

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 II, #247)

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

Document No.: 184568

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.

184568

**THE NEXT MILLENNIUM CONFERENCE
Ending Domestic Violence
Evaluation 101 (Part II, #247)
Monday, August 30, 1999**

**Page 1
BOS:das**

...: How many people, here now, were in this room in the previous session? I should actually ask, how many people were not?

What may not have been clear from the program, was that this is actually the second half of a three-hour session. You're welcome to stay -- you probably won't have any trouble keeping up, but if you want, you could buy this tape for the first half, if you want to hear our general introduction to evaluation. I'll try to give a little bit of that in what I'm talking about, but I'm not going to give too much of it.

We also had some handouts, and we're out of the handouts that Angela Moore Parmley, who is this lady standing right there, has graciously offered to take names and addresses of anybody who wants the handouts, and she will send them to you.

AMP: I will pass two sheets -- if I don't get them back, then I won't send anybody anything. (Laughter.) So, if you could just put -- write legibly, so that the contractor can read it, and he can make the copies, and get it all mailed out to you all -- for those you who didn't get the materials.

Put your name, and address, and anything else -- E-mail

-- a lot of this, I have on-line, so I could possibly send it to you that way, if you would like. But otherwise, I will just mail you the hard copy.

MS. RIGER: Is it going to be okay if I just talk, or would you prefer that I use the microphone?

AMP: You don't have an option, Stephanie, because it's taped. (Laughter.) It's taped.

MS. RIGER: Never mind.

AMP: But, you can -- I think you can sort of clip that onto your pocket.

MS. RIGER: I'll clip it onto my other thing that's clipped on. (Background conversation.)

As you can tell from this, I'm a very low-tech kind of person. I'm going to be using overheads, but we'll all hope that works out okay.

My name is Stephanie Riger -- for those of you who weren't here before, I am a professor of Psychology in Women Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, where I direct the Women Studies program.

I am also working with a group of people -- we refer to ourselves as a team, to sort of energize, give the impression that we're energetic and enthusiastic -- a team of people at University of Illinois at Chicago, who are doing an evaluation of all of the state-funded Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault programs in the state.

We are working with 87 agencies, developing generic evaluation measures, and an evaluation plan, that can be used in all of those agencies. And, let me tell you right now, it's really hard to do that.

I'm going to be talking a little bit about what we're doing, how we're doing it, why we're doing it, but I'm especially going to be talking about some of the difficulties we've encountered, and how we've gotten around those difficulties -- except that I've cleverly lost the page on which I had written down all the difficulties -- am I still on microphone? -- but, I will find it.

What I'm giving you in these overheads, are the overheads that we've used in the training sessions with people from these 87 agencies. So, these overheads were not done for this conference, they were done for the session -- and, I'll tell you why we said what we did on here.

Who are we? The USC evaluation team. We went around and introduced ourselves, and one key thing is that all of the people working on this, who are now connected with University of Illinois at Chicago, at some point we're on the other side of the fence -- at some point, we're service providers. I think that's really important in terms of gaining trust and acceptance. It doesn't mean that every evaluator has to be, but it made it easier, because we can't establish close relationships with 87 agencies --

especially, because some of them are really far away. But, at least we're aware of the issues, and we're aware of their concerns.

Why we're doing this is because the State of Illinois, Department of Human Services, started to do strategic planning for all of the services they offer. And as part of strategic planning, they wanted to do evaluations -- they wanted to develop evaluation plans for all the services they offer. So, there are other people doing evaluations of drug abuse services, there are other people who are doing evaluations of infant mortality -- programs to reduce infant mortality, etcetera. And, domestic violence happened to be a set of programs that the state wanted evaluated.

When we said to the state people, some of whom were at this conference, "Why do you want to evaluate them?" what they said is, "We go to the state legislature, and we ask them for more money for domestic violence services, and they say to us, "How do you know what you're doing is doing any good? How can we justify to the taxpayers, giving you more money?" So, that was what the state said. And, that's of course what we told the people who we were working with, in evaluating. They of course said, "Yeah sure, what they really want to do is cut our funding. This is going to be used to punish us," etcetera, etcetera. We've had endless conversation that that's not the intention.

