gained by the NBHW when developing the guidance document related to safe-houses, conducting the evaluation of the extent and quality of the safe-houses currently operating in Sweden, and defining the term “safe-house”. At an early stage, September 2012, a draft of the indicators was discussed in a reference group consisting of representatives from the National Organisation for Women’s Shelters and Young Women’s Shelters in Sweden (ROKS), the Swedish Association of Women’s Shelters and Young Women’s Empowerment Centres (SKR), the Swedish Association for Victim Support (BOJ), the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR), the National Centre for Knowledge on Men’s Violence Against Women (NCK), The Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bi-

sexual and Transgender Rights (RFSL), the Children's Ombudsman, local county representatives, and the Swedish police.

The final indicators were then tested in a pilot study including ten safe-houses during the spring of 2013. A focus group of these same ten safe-houses met in April 2013 and discussed the choice of performance areas and individual performance indicators based on their unique local situations.

The indicators

The 35 performance indicators are based on the National Board of Health and Welfare's definition of a safe-house: "a residential facility that offers 24-hour accommodation to people in need of services in the form of protection against threats, violence or other abuse together with other relevant services".

The primary target group considered during the development of the performance indicators was safe-houses that provide services according to the Social Services Act (2001:453). However, there are a number of safe-houses that do not provide services according to the Social Services Act. These safe-houses can of course also use the performance indicators in their own quality development, although some of the indicators may not be relevant.

The indicators are general and applicable to all types of safe-houses including those that offer specialised services to a particular target group such as; abused people with substance abuse problems, abused people with physical or mental impairments, abused people with a foreign background, or abused men. The indicators are also suitable for safe-houses operating in both the private- and public sector.

Good quality social services

The performance indicators developed by the National Board of Health and Welfare (NBHW) for the social services must adhere to the principle of good treatment and care in the social services. In practice, this means that the services provided must meet the required targets set by legislation, regulations and guidelines as well as be:

1. based on respect for individuals' autonomy and integrity (see Ch.1 1§ Social Services Act),
2. grounded in a holistic approach, well-coordinated, and characterised by consistency (see Ch.3 1§ and 5§, Social Services Act),
3. knowledge-based (see Ch.3 3§, Social Services Act),
4. accessible (see Ch.3 1§ and 4§, Social Services Act), and
5. secure and safe, as well as be characterised by respect of individuals' legal rights (see Ch.11 1§, 5§ and 7§, Social Services Act).

The performance indicators developed by the NBHW typically relate to at least one of these five performance areas. Indeed, the 35 indicators presented in this report for safe-houses are no exception and represent all five of these performance areas.

As safe-houses primarily aim to provide protection for victims of intimate partner violence, the NBHW decided that the majority of the indicators should relate to the fifth performance area. This performance area explores whether practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided. Fur-

thermore, it must be ensured that individuals' legal rights are respected, especially when authority is exercised.

The majority of the indicators refer to the relevant section of the law, regulation, provision, and/or general guideline. However, some of the indicators lack such a reference and are instead based solely upon the knowledge and experiences provided by research and practice.

The performance indicators are presented in the following section.

Next step

The quality indicators will be published on the National Board of Health and Welfare's website in the autumn of 2013. Following their publication, the indicators will be used to evaluate all of the safe-houses operating in Sweden. This evaluation will contribute to the further development of the knowledge obtained during the mapping of safe-houses conducted in 2012.

Performance indicators

Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights

1. Staff employed at the safe-house during the daytime on weekdays

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have employed staff with a suitable education on-site during the daytime on weekdays.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses with employed staff with a suitable education during the daytime, Monday-Friday.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p><i>Staff on-site-</i> staff are physically present at the safe-house and not only, for example, available via telephone.</p> <p><i>Daytime staff-</i> the safety house is manned from approximately 8am to 5pm.</p> <p><i>Employed staff-</i> members of staff have a contract of employment with the operator of the safe-house. The staff cannot be voluntary.</p> <p><i>Suitable education-</i> Bachelor's degree in social work, or another suitable education.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of the criteria regarding staff on-site and employed staff.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

