

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Next Millennium Conference: Ending Domestic Violence; Evaluation 101 (Part I, #226)

Author(s): Eleanor Lyon ; Anuradha Sharma ; Angela M. Parmley ; Stephanie Riger

Document No.: 184567

Date Received: September 27, 2000

Award Number: 1999-WT-VX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

THE NEXT MILLENNIUM CONFERENCE
Ending Domestic Violence
Evaluation 101 (Part I, #226)
Monday, August 30, 1999

Page 1
BOS:das

MS. LYON: We'll be doing a lot of passing the baton here. But, at any rate, this is Evaluation 101 -- the nuts and bolts, nitty gritty of evaluation.

For those of you who may have been somewhat confused by the fact that both part one and part two were described in the same way, this is seen as sequential, it is not being repeated in part two. So, in other words, part one is the first part, part two is the second part, they are different. So, for those of you who did not read the program, or think that's what was going to happen, we may be able to -- well, we would encourage you to get the recording, and get part two that way.

My name is Eleanor Lyon. I've been doing evaluation research for many years, primarily focused on violence against women. (I) am currently involved in an evaluation of my state, which is Connecticut, stop grant programs. I'm also doing the evaluation of VARNET(?), the electronic network for -- on violence against women.

We're going to all introduce ourselves, and then I'm going to review quickly with you, what we're going to plan to do today, and then we'll get right into it -- so, turn it over to Anu.

MS. SHARMA: Hello, I'm Anuradha Sharma. I came into this work as an advocate, working with women in New York -- South

Asian women, in a program there and doing work with children and mothers from Women Against Abuse shelter in Philadelphia, and have moved on to doing some graduate work in public health. From there, I have been doing work on measurement issues in research on violence against women.

Most recently, (I have) looked at ways in which we document and evaluate the work of programs within the battered women's movement, as well as where we place women who have traditionally been in the margins, or under served communities, and the kinds of evaluation issues that come forward, in an effort to sort of restructure how we begin to think about evaluation. I'll pass it on.

MS. PARMLEY: Hello, my name is Angela Moore Parmley. I work for the Department of Justice, in the National Institute of Justice, in the Office of Research and Evaluation. I am one of the program managers of the Violence Against Women and Family Violence Research and Evaluation Program.

We have the dubious distinction, I guess, or the reputation for being one of those organizations that give money to people, and ask a lot of them in the process. We are one of the funders of perhaps some of the largest national evaluations. We are overseeing the evaluation of the Stop Violence Against Women program, which is funded by the Violence Against Women office, evaluation of the Grants

to Encourage Arrest program, evaluation of the Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization program. There is a host of evaluations, that's one of the major things that we do in our office, but I also am working with a lot of researcher/practitioner partnerships, to encourage collaborations at the local level.

I also do my own research. I do research in the areas of police response to domestic violence, as well as intimate homicide, and things of that nature. I do more basic and applied research, not necessarily evaluation, although I manage a lot of evaluation projects.

MS. RIGER: I'm Stephanie Riger, I am a professor of Psychology in women studies, and director of the Women's Studies program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, where I am currently teaching a class on domestic violence, and I'm using one of Angela's articles. (Laughter) -- small world.

I'm also doing, with several other people at University of Illinois at Chicago, an evaluation of all of the state-funded Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault programs in Illinois. At the beginning of the second half of this -- the beginning of part two, I'm going to be presenting that as an example of what happens when you actually try to do an evaluation.

MS. LYON: Realized I should have included in my

introduction that I started out doing programmatic work, I was connected with one of the first shelter programs in Connecticut, and then moved on to doing research.

When we first began talking about this, we weren't sure how many of you there were going to be, and we thought we could have everybody go around the room and introduce themselves, and do that sort of thing. I think we are not going to do that (laughter) -- but, if we could have a quick show of hands, how many of you work in a shelter-type program? Okay, how many of you consider yourselves advocates? How many of you are researchers? Okay, this will probably not be new to you. How about administrators? Policy makers? Okay, state agency workers? National organization folks? Okay, how many of you have had any experience with evaluation? Okay, this is good (laughter).

All right, one of the things that we wanted to do, as you can see -- what I'd like to do is to quickly review our planned agenda. If there is something that is hugely glaring, that we haven't included, feel free to speak up, and we'll see if we can take that into account. But, we wanted to talk about -- start right off, by talking about some of the kinds of fears and concerns -- the issues that get in the way of people wanting to approach evaluation, and then to talk about what evaluation is, and what you might be able to get out of it, why you can actually benefit from it.

We are also going to then talk about providing a context for evaluation -- a broader context, what is evaluation as opposed to research, as opposed to other forms of information collection. And then talk about issues of inclusivity -- strategies for being as inclusive as possible, and how that is particularly an important part of evaluation. Then, we're going to go through an overview of the evaluation process, a kind of a step-by-step. These are some of the basic elements, the key steps in conducting an evaluation, start-to-finish. That's the point at which we'll take a break.

In part two, there will be a good deal more -- throughout, we're going to be providing examples, and while there's a primary person talking about the particular topic, we're all going to feel free to jump in. So, I think, given the nature of this workshop, it would make most sense if you were to ask your questions as we go along, because there's sort of like not a natural -- one part is really over, and then we move on -- it all sort of flows together. So, ask questions, make comments as we go along.

Then, we'll be talking about sort of hints and strategies, and experiences for developing goals and objectives, for developing measurements, and for analysis of the results, and some of the sometimes complex issues involved in sharing results, and negotiating and

interpreting findings.

We'll also then be talking about a variety of other issues involved in evaluation. Particularly, safety considerations, issues related to under served populations -- human subject issues, when you need to select an outside evaluator, and guidelines that you might use for doing it, and when you might not need to. Then, some suggestions for resources -- a lot of that's contained in handouts, but we also have some additional words about that. So, that's what we intended to do. Is there anything that's glaring, that we've omitted? Okay, so -- Angela, you were going to do the flip chart.

This is an important part of this whole research track, here at the Millennium conference, where the theme is, making connections and collaboration. In order to do that, it's important that people start off from being as much on the same page as possible, so this is really a nuts-and-bolts thing. But, evaluation and researchers have sometimes not made the best of impression, and people have found themselves getting involved in evaluation, not because they wanted to, but because it was imposed upon them. So, we wanted to sort of start there with, let's just get some of those fears and barriers out in the open -- what's your experience, why is evaluation either a negative, or a fearsome thing?

...: I was hired to fulfill a grant that was written, and it was very specific about providing community education and technical education around domestic violence issues. The grant specifically said that I would give a pretty impulse(?) test.