We even had the person high up in the bureaucracy of the Department of Human Services send a letter to each of the 87 agencies, assuring them that their funding will not be cut as a result of the information that comes out of the evaluation. They are required to participate in the evaluation, but the findings are to be used for service improvement. Everybody got that letter, and they said, "Yeah sure, they really want to cut our funding," etcetera. (Laughter.)

I think that if the state really wanted to cut their funding, they would just cut their funding. They don't need evaluation data to cut funding. So, that's one of my responses. I, of course, am not going to be affected if their funding gets cut, because I'm at the university -- I have tenure, etcetera, etcetera.

So, I think that, as far as trust goes, we're going to have to come back to this issue two years down the road. And, when it is clear that no ones funding is cut as a result of the evaluation, people will then believe me. But, we've done as much as we can to try to convince people of that.

What happens next, we outlined what we were doing -- and what we did in this evaluation was try to work collaboratively with 87 agencies, which is a really big challenge. We used surveys a lot, we used conferences, we

used focus groups, we used E-mail a lot. We used every means of communication we could to try to get their participation.

So, the first thing we did, was said to them -- the state wanted us to evaluate services, so I'm skipping a bit of the step that Eleanor talked about, when she said you should identify what your goals are. We didn't do a lot of work in identifying goals; although, I would say in general, generic goals were number one, to increase women's safety. And number two, to reduce the trauma of victimization -- those were really the two goals.

Notice that we did not have, as a goal, reducing the amount of domestic violence through this. As somebody said earlier, that really depends on perpetrators. We were specifically not asked to evaluate perpetrator programs, some other people are doing that -- we're just evaluating services.

So, we wrote to all the programs, and we sent them a survey and we said, "Which services do you want us to evaluate?" We got a very low response, but the ones that sent us back the survey were very clear. There are several services that people are required to offer in Illinois, in order to get funding, those are the ones they wanted to evaluate.

We chose not to evaluate certain other things that we

could have evaluated -- for example, children's programs. Children's programs are really hard to evaluate in a generic sense -- and remember, we had to develop a plan for 87 agencies -- because, your program depends on the age of the kids. If you're doing a program for five-year-olds, it's real different from a program for 15-year-olds, you can't use the same evaluation tools. And, children's programs are one are where people do really different things; these 87 agencies did very different things. With respect to children's programs, telephone crisis lines, on the other hand, all look more or less alike. Counseling looks more or less alike. Shelter, more or less alike. Children's programs are all over the board.

Now, one of the services that we did decide to evaluate, because people really wanted us to, was advocacy. Advocacy has given us terrible problems, to evaluate. It's really, really hard to evaluate in a generic sense, because the programs differ tremendously -- they really differ tremendously. We have a program in Chicago that mainly provides orders, helps women get orders of protection. And, we have an agency in southern Illinois that not only does domestic violence and sexual assault, it gives out food, it gives out food stamps -- it is the social service agency in its county; we're trying to develop a generic measure that fits both of these. You can see the challenges. I like the

word challenges, as opposed to problems or dilemmas, but it's been very challenging. But, we like these sorts of challenges.

Big concerns -- earlier, Eleanor had worked with you to generate a list of concerns that are on the board. Every one of these concerns came up at some point in this evaluation, and of our 87 agencies, they are all across the spectrum in terms of familiarity with evaluation. Some people were quite sophisticated and experienced, other people had never heard of this before. They were all over the spectrum in terms of -- how should I put this -- their pleasure and delight at the thought of doing this evaluation. (Laughter.) This is putting it politely. Some people knew what evaluation was. Some people had to do it already, for their other funders. And what we were doing in developing measures, was to do doing a lot of the work for them. We're also analyzing the data -- that's doing a lot of the work. They were delighted. Other people were less delighted, and saw this, not only as a means to provide information that then would be used against them, it also meant a whole lot more work. It meant more cost, they have to duplicate the measures. It meant time taken away from service provision -- it meant, a real pain. They were less than delighted, and they were somewhat suspicious. We like to think of ourselves as independent of the state,

independent of their funding agencies. From their point of view, the distinction between us and the state agency that funds them is not as clear.