2. Staff employed at the safe-house during evenings, nights, weekends, and public holidays

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have employed staff with a suitable education on-site during evenings, nights, weekends, and public holidays.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safety houses with employed staff with a suitable education during evenings, nights, weekends, and public holidays</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p> <p><i>Staff on-site-</i> staff are physically present at the safe-house and not only, for example, available via telephone.</p> <p><i>Evening staff-</i> the safety house is manned from approximately 5pm to 10pm.</p> <p><i>Night staff-</i> the safety house is manned from approximately 10pm to 8am.</p> <p><i>Weekend staff-</i> the safety house is manned on Saturdays and Sundays.</p> <p><i>Employed staff-</i> members of staff have a contract of employment with the operator of the safe-house. The staff cannot be voluntary.</p> <p><i>Suitable education-</i> Bachelor's degree in social work, or another suitable education.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of the criteria regarding staff on-site and employed staff.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

3. Individual safety planning together with adults residing at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that create a safety plan with every adult residing at the safe-house. Safety-planning includes discussing security measures, taking into account any risk assessments previously conducted by the police or social services.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that safety plan together with every adult residing at the safe-house while also taking into account any risk assessments previously conducted by the police or social services.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p> <p><i>Safety planning</i> involves sitting down together with the person seeking refuge and discussing their current situation regarding the risk of further abuse and their protection needs while residing at the safe-house.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of safety planning.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

4. Individual safety planning together with accompanying children residing at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that create a safety plan with every accompanying child residing at the safe-house. Safety-planning includes discussing security measures, taking into account any risk assessments previously conducted by the police or social services.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that safety plan together with accompanying children residing at the safe-house while also taking into account any risk assessments previously conducted by the police or social services.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p> <p><i>Safety planning</i> involves sitting down together with accompanying children and discussing their current situation regarding the risk of further abuse and their protection needs while residing at the safety house.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of safety planning.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

5. Physical security measures in place at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have physical security measures in place. (Provisions and general guidelines on the social service's work with abused women and children who have witnessed violence, SOSFS 2009:22)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have at least of the following security measures in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security door • Video surveillance • Burglar-/personal attack alarm • Security windows • Secret address • Other security measures <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of different security measures.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

6. Management of the threats and hazards faced by those residing at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how staff should manage the threats and hazards faced by the residents.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how all employed and volunteer staff should manage the threats and hazards faced by the residents.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what a written procedure comprises.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

7. Management of the threats and hazards faced by the staff and volunteers at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the safety of the staff and volunteers is to be ensured.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the safety of the staff and volunteers is to be ensured.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what a written procedure comprises.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

8. Protection of confidential personal information at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying the protection of confidential personal information. (Provisions and general guidelines on the social service's work with abused women and children who have witnessed violence, SOSFS 2009:22; Violence Handbook, National Board of Health and Welfare, p.144)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how staff and volunteers should handle confidential personal information.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safety houses.</p> <p><i>Confidential personal information</i> includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information that is marked as confidential • That no address change is registered, that is, that a person's actual address and town is not disclosed • Fictitious personal information, that is, that a person may change their identity by using personal details other than those that were originally theirs
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what a written procedure comprises.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

9. Safe-house staff's knowledge of the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of public sector safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how it is ensured that all staff have knowledge of the secrecy provisions of the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act (Chapter 26, 1§, SFS 2009:400).
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of public sector safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how it is ensured that all paid staff and volunteers have knowledge of the secrecy provisions of the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of public sector safe-houses.</p> <p>Both the numerator and denominator only apply to safe-houses operating in the public sector.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what is meant by ensuring that knowledge exists.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

10. Safe-house staff's knowledge of the confidentiality provisions of the Social Services Act

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of private sector safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how it is ensured that all staff have knowledge of the confidentiality provisions of the Social Services Act (Chapter 15, 1§, Social Services Act).
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of private sector safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how it is ensured that all paid staff and volunteers have knowledge of the confidentiality provisions of the Social Services Act.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of private sector safe-houses.</p> <p>Both the numerator and denominator only apply to safe-houses operating in the private sector, that is, those that are not run by the local municipalities.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what is meant by ensuring that knowledge exists.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

11. Documentation and record keeping at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the provision of services is documented.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the provision of services is documented.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what is meant by ensuring that knowledge exists.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

12. Development of an implementation plan together with the abused person at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that procedurally develop an implementation plan together with the abused person upon arrival at the safe-house. (Chapter 6, 1§ AR, Provisions and general guidelines on documentation for case handling and service provision according to the Social Services Act, SOSFS 2006:5; Violence Handbook, National Board of Health and Welfare, p.83)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that procedurally develop an implementation plan together with the abused person upon arrival at the safe-house. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what is meant by implementation plan.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

13. Approach for ensuring that the mandatory reporting requirement for child protection is met at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures that specify the approach for ensuring the mandatory reporting requirement when it is suspected that a child may be maltreated as specified in the Social Services Act. (Chapter 14, §1, Social Services Act)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests practices are in place that contribute to the security and safety of the services provided.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying the approach for ensuring the mandatory reporting requirement for child protection as according to the Social Services Act. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses. Unclear or insufficient definitions of what is meant by implementation plan.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Security, safety and respect of individuals' legal rights.