I'm in a rural city, 28,000 people, and they do not like taking tests. They refuse to do it, and so I live under this big fear that -- how am I going to evaluate this if people aren't willing to do what the grant tells me I'm supposed to do?

...: Inappropriate. (Laughter.) -- inappropriate methods for collecting data?

...: Yeah, maybe that's it.

MS. LYON: Or, methods imposed from the outside, without.

...: Unrealistic business, no.

MS. LYON: Realistic.

...: Unrealistically written grant.

...: (Inaudible) for collecting data that ___ for.

MS. LYON: Standards that don't work.

...: I was going to say, you might not want to know the results.

MS. LYON: Okay, fear of the results -- fear that the results might be negative.

...: Right.

MS. LYON: Yeah?

...: Negative, or abused in a way that is harmful to the program, to the work. _____ negative.

MS. LYON: Okay. Fear that the results will be used negatively, may be misinterpreted, may be taken out of context.

...: I represent a community -- it seems like everyone here does (inaudible). I was working in a community that (inaudible) -- in the past, the fear was that because it was something (inaudible) to work in, or they were afraid that the numbers, and the outcome would be used to affirm that this was an issue of more of this community than of us.

...: The battered women in our programs are going to get labeled as successes and failures, depending on whether or not the funders agree. They're actually setting the funders ideas of what there actually should be, with having to move from quantitative steps to outcome evaluations.

MS. LYON: Quick summary.

...: Labeling is part of that.

MS. LYON: Yeah, used to label.

...: Someone's becoming descriptive of what we --

...: Well, its evaluating based on whether it's a success, or a failure. I don't think they're looking at this situational.

MS. LYON: Right. So it's -- out comes a contextual.

...: It really is that the money -- we tend to compete with

each other for the dollars, when we're all trying to do the same thing. So, when you have an outside evaluator, sometimes there's the fear that they're not understanding what you're doing. And, if you get a negative evaluation, your funding might be at risk.

Unfortunately, at least in Illinois, we constantly try to get funding from the same sources. We're doing a better job, I think lately, of sharing, but 10 years ago, we were almost fighting for the money, amongst ourselves. We're afraid that maybe, if the evaluation doesn't come out the way the funder wants it to, a lot of times people, in our area at least, are concerned about what the data looks like, as opposed to what the reality is of what we're really doing.

MS. LYON: Right.

...: I kind of look at evaluations as a collection of data, numbers, _____, that kind of thing. Often times, it's hard for me to figure out how it -- like, how to stop them from losing the human touch, the quality of life issues that are changed, and calculate that into an evaluation.

MS. RIGER: They're too often exclusively statistical, and you don't have the context in the sort of human life involved, yeah.

...: Along those lines, it's the difficulty, or even sometimes inappropriateness of trying to get the kind of

information that is valuable -- like, I work in a hospital, and we just had short-term contact with women in the emergency department, and refer them. We had a difficult questioning follow-up, and finding out if they felt less isolated, if they felt like they had more resources, that sort of thing, because there's not that ongoing contact -- you go there to make sure they're -- that kind of evaluation would be safe.

MS. LYON: So, some of the safety and ethical issues involved in --

...: What you really want to know is very difficult to get, safely and ethically.

...: Being out to provide outcomes in particular, and wanted to do it right, but not having the money to do it. To do it appropriately, it requires a lot of money, and you still get the money, but you get these requirements imposed on you.

MS. LYON: Insufficient resources to do it right.

...: Looking toward the evaluation, it really turned out to be the driving force.

MS. LYON: That's a very key political issue. I wanted to hear, in evaluation circles, a lot -- that the evaluation, and the requirements of the evaluation end up driving the program, rather than the other way around. Okay, anything else? Yeah?

....: Sometimes the outcomes are longer terms than you have in the grant that you evaluate.

EL: Uh huh. (Yes.) Didn't someone at lunch mention that? Yeah, that we can't end violence, necessarily, within our funding cycle. (Laughter.)

Interestingly enough, nobody mentioned that we're about doing services, and having to spend the time to do the quote, paperwork, feels like it's taking away of what we should be about, which is also an understandable, and one that we hear with some frequency.

That's a great, and compelling list -- and particularly, people very often find themselves saying, and why should we do evaluation anyway -- after all, we know the answer, we know that we're doing a good job, we know that we're working very hard, we're very dedicated, and to have to go through all of this energy, and spend all this time and resources to evaluate it, seems like a waste of time.

I hope that what we can do is to give you, at least, some different strategies and some tools here, so that you can think in more creative ways, so that you can seize more of the control of the evaluation, whether you're doing it yourself, or you're working with an outside evaluator, so that some of the issues around the wrong kinds of measurements that don't capture what is important to us -- at least, some of those issues can be moved along, can be

overcome possibly. So, I want to go through really quickly, some of the basic elements here. Just -- can you read that? It's not -- yeah, there is a handout -- no, there's not a handout for that particular one.

Basically, it's a set of definitions. The point of the definitions are that evaluation looks at the impact. It looks at efficiency, and quality, and effectiveness. It's a set of information that can be used, and should be used if it's worthwhile, to be able to make decisions about a program, and hopefully to improve a program. So, that's a real quick set of definitions. But, what I wanted to do is to move on to -- and so, why should we bother doing it? (Background conversation.)

Basically, one of the things that you want to do, is to find out if the program works. If you are engaged in an effort to try to provide support, to provide services, to improve the quality of people's lives, then in the abstract, at least, you'd want to know whether you're actually doing that. So, a good evaluation can help you to find out if your program is doing what it set out to do, but that means you need to know what you're trying to do, and why you're trying to do it.

It can also help you to develop, or improve a program -- now that's a big fear that many people have -- that they will there that there's a problem in the program. But, you

can in fact discover simply parts of the program that aren't working, and you can find it out in a way so that you can change those and really make dramatic program improvements.

You can also find out things that are misunderstood about your program. You can learn about barriers to your program, and to its services. You can learn about barriers through such issues as access, language, culture. Program policies, in fact, that get in the way of people being able to use your program. I mean, we all develop programs with the best intentions in the world -- I mean, we sit down, and we try to do what we can with available resources to provide help, to provide support, to provide advocacy. But sometimes, we're actually doing things that are either neutral, or can cause harm, and I think that we would want to learn about those.

We can learn if program goals should change in order to meet the needs. For example, there was a needs assessment that was done in a state that was very close to mine, in New England, and it was a needs assessment having to do with shelter programs. One of the things that they learned, somewhat to their surprise, was that the primary need that women had was access to low cost housing. That revelation led them to say, we need to devote some resources to learning more about housing issues in our community, to working with policy makers to provide support for low-income

housing, and for temporary-housing alternatives. So, they were able to shift the direction of their program based on what they had learned. So, they were able to make dramatic program improvements -- it's not that they were failing, it was that an unanticipated need existed, that they hadn't taken into account.