I invited some people -- I was walking around at this conference, and lots of people I have met, but some people I only know by name, who are people in the agencies doing this evaluation, and every now and then I felt, well maybe I should cover up my name, because there are some people who are still not entirely delighted at having to do this evaluation. So, I saw a couple of people outside, and I said, "Why don't you come in and heckle. Feel free to come in and give your point of view. I am giving the evaluator's point of view, and you should be real clear that that's my point of view." We have worked very hard to try to address people's concerns -- we have worked very, very hard, but we aren't always able to do that.

There's a lot of concerns, will this affect funding? What if these measures don't measure everything we do? One reason we're doing this is so that as we say to the agencies, you can credit for all the good work you're doing; that's one reason to do an evaluation. But, some agencies are doing lots of other good things that aren't included in the evaluation. If we try to evaluate everything the agencies are doing, they would do nothing other than fill out forms; it's really time consuming enough. I haven't

heard that lately, since they've seen the measures.

What if these measures don't fit our program? We have made numerous revisions in the measures, trying to get them to fit the programs. This project has been going on for a year. We're now starting the second year, in July. It took us a year to develop the measures, because we develop the measures, we try them out, revise them, try them out, show them to a focus group, revise them, have these 87 agencies try them out, revise them. In July, the agencies started using them, collecting the data. In August, they took July's data and sent it to us. I have a room in the university filled with paper of all the measures that have been sent. We are now entering them into the computer, we're going to analyze them and give the agencies reports. But, it's clear to me, from the first month of this that at some point, probably in November, we're going to have to make one final set of revisions to these measures. The language is really hard to get right, when you're dealing with all of these different agencies.

When you're working with -- for example, one of the programs in Chicago has Asian women. Another program has Latinas -- we got money to do a Spanish translation, but then, which form of Spanish? Do you do Mexican Spanish, do you do Puertorican Spanish? Do you do Latin-American Spanish? These are really challenging questions. The Asian

agency wanted us to do a Hindu -- Hindi, or Urdu(?) -- I hope that's right -- version of these measures. We couldn't find somebody who had experience in survey research, who could translate them, but we're still working on them -- but, that's a problem.

Even the difficulty of writing a measure that fits in urban Chicago group of women, and writing the same measure that fits a rural, downstate Illinois group of women is really tough. So, we're working a lot on the language, and we have more work to do. But overall, we have pretty much gotten there.

Now, these agencies -- we like to think of ourselves -- and again, this is not just the royal we, but all of the people working on this -- as working in a collaborative fashion. We are good, decent, caring human beings. We don't want to impose things on other people, we really want to know their opinions. From the agency's point of view, this evaluation is mandated. And, there is a paradox there in saying, we really want to you to participate, and you have to participate. I am fully aware of that dilemma there, and that's a difficulty.

There's a whole set of issues in collaboration that we may have time to talk about later, but let me just give a preview of coming attractions. There's a journal called, *Violence Against Women*, that some of you may be familiar

with. It's coming out with a special issue on collaboration in research on violence against women -- collaboration between researchers, and advocates, activists, and so on. Their October issue will be about collaboration. I know about this, because I was the special _____ editor of the special issue. And, there are six articles in there that describe collaborations in very different settings. One is a manufacturing setting, one is a shelter with a college of nursing, etcetera, etcetera. And, there are a lot of issues raised there about collaboration. If you're interested, that would be really useful to look at. If you'll excuse my giving an advertisement for the special issue -- I do not get any money from it.

But, we really try to be sensitive to the concerns of people. At the same time, we knew that this evaluation had to happen. So, that is a dilemma, and it would be good if you have friends in Illinois, talk to them about it -- get their point of view on it.