Accessibility

14. Accessibility of the safe-house 24 hours a day, seven days a week

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that can receive abused people 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are accessible.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that can receive abused people 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Accessibility.

15. Accessibility of the safe-house for accompanying children

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that can accommodate accompanying children, regardless of the children's age or gender. (Provisions and general guidelines on the social service's work with abused women and children who have witnessed violence, SOSFS 2009:22)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are accessible.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that can accommodate accompanying children, regardless of the children's age or gender. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses. Does not apply to safe-houses for abused women with substance abuse problems, as these do not need to be adapted for the accommodation of accompanying children.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Accessibility.

16. Accessibility of the safe-house for wheelchair users

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that are adapted so as to be able to receive wheelchair users. (Break the Barriers- Guidelines for accessibility- According to the Disability Policy (Responsibility of National Authorities for Implementation) Ordinance (2001:526), Swedish Agency for Disability Policy Coordination (Handisam))
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are accessible.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that meet all of the following requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance is of sufficiently large • Elevators (if any) are sufficiently large • At least one of the living chambers is adapted for wheelchair users • At least one of the toilets and one of the shower facilities are adapted for wheelchair users • The kitchen and all common areas are wheelchair accessible <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Accessibility.

17. Use of interpreter at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have procedures for the use of interpreter of the most common languages in the catchment area, including sign language for the hearing impaired. (8§, The Administrative Procedure Act (1986:223); Violence Handbook, National Board of Health and Welfare, p.70)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are accessible.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have procedures for the use of interpreters of the most common languages in the catchment area, including sign language for the hearing impaired. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Accessibility.

Autonomy and integrity

18. Private rooms at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses where all residents have their own private room. (Chapter 3 AR, Provisions and general guidelines on care- and residential facilities (SOSFS 2003:20))
Direction of effect	A high proportion is a sign of respect for individuals' autonomy and integrity.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where all residents have their own private room. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses. <i>Note:</i> Accompanying children can reside in the same room as their parents.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Autonomy and integrity.

19. Access to lockable toilets and shower facilities at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses where residents have access to lockable toilets and shower facilities. (Chapter 3 AR, Provisions and general guidelines on care- and residential facilities (SOSFS 2003:20))
Direction of effect	A high proportion is a sign of respect for individuals' autonomy and integrity.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where residents have access to lockable toilets and personal hygiene facilities. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Autonomy and integrity.

20. Access to kitchen facilities at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses where residents have access to kitchen facilities for the preparation of food. (Chapter 3 AR, Provisions and general guidelines on care- and residential facilities (SOSFS 2003:20))
Direction of effect	A high proportion is a sign of respect for individuals' autonomy and integrity.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where residents have access to kitchen facilities. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Autonomy and integrity.

21. Access to common areas at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses where residents have access to common areas for social contact and relaxation. (Chapter 3 AR, Provisions and general guidelines on care- and residential facilities (SOSFS 2003:20))
Direction of effect	A high proportion is a sign of respect for individuals' autonomy and integrity.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where residents have access to common areas. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Autonomy and integrity.

Knowledge-based practice

22. Experience in applying standardised risk-assessment tools at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that report that they have experience in applying standardised risk-assessment tools.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are knowledge-based.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that report that they use at least one standardised risk-assessment tool.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p><i>Standardised risk-assessment tools</i> are developed by or in collaboration with researchers. The tools have been evaluated and determined to be effective.</p> <p>Note that it is not expected that safe-houses use the standardised risk-assessment tools for all seeking refuge. Instead, it is expected that they have knowledge of the existence of such tools, how they should be applied, and if it is appropriate to use them.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Knowledge-based practice.