You can discover unintended side effects, and then either get rid of them, or build on them. For example, there was an evaluation that was done of a school program in which the kids were told that everything that went on during this program was supposed to be confidential, and so the kids took this extremely seriously. So, when they went home after going to this program, their parents said, "So, what did you learn?" and they said, "We can't tell you."

(Laughter.) Now, the program folks only found out about that through the evaluation. So, then they were able to explain, you can tell Mom and Dad, it's a good thing to talk about at home -- what you've learned here -- and, that sort of thing. So, very often you learn things that can actually make a difference, to help create better connections within your program, and you'd never have dreamed that they were going on.

You can also use evaluation to meet demands for information about a program from funder's clients, or the public -- and, that's a very common use of evaluation

results. That after all, enables you to continue, it adds credibility for a lot of your system's change work. People have used evaluation results with legislators, with funders, have used it for substantive policy changes, as well as to increase funding. So, just sort of nitty gritty survival of the program can be enhanced through evaluation.

It can also answer much more specific questions about services. Things like, which kinds of services seem to be most helpful, and for whom, and when does it make most sense to offer them? Sometimes through evaluation, you can learn that the sort of barrage of information that you give to women when they first come into shelter is not something that can be absorbed at that particular stage, which you might learn through your experience, but it also is helpful to find that evaluation supports that, as well. So, you can incorporate that into your training of new staff, and volunteers, and that kind of thing.

So, in other words, it can help you to identify sort of where you are, what needs and resources are relevant, and what you need to do next. So, it can be extraordinarily helpful for planning.

You have a set of key terms that were handed out with you -- which, I will not go through all of those terms. The idea is simply that this is some of the language -- this is one of the ways -- one of the barriers that sometimes can

exist between researchers and people in programs, and that is that people speak this kind of strange language, and it's really alienating. It actually can be translated into your ordinary, garden-variety English, which researchers should do a whole lot more, to begin with.

Are there more of the key terms?

...: No.

MS. LYON: Okay. So, we can get more of them to you.

One of the things I want to highlight is that when people talk about goals -- it's only because we're going to be talking about that a bit more later -- what researchers mean, is more longer term goals, it's sort of the into the future benefits of the program that folks have in mind. Objectives are much more short term, much more immediate steps to achieving longer term goals, so just as a kind of clarification of that distinction.

I want to turn to, however, looking a little bit more at the distinction between process evaluation and outcome evaluation, just real briefly. Because, that's also a set of terms that you hear. Those are in fact, two types of evaluation that look at different things. They can be used together, but if you're talking to a researcher, that's useful language to know about.

As the handout says, basically the process of evaluation looks at the degree to which the program is

operating, what its activities are -- how is it operating, what is it doing? So, it addresses questions like, what are you doing, the number of people who are served, the number of people who are trained, the number of services that you're providing, the number of hours that are spent providing those services. Those are all examples of the -- sort of, what are you doing kind of question.

The how are you doing it question can look at such issues as, what types of services are you providing? Are you providing support groups? Are you providing advocacy? Are you providing advocacy in criminal court, in civil court with welfare agencies, with child protection agencies? So, in lots of different settings, and lots of different strategies of providing advocacy.

Process evaluation can also look at who is -- and probably at least as important, who is not receiving your services? And there, you can be looking at demographic kinds of information, for one thing. That's stuff that people very often collect on their intake forms. Just basic race, and ethnicity, and gender, and age kinds of questions. Then, if you can, compare it to the population in your community. Or, if you're doing work in court -- if you compare it to the population of people who are involved in court, the battered women whose partners have been arrested, and who may be involved in that way, in a criminal case.

Then, you can learn a whole lot more about who you are missing in the services that you provide.

I think very often of an example of someone who is doing a site visit to a program, and they said, "And, how many Latinos are you serving in your shelter program?" And they said, "Well, none." Sort of looking, well, and of course, none. They said, "Well, but 25 percent of your population is Latino." This was a revelation to the people in the program. They were clearly seeing none of them. That was an issue that was something that they needed to think about -- services for the populations that they were missing. So, you can learn a lot about who is receiving, and not receiving services.

Process evaluation could also tell you how people experience your services, so such questions as their level of satisfaction with the services that they've received, the extent to which they felt respected by the people in the program, when they were interacting with them, the extent to which they felt understood by the people in the program -- were the issues, were the needs, were the kinds of things that you came to the program wanting, did people demonstrate that they understood those? In my experience doing evaluation, that has often been a complete key to whether or not people feel that they have received adequate services -- that level of feeling like they were understood.

Sometimes, women feel that service providers are pushing their own agenda, or trying to fit them into particular categories of service bluck(?), and if they don't fit, then -- and, they're not listening to what the women are coming to them with, wanting and needing.

...: Question on that.

MS. LYON: Yeah.

...: I am responsible for running a batterer's intervention program, so the service I'm providing is not something they want. Can I still ask that same question, whether or not they're satisfied with the services? How would I phrase it to them?

MS. LYON: Well, there you might ask whether or not they felt that they were understood, whether they learned something. It really -- the kinds of questions that you ask depend on your goals for the service. So there, you might ask whether their behavior has changed.

MS. SHARMA: Or, if any expectations had been met, that they may have had.

MS. LYON: All right. Expectations for the training or for the intervention were met, yes.

...: It may also depend on when you ask the question. If you ask the question when they first enter the program, you're going to get a different answer (than) if they make it to the end of the program.

MS. LYON: Absolutely. And, sometimes it's important to ask the question at more than one point in time. And, it's often important to -- for some kinds of programs to ask some of those questions early on, because people very often drop out, and so, you need to have -- you might want to have some information from early, as well.

MS. PARMLEY: One other thing I'll just add, you may have men who are required to be at the program, because they're court mandated. That doesn't absolve us of the responsibility of making sure those programs are actually meeting their needs. Your program should still be relevant and based in experiences of the individuals who are coming to your program. So, you need to find out from them about that.

You know they're there because -- they're a captive audience, they have to be there. But, are your services relevant to them? Are you talking about the things that they need to hear? Holding them accountable, but dealing -- I mean, if you're dealing with men of color, are you talking about racism and oppression, and other things that they experience in their daily lives that intersect with the violence that they're perpetrating?

I mean, your program still needs to be relevant, and you still need to meet the needs of the individuals who come, regardless of whether or not they have to be there.

And, that's something that you can find out through your process evaluation. You want to know how are we doing it, which is different from what Eleanor is going to get to, and what is ultimately the outcome of what we're doing.