Some other challenges, in doing this -- and, I realize I have already gone -- I have about three minutes left, so I'm going to talk real quickly -- is that the agencies had to collect the data, themselves. They had to do it while the women were there, getting services. They did not have the time, or staff to -- for example, call women six months later, or two weeks later, and say, "What did you think of

that phone call, was that helpful?" They had to do it within the phone call. Safety and confidentiality concerns had to be primary -- those had to be considered more important than the evaluation. And, nobody disagreed with that, we didn't get into any problems about that.

One of things we did, as acting as neutral evaluators, but still recognizing the burden this was placing on the agencies, was -- oh, I have 10 minutes, thank you. I'll start talking slowly. (Laughter.) -- was, always tell the state this was requiring more time and effort, why don't you give these people more money to do this, that would ease the burden. And, I'm happy to say that the domestic violence agencies got more money to do this. And, the money covers their staff time, and then some.

Now, you realize this is only possible because we happen to be at this fluke time in economy, when the state has all this money its got to spend. So, we were very fortunate that happened. That's actually paying for the evaluation, too. So if times were not so good, maybe nobody would have to do this. (Laughter.)

Anyway, what we did was develop measures. We use surveys, we use focus groups, we use pilot testing. Today's training does not mean today here, but today, when we were training people. In doing this, this is pretty much what we did, we talked about each measure. We gave everybody a

manual, which some of you may think, I want that manual -- you're not going to get it yet. Write me in the Spring, because we are going to revise it again. We're not sending it out until its completely finished. We modeled how to use each measure. So, we went through each measure and role-modeled. Somebody was the staff person, somebody was the client, and then we talked about it. And we talked about how each agency had to develop an evaluation plan. And we talked about it in a very nitty gritty fashion, like who's going to be in charge of duplicating the forms? Where are you going to keep them in your agency? Who's going to send them back to us? They were all supposed to send July's evaluation data back to us by the 10th of August. Last Friday, which was the 28th, 20-something like that -- I got the most recent envelope in the mail, of data. So, things are continuing to come in, etcetera. But, this is the real world, and there are more important things than the evaluation.

When we asked the domestic violence people, which services do you want us to evaluate, they wanted us to evaluate the crisis hotline. They wanted us to evaluate short-term advocacy, like criminal justice, or medical advocacy, long-term advocacy, quitting(?) general advocacy, counseling, and shelter. And for each of these five services, again using surveys and focus groups, we said,

"What are you trying to do with these services? What is it you're trying to accomplish? How do you know when you will have accomplished it?" In general, what they were trying to do was -- number one, give people information. Number two, give people support, and number three -- and, this gets a little tricky -- is help them, if they wanted, in the decision-making process. And, you know helping them is a very tricky thing to talk about, because you want clients to be able to make their own decisions. On the other hand, the agencies were giving people what they needed, trying to help people get the information and resources that they needed to make decisions.

I'll give you an example of another one -- short-term advocacy, which is medical or criminal justice advocacy, feels informed, feels supported, feels an increased sense of control -- that was a tricky one to develop measure for. Develops safety planning and has access to follow-up services in care. So, these are examples of the desired impacts. When we said you're doing the short-term advocacy, what is it you're trying to accomplish? These are the things people told us.

Then, we spent the year writing measures, writing questionnaires, instruments to measure each one of these things. Feels informed, do you have more information, after talking with somebody from our agency than you had before?

Do you have all the information you want? You can start -- when you hear me saying these questions, you can see why you really have to focus on the language. I didn't bring the measures with me, but we worked on that for a long time.

...: Wasn't(?) it similar to design?

MS. RIGER: Design. Eleanor mentioned that you can do a pre- and post-. You can do a before and after services, or you can do just after, and there are lots of other variations.

The short-term advocacy design -- after service delivery, people were asked how affective the services were. It didn't use the word, effective, but we asked, "Do you have more information now, as a result of talking with someone from our agency? Do you feel supported, after talking with someone from our agency?" etcetera. That was only given after advocacy happened.