23. Follow-up of the residents' view on the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that systematically follow-up and document the residents' views on the safe-house, including their views on their treatment by staff and the services offered. (Chapter 5, 3§, Provisions and general guidelines on the management system for systematic quality work, SOSFS 2011:9)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are knowledge-based.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that, in the last 24 months, have conducted at least one evaluation of the residents' views on the safe-house, including their views on their treatment by staff and the services offered. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Knowledge-based practice.

24. Follow-up of the violence experienced by residents during their stay at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have procedures for systematically following-up and documenting the violence experienced by residents during their stay at the safe-house.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are knowledge-based.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have procedures for systematically following-up and documenting the violence experienced by residents during their stay at the safe-house.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p><i>Systematic follow-up</i> means that the safe-house has a practice in place that involves procedurally determining (by asking or another method) whether the resident still has contact with the abuser and if she/he continues to be abused or threatened.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Knowledge-based practice.

25. Staff at the safe-house have a suitable education

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have staff with a suitable education. (Chapter 3, 3§, Social Services Act)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are knowledge-based.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where at least one person employed at the safe-house has a Bachelor's degree in social work, or another suitable education, and at least one year of experience of social work. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Knowledge-based practice.

26. Staff at the safe-house have expertise in working with children who have witnessed violence

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have staff with relevant expertise in working with children who have witness violence.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are knowledge-based.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses where at least one person employed at the safe-house has relevant expertise in working with children who have witnessed violence.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p><i>Expertise</i> means that the staff member has completed a relevant education on the topic, for example Save the Children's professional development course on the "Trappan" method, or who have obtained such expertise as part of a tertiary education.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Knowledge-based practice.

Holistic approach, coordination and consistency

27. Collaboration between the safe-house and social services

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with social services or <i>within</i> the social services in those cases where the safe-house is run by the local municipality. (Chapter 4, 5§, Provisions and general guidelines on the management system for systematic quality work, SOSFS 2011:9)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with social services. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

28. Service planning in collaboration with the social services

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the safe-house plans services in collaboration with the social services.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures specifying how the safe-house plans services in collaboration with the social services.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

30. Collaboration between the safe-house and the police

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with the police. (Chapter 4, 5§, Provisions and general guidelines on the management system for systematic quality work, SOSFS 2011:9)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with the police. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

31. Collaboration between the safe-house and the health- and medical services

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with the health- and medical services. (Chapter 4, 5§, Provisions and general guidelines on the management system for systematic quality work, SOSFS 2011:9)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with the health- and medical services. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

32. Collaboration between the safe-house and other organisations

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with associations and organisations that support abused people and children who have witnessed violence. (Chapter 4, 5§, Provisions and general guidelines on the management system for systematic quality work, SOSFS 2011:9)
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have written procedures for collaboration with associations and organisations that support abused people and children who have witnessed violence. <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

33. Designated areas for play and activities for young accompanying children residing at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have designated areas for play and activities for young accompanying children residing at the safe-house.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have designated areas for play and activities for young accompanying children residing at the safe-house.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p>Only applies to safe-houses that can provide refuge for young accompanying children.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

34. Designated areas for activities for accompanying teenagers residing at the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that have designated areas for play and activities for accompanying teenagers residing at the safe-house.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that have designated areas for play and activities for accompanying teenagers residing at the safe-house.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p> <p>Only applies to safe-houses that can provide refuge for accompanying teenagers.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.

35. Planning before leaving the safe-house

Measure	Proportion, percent.
Aim	Shows the proportion of safe-houses that routinely create a plan together with the abused person before they leave the safe-house. This plan should allow for continued contact and support.
Direction of effect	A high proportion suggests that the services are grounded in a holistic approach, are well-coordinated, and are characterised by consistency.
Target value	Not yet defined.
Type of indicator	Structural measure.
Indicator's status	No data sources with continuous data collection available.
Technical description	<p><i>Numerator:</i> Total number of safe-houses that routinely create a plan together with the abused person before they leave the safe-house. This plan should allow for continued contact and support.</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of safe-houses.</p>
Data sources	Survey sent to all safe-houses.
Possible sources of error	Quality of data available from the survey responses.
Level of reporting	Kingdom, county, categorisations arranged by cities/medium-sized towns/rural areas, small- and large safe-houses, as well as by type of organisation (e.g. public- or private sector) and licensing/regulatory requirements.
Performance area	Holistic approach, coordination and consistency.