Are we even doing what we said we're supposed to be doing? I mean, that's key -- for example, in link to your goals, because you find a lot of programs, they say their goal is to end domestic violence -- if you're not doing anything with batterers, how is your goal to end domestic violence, if these men are the ones who are perpetrating violence? It sounds simplistic, but those are things that people don't think about when they're developing their programs, or you come into a program. With process evaluation, you can start getting at those types of issues.

...: Can I ask one question?

MS. LYON: Sure.

...: I'm coming from the law enforcement background, and when you're talking about how the women are feeling (about) our services. We're operating under a mandatory arrest and _____ arrest environment. So, a lot of times we feel we're meeting our goals and objectives, because our arrest numbers, and our conviction rates are up, based on Evan's(?) -based prosecution. But, we're having some clients who are not happy with us going forward with Evan's-based prosecution.

MS. LYON: Right.

...: So, we have some women who are very, very happy, and then we have some women who are very angry that we run with Evan's based, with the razor(?) blade, that he had to -- and with the 9-1-1, with the bloody clothes. We went forward with the Evan's based anyway, securing conviction -- she was absolutely outraged that we would dare to do that, because he just needed some help.

...: But, in law enforcement, we're not going to always have a satisfactory evaluation from probably half of our clients. Half of our women seem to appreciate the fact that the laws are operating the way they are, and the other half seem to think that we're interfering in their personal lives, when we're making arrests.

MS. PARMLEY: Can I address that? We call this -- and, I mean it's just the term that's being thrown around, procedural justice. Basically, there's a distinction to be made between how they feel about the services you provide, and the service you provide. There's a clear distinction, because women may not be happy that you have mandatory arrest -- and given probable cause and evidence, we're going to make an arrest -- but, how you do that will make a tremendous difference. I mean, if you in, if you're disrespectful to the women, to the children, to the people who are in the household, if you ignore what the women are

saying, etcetera, then they may be dissatisfied with the process, and with what you're doing. You can find that women may say, "Well, I really didn't want my partner to be arrested. What I wanted, was the violence to stop, but I understand your position, and I respected the way you handled my case." So, you can look at that. When they can be satisfied with how you do your job, even if they don't agree with what you have to do.

...: Initially, yes, we have very happy clients. It's when we, through the court systems, refuse to drop the charges -- you know, the same women who have been in my office, very happy, initially, sincerely grateful that we've intervened, because our officers are trained a lot on how to -- we don't have initial complaints, it's when, toward the end, the state's attorney, and the judge, and the officers, and everyone saying, we can't just drop this -- you know, we have hospital records, we have his statement, we have your statement, we have the witnesses, we have the clothing, and every -- we can't just drop this, we have now made a felony, we are going forward. That's when the dissatisfaction comes in, down the road, in my experience, when she is no longer is in control of the process.

MS. LYON: Okay, and you may have then, multiple measures, which say, she was unhappy with it, and we got a prosecution -- and, the goal of our program was to have an effective

prosecution, which led to a conviction. However, that as a policy, is still something that needs to be tested further, and it's important that we know that there are people whose lives may not necessarily have been helped, from their perspective, by having gone through that process. That's useful information -- Stephanie?

MS. RIGER: I was going to say, as part of the evaluation, you can ask, what did you want to happen, and then you can look -- you can divide your responses, and look at those who wanted a prosecution to happen, and see how satisfied they were, and those who didn't want it.

...: That's a very good idea. It's just that we're in a catch-22, because if we were to allow her to control the process during the entire phase, there's a point of no return. We give consideration to what our alternatives are, and a lot of women can sign refusals to prosecute them, and we can give some weight to their situations.

In law enforcement, you have to protect them, sometimes when they don't want to be protected based on his background, the history of violence -- and so, at some point -- if we don't follow through, then if something happens to her, we're in a catch 22. So, that's a good idea, I would appreciate that comment.

...: I can remember the Health and Human Services Act(?) -- I automatically start thinking, in addition to legal

indicators, things such as numbers of arrests, (inaudible) to drinking. _____ orders were given -- and, we would look at the psycho/social impact of it. Okay, that's where the satisfaction(?) comes in, that's (inaudible).

What kind of measures are you looking at? Are you looking at the change in their social (inaudible)? Are you looking at things that are psychologically (sneeze) (Inaudible.)

MS. LYON: Yeah, and we'll get to some of those issues, when we talk about considerations in design. But, I think one of the things that this is all pointing out very clearly is that what your measuring relates to the goals that you have. And, I think we all here, would advocate that effective program planning to provide an improvement in people's lives involves the involvement of the people that you're working with, and the establishment of program goals to begin with. So, then there wouldn't be necessarily that kind of division between the organization, and the people who are receiving services, perhaps.

So, that's another kind of consideration of involving people who are going to receive the services, and the planning in of -- and, the organization of the services, and the identification of the goals for the program.

...: (Inaudible) question to what she just stated -- they offered a battery program, (inaudible) person that you would

want, that you want a reflection of how that man is doing is from his partner. And, that realization sometimes doesn't come until six months, or a year after he's out of the parole unit(?). So, the question is, how do you keep track of that program, or how do you keep track of, what if he changes partners?

I mean, that's one of the problems that I see in my program is, how do we maintain contact with the partner -- every man leaves the program for -- to actually get an evaluation -- how are we doing it?

MS. LYON: That's a complex -- does anyone have a 25 words, or less answer to that? Stephanie?

MS. RIGER: Offer to pay people for an interview, six months down the road, get a lot of contact information from them, find out names of their -- you know, with their permission, ask them for names of a family member you can contact to locate them. Give them a card with your name, and phone number, etcetera, of where you'll be in six months. But, the most important thing is to offer them a significant amount of money to an interview, at this point. (Laughter.)
...: (Inaudible.) (Laughter.)

MS. LYON: The major funders, when there are -- evaluation components, or evaluation research do, in fact, often encourage incentives, out of respect for the time of the people that you're going to be talking to. So, yeah,

funding can be available -- and, there are additional strategies, people have tried one, eight hundred numbers, a lot of other things, but it's a matter of ongoing contact. And then, that gets into other ethical kinds of considerations, too.

So, I think that maybe we need to sort of move on here. We will all be real happy to talk, and we have a half-hour break to talk about more specific, and more complex kinds of individual issues. So, if it's all right, just to sort of continue quickly.

Some of the other experiences with services might be, did you receive relevant information -- some of the issues that we've just talked about. Would you use this service again? Would you recommend it to someone that you cared about, as a good way of finding out whether they found it helpful?

Process evaluation can also look at the experience of staff and volunteers, and that's important for the ongoing life of any program. The work that we do is very often difficult, and if it's organized in such a way that burnout hits us really quickly, than that's also something that we need to know.