Counseling -- when people to an intake at their agency, they have a counseling measure that includes some mental health kinds of stuff -- like, do you have some post-traumatic stress stuff? Do you have bad nightmares about abuse, etcetera. And then, we do that again after -- we ask the agencies to figure out the average length of time that people stay in counseling. And at that point, which is usually about four weeks maybe, they do an after-counseling. That's a short amount of time to expect a lot of change.

But, it's not reasonable to expect the agencies to track people down after six months. It's really -- I do longitudinal research, and it's really expensive, time consuming, and hard to find people once they're gone.

Yeah, you have a question?

...: You could do(?) evaluation after deliver of the surveys (inaudible).

MS. RIGER: Uh huh. (Yes.)

...: After how long, (inaudible) for evaluation, try to (inaudible).

...: I wouldn't do it immediately after, when they go to the -- because, after the _____, you want to see the person (inaudible) then you will know how much (inaudible) the survey. (Inaudible.)

MS. RIGER: There are sort of theoretical concerns, like the ones you're raising. They're practical concerns, like -- what if you give her a referral, she leaves your agency, you never see her again, how are you going to find her? Well, some people do follow ups, some people may not do follow up. And of course, the people you may find most easily are the people who are probably doing the best. And, that's going to bias your evaluation -- or, people who are doing the worst, somebody suggested -- maybe it will all wash out.

The advocacy measures -- I will say frankly, driven us nuts, because it's so -- advocacy differs a lot across the

agencies, and it brings up lots of complicated issues. A lot of the success of advocacy depends on things that are not in the hands of the people giving the domestic violence services.

That's another issue, what we think of as community capacity. We've thought a long time on how to deal with that. For example, what if you do court advocacy -- you have a wonderful court advocate, you have a terrific program, you're very good, and you have a terrible judge, who's completely unsympathetic? People are going to have a bad experience, and they're going to give negative comments, but it's really not because of you, it's because of the judge.

We've talked -- I mean, basically what we've done -- it's not within the scope of this evaluation, to look at community capacity. So, what we have done is talk with the funders a lot, and talked a lot about how to interpret the numbers that we're getting. It's really important to think about the context in which people interpret the numbers, and make sure that they understand what the numbers can say, and what they can't say -- you know, what they're not really measuring.

...: Can we keep(?) to the issue on financial information? I think that's one of the lines(?) where we can have more control. We should be held (inaudible); however, sometimes

when I feel that she _____ information, (inaudible) conversation. (Inaudible.)

MS. RIGER: That's an interesting -- whoa. (Laughter.) That's an interesting methodological issue. It wasn't practical -- we didn't have enough time. That would have been seen as very intrusive by the agencies. The agencies would not have wanted to give women a test of information. So what we're getting, is self reports of how informative the session was. And of course, anyone who knows research could say, "Well, there's a lot of problems with self reports." And, there are problems with self reports, but it does give the agencies a rough idea of whether the people they're working with feel more informed, or not. It doesn't give an independent measure of whether they actually are more informed. It's really beyond the scope of this evaluation.

...: Are you willing to share these questions (inaudible).

MS. RIGER: I'm willing to share them -- I didn't bring them with me. I'm not willing to share them yet, because we're going to do another round of revision.

My name and address are in the information you got. If you write me in the Spring, I will see what I can send you. I also -- well, really this is a contract for the state, so I have to ask their permission to do that, but probably they will say it's just fine. But wait until the Spring, because

I can't handle anything more now -- am I running out of time?

...: Coming close.

MS. RIGER: Coming close, okay. Yeah?

...: Do you, or anyone you know, do any work in measuring the efficacy(?) (?) of battering intervention programs?

MS. RIGER: Yes. Larry Bennet(?), whose also at University of Illinois at Chicago, does batterer intervention. There's a session tomorrow, on evaluating batterer intervention programs. Larry Gondolph(?) does that, and there's two other people in that session, who do that. There's a lot of work being done right now on that -- yeah?

...: Impressions(?) for legal services, specifically mentioned?