Is the way that our service is organized something that makes the people, who provide this service, really grumpy, or quick to make judgements about people? And then, we need

to know about that. So, it's important to include the experience of people who are providing services. It will also provide information about barriers to services, and how you can improve services. So, those are some of the kinds of issues that you can address through process evaluation.

Outcome evaluation looks at the program's impact on clients and their problems, or on particular behavior, knowledge, or opinions. So, if it's an outcome of a training, it might have to do with knowledge and attitudes. If it's outcome of services --

(End of recording on side A. Turned tape over to side B.)

MS. LYON: -- what degree of support you felt, but they are generally measurable. They need to be realistic, and that's probably the hardest thing. We've already alluded to that, so that they need to be connected to clear goals and objectives for the program.

Having realistic outcomes can be incredibly also good for staff, because as the process of developing realistic goals and objectives for the program goes forward it can reduce burnout, because then, unrealistic expectations are not set in motion. It can help to deal with some of the feelings that many of us have, that we need to save, or rescue people if they're in danger -- and, that's one of those big sources of burnout. So, if goals and outcome

measures are realistic, in fact, that can help with the continuity of the program.

In other words, an end to violence is probably not realistic, so that you feel really frustrated if you haven't. And yet, people still design programs saying, we're going to end violence, or we're going to make all battered women safe, we're going to change old batterers, or 90 percent of batterers, and that kind of thing. We'll get back to that in a moment.

Outcomes have to be linked to what your program does, the activities that you engage in. Very often, particularly in criminal justice, people will say, we're going to have an increase in the percentage of women who press charges. One of the things that you need to keep in mind is that it's prosecutors who proceed with charges, it's not women who press charges; so, just that kind of language -- that's not a realistic goal, women do not engage in that. And certainly, it may not be that it's in her best interest, that may not be her goal -- another set of issues. And, outcomes can be short, or long term. All of that means that what you're looking at in measuring outcome, is change. A program induces change. So, you can say, women will have more information about resources, women will feel that they have more ability to do the things that they want with their lives -- that's a little bit grandiose -- that their goals,

for themselves, were met. Women felt safer, women felt like they had more options in their lives.

You can talk about change in beliefs, about change in attitudes. I think one of the things, before we move on -- sort of the final thing is that I think it's important to include, again, women in the process. One of the things that we used to see a lot in evaluations is that x-percent of women, at the end of our program, will leave their partners. We've subsequently learned (that) this may well not be the goal of many women. It assumes that leaving their partner will make her safer -- and, to set that as a goal disregards what many women in the program will want, so it's important to include them in the process. And, with that, I'll turn this over to Anu.

MS. SHARMA: What I'm going to do, is talk about evaluation in context, and some issues around inclusivity.

In my introduction, I forgot to mention that the insights that I'm going to be sharing with you, come from previous work done at the Centers for Disease Control, in Atlanta, on some of the issues and standards that exist for measurement, and how those don't -- sometimes, what gets privileged in a research setting, may not be what -- in an advocacy setting, speaks to realities of battered women's experiences and lives. Also, in terms of other federal-level work, there's been an effort in terms of designing

some kind of data collection -- consolidated data collection form for Violence Against Women work, and in those conversations, again, the issues around representation and how we capture information that speaks to different ethnic and racial groups, as well as different groups of battered women that tend to be more, or less on the margins of the movement itself, as well as in terms of just as we do research, some of those efforts.

There's also healthy people, 2010, which is developing a set of objectives for the nation. All of those efforts have informed what I'm going to speak to you about today. As well as, I'm taking a bit more of an activist stand, in terms of what evaluation is about. And, some of that comes from organizing that I've done within the Public Health Association around fighting some of the biases and racist practices in research that sometimes derive from some of the privilege of being within the institution of research, and not taking the stand to challenge each other around looking at the complexities regarding race, and class, and gender, and a number of those intersections.

Currently, I have recently left the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, where I did look at a number of different groups -- I worked with a number of different groups of battered women's advocates, and survivors in a number of areas, such as Battered Women's Disabilities,

different groups of Battered Women of Color -- and, I'll talk to you later also, about the issues around compartmentalizing women in some ways that then negate certain other aspects of their identity. But, it is -- as a starting point, at least, an important piece to begin to start to pull together some of these different axes of privilege and marginalization that we may, at first glance, not really go into as much detail, as perhaps we should; otherwise, we only privilege experiences of certain battered women.

Currently, I'm focusing my work in the development of an Asian Institute on Domestic Violence, and the research and evaluation agenda for that. So, all of these conversations have informed a bit more of a political sense of what evaluation is about, who needs to be included in this process -- and, I take the term, inclusion, a little bit further, as well as really what is that stake, if we don't do the work in this way.

I wanted to start of by saying that the very act of defining, or creating categories, or creating measures of success -- and, we alluded to some of that earlier, in our Fears piece, really is an act of privilege. So, when I say, what is evaluation, what is not evaluation, what I'm doing really here is not saying that myself, or any of us are the persons to define that, but I'm challenging us actually, as

advocates -- and, I did see a number of hands in the room, in terms of advocates -- to remember our charge, in terms of being a movement that moves, that is not in stasis, that wants to carry us further, in terms of our visions regarding equity, and equality, and so forth. So, I'd like to challenge us to think of new ways to think about how we can use some of these tools that we're talking about here, to move ourselves into places that we would like to be.

Evaluation as a tool, and research as a tool, do give us a certain amount of skill, but by limiting ourselves to what's defined for us, in terms of research and evaluation, we may be -- for example, this is a tool that comes out of certain professions, such as mental health -- certain ways of looking at information, that may not speak to some of the complex realities.

I was going to start off -- taking you completely away from violence against women, not completely, but -- looking at a use of evaluation, which I'm going to sort of broadly talk to you about what could look sort of at activist, or political use of statistics and evaluations.

I'm going to just give you -- just to think about this a little bit. Progress in the art world is one where, it's built on a lot of exclusivity, there's a bit of a sense of it being a country club, it's a who knows who type of a world. The presence of women in the art world, in major

galleries, and in shows, and museums, and so forth, as well as artists of color is very much one that is based on privilege and exclusion. A group of women activists, who are artists, and women of color, and artists of color, got together in the 80s, and really started a type of a movement to kind of combat some of what was going on. I'd like to encourage us to think about how this might be useful to us, as advocates in a movement, moving toward change. Some of you may be familiar with this group of women, they are -- I'll just give you a little sense of who they are. I think it's interesting also, they do this in a mast way, because to challenge an institution that has such a strength, in some ways, that's based on certain axes of privilege and exclusivity, becomes a very difficult process, because we have to respond to so many issues, like funding, and all of those. So, they've taken this stand there, they're known as the gorilla girls, and they've taken the approach of really trying to fight sexism and racism in the art world. So, this is just very much to simplify what -- some of what they've done is -- look at, for example, statistics -- these are some basic statistics, in terms of women that in the year 1989, and artists of color in '89 to '90. They basically, by promoting this -- promoting just even using statistics -- this is an evaluation, this is just a strategic use of statistics, where they've really showed

ways in which some of these galleries have really not been representative of women and artists of color.

Just to differentiate a little bit between that and what moves us a little bit further toward evaluation, conceptually, is this piece, which they did. They took, for example, Leo Costelli Gallery, four women artists -- and then, they went down, three -- not paying attention. They make very humorous, but pointed points, in terms of what's really going on. I think that's part of what I think we should be thinking about when we do evaluations -- I mean, we may not be putting up these postcards, but to really think about looking at what's really going on in our systems, how we may be developing processes of exclusion, and how we may be thinking about looking at a change.

In this piece, they've articulated in a way that we're going to look at the representation of women of color, over time. And then, they're putting a commenting of that failing here, underachiever -- you know, making excellent progress, and I think that's really at the heart of what we need to be thinking about, when we're doing evaluations. So, that's just -- someone who mentioned earlier, in terms of statistics, sometimes evaluations seem like a lot of statistics -- I think what I'm trying to point out here, also, is that evaluations use statistics as a basis, to then try to frame certain issues in ways that we can then come up

with some kind of conclusion that can then help us promote some kind of change.

So, my hope in that piece was to get you to think a little bit more creatively, and a little bit more in terms of the activist role that we all share.

Back to the traditional, sort of looks at what evaluation is, versus what basic research is -- statistics, I think, informs both evaluations and basic research. Evaluation is a part of what we call as applied research. And, basic research, the way that I've seen represented mostly, is about explaining certain phenomenon, or causes, or really the creation of a certain amount of knowledge; whereas, evaluation has certain practical aspects in sort of -- it's purposefully developed to perhaps resolve social problems, to perhaps alter phenomenon -- and, the people most affected by evaluations are, as we've talked earlier here, people -- individuals, women, survivors, who use programs, women who do not use programs -- and, it really has that very practical aspect of it, which really, I think, underscores why it is such a political piece, evaluation, and it really makes us look at -- when an evaluation is done, is it done with the self interest of a funder, or a program, or is it done with a collective interest of all the people that should and could be involved? And, is it done to sort of maintain a certain status quo, or is it done to

move us in a direction of change?

Since there is a reality of evaluations being used in local, state, and national levels to inform the funding processes, and policy, and practices, it's really important to understand how reinforcing the kinds of privilege, and the structures of privilege that exist can affect what we determine as important in the evaluation process.

Some of what can happen, without being inclusive -- and, I'm going to talk more about inclusivity -- is we can start to set certain criteria, and standards, and rules, and policies, which then don't speak to realities of all women. We can create images of whose valued in the process, of who should be served -- or, shouldn't like the term serve -- but, who programs should work with. And, we affect the type of access that women could have to programs.

Some of the women that I have been working with had talked about how some of the mental health goals and objectives have become quite a barrier to women's being able to access services, because it becomes such a burden on women to perform all these -- battered women are already doing so much in their lives, then having to meet all these expectations, and these goals and objectives coming from another, almost discipline, that's not so much advocacy based, sets them up in ways that hinder them going back to programs, and seem to think very critically about how we set

up these measures.

What's really at stake, is that by not including women -- women of color, immigrant women, migrant women, women with disabilities, older women, poor women, young women, queer, LGBT persons -- by not including many different women in the process -- and, I'm not talking about it in a tokenized(?) way, but really building some collective strength, in terms of the input that goes into this process. It perpetuates an invisibility, an invisibility to the needs that exist within these communities. Just in the conceptualization and design of programs, there's an invisibility of these issues. Then, that translates also into the impact, because then we're not able to assess whether or not we really have made any impact in these areas.

This came up a little bit earlier, too, but another thing that's at stake is the further dehumanizing of populations and people who are then -- I've been in research settings where an entire group of people of color, poor people have been referred to as a catchment area, and we should be mindful in how -- if we are perhaps creating our own terms -- as we are linking our advocacy with certain research and evaluation processes, be careful in terms of the language, and how we may perpetuate certain biases against certain groups of people, just in the language that

we use. Which, it's different to stop at language then, because it just, again, further says that it's okay to marginalize these people, and not think of them as human, and then not treat them as human, and then not have the space to work together.

Then, historically, within the movement -- this is something Val Kanua(?) has written about, sort of the good and deserving battered women, and the not so good battered women, which then are women who are poor, women who are prostitutes, certain women of color -- and, I think we really need to be careful in how we design evaluations, that we do not create them in ways that are so exclusive?

I think this calls into question then, our ethics around evaluation. One of the things that one of the state administrators has told me -- and, I've heard it throughout the working groups that I had developed at the NRC, was that the evaluations can -- by developing these standards that are exclusive, they can institutionalize further a process, which some of you may be familiar with, called the creaming process, where some of the most complicated cases -- not cases -- women of the most complex set of situations, whether it's immigration, and welfare, and -- some of the most complicated situations can be termed as, not best able to succeed with what our program offers -- which would mean, women then -- the standards of evaluation can set it up, so

that we institutionalize a further racist bias, and other kinds of bias against women that may not be the easiest ones to work with. So, we have to be mindful in terms of how we characterize -- I think, in some ways, we're heading toward some of what's happening in the health care field, where there's a need to produce numbers, and to produce high numbers, you can't deal with complexity, and take the time that's important. So, I think as advocates, we need to (cough) -- but, I think as advocates, we need to do a little bit of digging our heels in, and talk about how much of this process -- I'm not saying that we don't want to do evaluation, but I'm saying we need to really carefully think through. As we embark on this process, what information will we gain, and what really is at stake, and what will help us, and what will not help us.

The last point, in this section, is really about being careful of how -- and, it follows into the next section -- how maintaining structures and hierarchies is really facilitated by the way in which we develop evaluations.

(Background conversation.)

One of the things that I wanted to bring up also, is that how we, as the battered women's movement, and people in the world of evaluation and research, and so forth, how we confer expertise on people, what it means to be a sort of a national expert, or how we confer that kind of expertise.

What's the culture of experts, whether it's within the movement, or whether it's in who are evaluators, and so forth. I think it's really important for us to begin to look at expanding that notion, in terms of who -- people who are -- I think something you've spoken to, as well -- local -- the evaluators who are in a local community, and who may know the community, and have perhaps, a working knowledge of many of the different issues, I think it's important for us to try to expand whose included in the evaluation process, so that we're not just creating a set of few experts, but we're expanding that -- and, not really even labeling it as experts, but as partnerships that occur. Stephanie will be talking more about the collaborative aspects of this.