MS. RIGER: One of our measures is legal advocacy. We also did an -- being good academics, we did a huge survey of what everybody's doing, and we thought there must be evaluation measures out there, aren't there? We don't have to invent the wheel -- we had to invent the wheel.

Chris Sullivan has very good measures. Hers weren't published in time for us to use them for this. And the people that we worked with, in the 87 agencies we worked with, wanted us to do certain things. So, everybody's a little different, so we had to develop them from scratch -- yeah?

...: This is partly a follow-up question from the earlier portion on --

MS. RIGER: Yeah.

...: Can you speak a little bit more to sort of this (inaudible) internal versus external evaluations, a little bit more?

MS. RIGER: Sure. I've always been an external -- people use the phrase, in-house evaluator, meaning somebody who works for the agency does the evaluation. Of course, you don't want to use the phrase, out-of-house evaluator, but I use external evaluator. I've always been an external evaluator. And that means, in some ways there are more issues of trust, but there's also more freedom. I don't know if anybody here has had the experience of being an in-house evaluator?

...: Me.

MS. RIGER: (Do) you want to speak to this question?

...: (inaudible) of using someone internally. I did it as a member of a research department of a large agency, so it (inaudible) good people who did that. So, we weren't providing the service, and evaluating the programs (inaudible) more complicated. But, we did have the benefit of much more knowledge of the programs, and the people that it was serving, and the issues that were concerns to the staff in the program, and a whole lot about the climate.

So, we could capture a large -- the contextual kinds of things. And, I think the _____ ways that someone coming in from the outside would have more difficulty doing.

There is a concern, particularly from outside funders, that it's going to be biased. And that, I always thought as an external perception issue, because if you review the kinds of data that you're collecting as part of the evaluation, and you collect them faithfully and systematically, then the results are the results. It also means that there are different kinds of dynamics in some of the trust issues that Stephanie had mentioned. So, I think there are advantages (inaudible).

MS. RIGER: Another issue is funding. Not everyone has money to pay for -- I mean, we've had like eight people on our team working for a year -- not full-time, part-time. We're academic, so we're fairly cheap, but it's been expensive. And it's expensive for the agencies, expensive for the funder. What I always suggest to people, is call your local university. Find the person teaching a course on evaluation research, and see if that person can get their students to do your agency as an evaluation -- as a sort of class project, maybe. And, as long as you have something sort of -- as long as you negotiate control over where it gets published, or whether it gets published anonymously, so on, that can be a good, cheap way to get an evaluation done.

I'm going to take one more question, and then I think my time is up -- yes sir?

...: DB(?) programs, are they under need of a standard setback in state, in Illinois?

MS. RIGER: There are some requirements for what they have to do to get funding. That's a little bit different from standards. I'm not sure what you mean by standards?

...: I mean such as, is there some type of certification in order to do this?

MS. RIGER: Okay, not to my knowledge. Okay, last question.

...: Are you saying that the 87 agencies, none of them were doing evaluations of their services?

MS. RIGER: Oh that's -- no, that's not true at all. Lots of them were doing -- but, they were all doing different evaluations.

...: My other comment is, we did something local -- United Way did a training -- brought someone in from Seattle, setting up logic models, and all kinds of different things that was (were) really helpful, but it was never taken to the level of combining that information, so it was real ineffective. So, how do you educate your state people, at that level, to help with funding and organizing?

MS. RIGER: They decided -- well, you mean the state -- the Department of Human Services that funded it?

...: The people who hired you to basically say that this is important to us, we want to understand what this looks like.

SR: We didn't have to educate them, they actually came to us. Actually, what they did was, they wanted an evaluation, so they brought in somebody to meet with Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault providers, who is an evaluator -- who had worked with them on other evaluations. And it became very clear that this person knew nothing about domestic violence and sexual assault. The tension in that room -- I was in that room. The tension in that room got really high, and it was very clear that was not going to work. Then, the state people asked me, and some other people that I work with -- who they already knew, because I had done research on domestic violence, and I put on conferences on building bridges between the university and activists on women, and so on -- and research -- and advocacy on violence against women. So, they sort of knew us -- agencies knew us, so they came to us and asked us to do it. So, we didn't have to do that -- yes?