The other piece that I wanted to tell you about a little bit, is that there are some various approaches to evaluation, it's not always the case that you hire one evaluator, it's possible to hire an evaluator -- maybe, on-site, or off-site, maybe connected to the program, or not connected to the program, but is one who could just provide a lot of guidance to the process, and basically orchestrate the process in certain ways. Another approach is to have one, which is participatory, and very much inclusive of many different perspectives, including women of color, and other marginalized groups of women. That process begins to foster much more of a participation on the part of people in this

project, and involves many different stakeholders.

Then, the centered piece though, is a step further, in which it's known as empowerment evaluation, which really fosters not only participation, but somewhat of an ownership of the process of evaluation, as well as does some capacity building, in terms of allowing this evaluation process to be one which also teaches what evaluation is, and allows the use of evaluation skills to be something that can continue through the participants in the program, and so forth. So, I think there are some various different ways of thinking about an evaluation, as opposed to looking at one person to come in and do the evaluation, versus almost a process where -- it's a learning process, and eventually the process becomes owned by the program, and the skills of the people in the program increase to do this evaluation. And, the evaluator's skills increase in understanding the advocacy work that programs are doing.

Finally, another area in evaluation is, not so much to look at evaluation as a sort of final report on the status of the program, and what's working, and what's not, but also to look at it as a tool for negotiation, in terms of the politics that I spoke to earlier, that evaluations, particularly when findings may be ones that are problematic for programs, as they currently exist, but that evaluations can serve as a tool for negotiating, and bringing people

together, and having the discussions, and perhaps making some of that change. It's similar, in a sense, to having advocates on board on community coordinated responses, and councils, and so forth. I think it's important to see this as a negotiation process, as opposed to the distance between who's evaluated, and who's evaluating.

I think I'll make just a couple more points, and then I'll pass it on. I think there are some issues around when we talk about inclusivity, what shape that's supposed to take -- is that supposed to look like we've got one woman of color, or two -- or an immigrant woman, or a native woman -- we really need to look at how we may be setting up these structures, that we think are inclusive. I think it's very critical -- and, I've seen this in my own experience -- to build some kind of strength, for people to come together around their ideas that make sense for particular communities, and create the space for that, because sometimes we get caught up -- and, I've seen this on the national level -- we got caught up in 15-to-20 people work groups. If that's not supported by a set of networks that can facilitate the kind of critical thinking that needs to happen, we may set ourselves up in ways that we have people at the table, but they're not really able to be fully at the table, because they don't have the support of larger networks. So, I think I'm saying to question what it means

to be at the table, or even have a table. I'm also asking us to question our role as advocates for change, and developing evaluations that don't marginalize, or continuant further marginalize certain women that I think were trying to move, as a movement, toward being more inclusive.

The final point is -- it gets back to the capacity building of advocates and programs that there are advocates of color, who have -- in the work that I've done -- who have many other skills, beyond being a front-line advocate, and I think sometimes, we women -- particular Latino women, and other -- I mean, they're from Asia, let me know -- get limited to being on the front lines -- although, it's very challenging and rewarding -- because there's such a need to be there, but there hasn't been developed ways to sort of dismantle some of those structures and hierarchies that keep women in certain places within the movement. I see that translating also to the way in which we develop evaluations, and the structures of who does evaluations, and how evaluations are done, and who's included.

So, I put all these thoughts out as challenges -- some of which I may have answers to, and some of which I may not. But, I think it's important for us all to think about. So, thank you.

MS. LYON: (I'm) going to, quickly, very quickly go through the basic steps involved in an evaluation. Ideally, one of

the major points to be gained from this is that, ideally, it's a kind of feedback loop that you have some information that you collect -- that information is used to improve the program. You make some changes in the program, you then look at the impact of those changes. It's a kind of ideally ongoing process. So that each part in the process informs the next part.

The first thing that you need to is to identify the reason for the evaluation and its audience. For many of you, it may be because the funder said we had to do it. In that case, well, that's one reason. Hopefully, you can figure out that while we're being requested to do this, there are things that we can do, that we can sort of turn it into something that is useful for us, so that we have our own reasons, we have our own questions that we would like to see answered out of this. And, in that case, you might have multiple audiences.

There are some sort of guidelines, in general, that are useful to keep in mind. First of all that you're capable of answering some questions -- that your program is developed, or has the capacity to be able to answer some questions that the audience might have. It's not a good idea to do an evaluation if it's an excuse to postpone decisions -- or, if you have no questions that you want answers to, or that you're not fully functional, in which case, you may not want

to do an outcome evaluation, but you might want to do a process evaluation to try to identify where the problems lie. When I say that, that's sort of abstract language, but I'm doing an evaluation of some changes that are being implemented in three courts, within my state, and in two of those courts, the changes have been implemented. In the third court, they've had all kinds of political problems -- they've had changes in judges, they've had changes in the prosecution, they've had turnover among the advocates. They are supposed to identify particular people who are -- particular defendants, who have been arrested for a domestic violence crime, and their partners, for extra attention from the court. But, they have defined those people that they want to pay attention to in different ways, every couple of months, so that it's ongoingly changing. So, in the context of all of that turmoil, what I have done is to implement the evaluation in the other two courts, where there's some stability in agreement about what they're doing. In other words, they have a program that is being implemented. And, I've delayed, until there is more stability, in implementing the evaluation in the third court, because you would find that you didn't know what your results meant, because they were changing, all the people were changing, the philosophy was changing, the people that they were providing services to were changing all the time, and so, it would not be a

meaningful thing to do.

So, it's helpful, if you're going to be focusing on outcome evaluation, to actually have a program that is functioning before you do it. So, they always say that if you're developing a new program, it's good to do some process evaluation for a time first, to achieve some stability, and then move onto an outcome evaluation. That may seem like, yeah -- it took researchers a long time to figure this out, but that's important, and it's something that's easily overlooked.

I was told to evaluate some programs in juvenile court that were just getting started. They didn't even have their staff hired, and everything else. I said, "This is a lousy idea. You should wait a year before you do this evaluation." They wanted to do it for their own reasons, and so we went ahead. And then they said, "But, wait a second, those programs weren't fully operational yet." I said, "Yeah, I told you that from the beginning." At any rate, so that's an important consideration.

You need also to think about the possible impact on your audience, of sharing the findings. So that sometimes, it could lead to increased public awareness about a program that you're not prepared to handle. And so, perhaps that's not a good time to do the evaluation, or it's not a good time to be releasing the findings, until you are able to

deal with the likely impact on those you share them with.

Clarifying goals and objectives, Stephanie will give you some good examples of that -- of how she worked that out, in part two. But, that's really absolutely key -- and again, the inclusion issues are critical in that.

Determining the measures -- many of you already have -- most of you have some kinds of measures that you're using, and those can be useful in a variety of ways. You're collecting demographic information probably, you're collecting something about the life circumstances of the people that you're serving. Maybe you're collecting some information about the types of violence or abuse that -- you're probably collecting some information about the types and numbers of services in those kinds of things. Those are all kinds of factors that can affect other changes that you're going to introduce, or may be things that will change. So, those are important parts, and you're already part way in doing an evaluation.

There are lots of different data sources that you can use, and all have their strengths and weaknesses. I have my biases -- every researcher has their biases about the kinds of data that they like, but I would probably say that a combination of kinds of information make for the strongest evaluation. So, you can use program records, you can use external data sources like official documents, so you can

incorporate those -- like, the numbers of arrests, or that kind of thing into an evaluation. You can create your own survey, or questionnaire. There are many that are standardized, that you may want to think about. And, if you're doing a more complex evaluation, and you feel that you want to involve an outside evaluator, then that person probably knows about what are the best, what are the shortest, what are the most valid, and reliable, and recognized, most credible kinds of surveys that already exist out there. You don't have to reinvent the wheel, it depends on what kinds of issues you're trying to measure, which will be useful.

There's something that has become sort of popular, it's the Stage of Change model. That is a very extensive kind of survey questionnaire that looks at -- that's based on the principle that people make changes in their lives going through different stages of recognizing an issue, identifying it as a problem, weighing alternatives, going through lots of different stages. And, that applies to battered women and abusive men, as well.

...: How do we access those types of forms?

MS. LYON: Well, there's one -- the Stage of Change model has been reproduced in -- I think, it's the *Journal of Family Violence*. One of the people who's working with it is a researcher in Rhode Island, called Jody Brown, and I can

get you that information. I know that the National Institute of Justice has become interested in the possible use of this Stages of Change model with battering men, but there are lots of others -- that's a fairly long one, and a fairly complicated one. That's an issue that you want to think about in evaluation, is how much time -- you know, the literacy level of the people who are going to be completing something. Do you have time to read, do you have a staff or volunteers who can read something to a person, then there are confidentiality issues -- I mean, so there are lots of complex things that are involved, but the length is certainly one? And, do you need to have a long instrument?

There's Women's Experience of Battering, which is a 10-item questionnaire, which is getting a fair amount of recognition these days. It's been developed at the University of South Carolina -- and again, simply 10 questions, but it really looks at the difference that we've talked about here, between somebody hitting, and somebody being battered. I mean, it's the whole notion of, women hit, and so, women are just as abusive as men, because actually on the conflict tactic scale, they actually strike people from time to time, but it's different than the level of fear and intimidation. This 10-item questionnaire gets at the issue of the fear and intimidation, rather than the counts -- the numbers of hits, or uses of domestic violence

-- Stephanie?

MS. RIGER: I wanted to tell you about another resource, which is Chris Sullivan, at Michigan State University, put together a manual --

...: Yes.

MS. RIGER: -- that tells a little bit about evaluation, but also includes measures to evaluate things like shelter programs, and counseling, and so on.

MS. LYON: You can get that by contacting the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. That's a manual that is for sale -- she wrote it for them, and collaboratively with them. Very important, the process of writing this manual was an extensive one, and I think it's an extremely useful one.

...: Are there any models out there for measuring community education?

MS. LYON: That's a little in the earlier stages of development, do you?

...: I know that CVC(?) is doing a lot more work about an area they're trying to -- they have a project they've been working on the data element, that they're working on. I know it's not complete yet. I've seen different drafts, and made comments to the president(?). But, they had more going on in that area, than they usually do in the _____ area.

Both projects' address is on one of those green

handouts, and you can -- or, you can contact them by phone, if you don't have a _____ address, and they can tell you where they are with that project. They may have some of the stuff already on-line, but I know that -- as Eleanor pointed out, that is -- we're Johnny come lately, when it comes to looking at that. So, we're in development in the Brown(?) Community education.

...: So, they might be looking for some communities (inaudible).

MS. LYON: Yes, if you want to volunteer as a pilot site, yes. Anu?

MS. SHARMA: I wanted to add also, that the Milwaukee Women's Center just got a CVC funding project to look at public awareness on some things. And, I think recently, the fifth step to specialty grants also could have public education grants, which people have, I think, reviewed in reports, for now. So, there will be more on that from the Family Violence Special Services book, who would get(?) funding. And, CVC is also doing a lot of work in terms of education in schools, and prevention efforts around teen dating violence, and so forth, which is another area of public education, I think, that is coming up with some results.

...: Great, thank you. What's the name of the manual?

MS. LYON: What is the name of the manual? Ask for Chris

Sullivan's manual on evaluation and right to peace -- violence programs, something like that. It's very specific to domestic violence programs.

...: Isn't that in the resource center, here?

MS. LYON: Excuse me?

...: I don't know if it's in this one.

...: If anyone's interested in it, do you want to give me your name, I can mail you the brochure, and you can order it. It's an Alcock(?) manual.

MS. LYON: Yes, it is.

...: It's got the measures in the _____ program.

MS. LYON: Outcome Measure and Domestic Violence programs.

...: What's the number?

MS. LYON: The number is 1-800-537-2238. (Laughter.) Not that I'm familiar with them at all.

Just a couple of additional -- I know that we're at the end of the time for part one. Part two will get into much more concrete examples, but just to sort of -- a quick overview of some of the additional consideration that we've come up with -- one is when you're going to collect the information -- at the beginning, at the end, multiple times. Who you're going to collect the information from -- for example, in our court process, we have dual arrest that occurs, so we have to make a decision whether we are -- when we collect data from what, in the legal system are called

victims of domestic violence, whether we're including men and women, how do we define that? Do we base it on what the police report actually said, about what was actually done, those kinds of things? So, those can be much more complicated. Who are you going to collect the information from -- do you use everybody, or do you use a sample? Who's going to collect the information? So, collecting information -- having men collect information from women can be tricky. So, those are our potentially sensitive issues.

Literacy considerations, and making sure that the level of education, and the language that's used is appropriate, and is understood, as you meant it. Issues of the relevance of the question, based on age, race, ethnicity, culture, so that the meaning of particular questions varies across different groups.

Making sure that all people who are receiving services, or should be receiving services are included, and that it's accessible to everyone. So, I think that testing the system is particularly important.

So, with that, we'll stop part one. Part two, again, will be much more specific. Thanks very much.

(End of recording on side B.)