...: You can also use an evaluator to work with you collaboratively, to develop measures and collect both kinds of data simultaneously, and use your measures to help inform your state agency about the kinds of outcomes that make more sense for your program. (Inaudible) in our state, which some of the sexual assault programs the Department of Health

was using (inaudible). And, got them to then change their required outcomes, because they went through that process. So, that's another way of proceeding.

MS. RIGER: I think at this point, I've used up more than my fair share of the _____ time. So, Angela is now going to proceed with the next part of the session.

AMP: I'm going to use the overhead. There was two sheets going around, to sign up. If you weren't in the last session, or if you did not get a copy of the handouts -- if you sign up on that sheet, I'll be more than happy to have the handouts mailed to you.

I guess I have an interesting task ahead of me. What I'm going to try to do -- I'll say, I'll try to do it -- is pull together a lot of what you've been hearing. And pull it together in the sense of, you're going through an evaluation, you had somebody come in, you worked with an evaluator, and then you get to the part of the stage where you've got something. The key is figuring out, what do I have? And, how am I going to use what I've got?

If I could step back a little bit, and get into this point, because often people look at this stage, the analysis, interpretation, and all of that stuff, as the end point. But, I would argue that this is something that you should be thinking about in the beginning, because ultimately you're going to get to this point. And what

happens when you get to this point, could be good or bad for your program. That's tying in what everyone was talking about.

As a program, any type of program -- whether you're within the criminal justice system, community base, what have you, you have to recognize the power that you have, in terms of this evaluation process, and use that to develop the evaluation, and to develop what comes out of the evaluation.

Unfortunately, we're in an era -- and I know this, working for the federal government, where we're saying, no funding without evaluation -- no funding without evaluation, that's kind of the mantra now -- no funding without evaluation. That's what we're doing on a federal level. That's why I'm involved with overseeing the evaluations of many of the federal programs. We cannot say to you, your programs should be evaluated, and we don't impose that same requirement on ourselves -- and, that's what we're doing. Seeing that as the case -- and, many of you may find yourself in a position, where you have to have your program evaluated, you can either do it from a reactionary stance, or a pro-active stance. And, I hope some of the information that I will provide to you will enable you to do it from a pro-active stance.

You've heard about evaluation, the distinction between

process and outcome. I just want to add one thing about outcome -- outcome leads you to impact. Outcome and impact are different. People use those words synonymously, but I don't, because I think outcome is just -- what is the result? What do we have out of this? But, that may not be -- that's not your impact. You may not see your impact two, three, five years later, of what you did with that particular individual. So you made a referral, the woman went, she followed through with that referral, and she got a particular service -- that was the outcome. What was the impact of that service on her life? You may not know, because you don't have the time, the resources, the funding to follow up with that woman to see what was the impact on her life. As it was mentioned at lunchtime, often we don't -- we can't see the results of what we're doing, within the grant cycle, the funding cycle, what have you. So, you need to make that distinction, when you're looking at what are the outcomes, and then, what's the impact of your outcome. So you've been involved in this evaluation process for x-amount of months, x-amount of years, and then finally you have something.

What you should be doing, is first of all, the researcher/evaluator, however he or she, or the team terms themselves, they should not be off in a corner doing anything by themselves. What do I mean by that? Often it's

the case, you have someone approach you, they want to do an evaluation, or you approach them and say, "We need to have our program evaluated." And they say, "Okay, wonderful, great." They scramble around, they try to find money to do this, or you take money from your program to provide for that. You all get together, you talk about -- if you done (did) it following a model, something like Stephanie's, you got together, you decided how are we going to measure what we're doing -- what are you all agreeing about. And, you shouldn't even be having that conversation by yourselves, you should be having your clients involved in that conversation, too. Because, if you don't do that, you and the researcher, evaluator will develop measures that have no meaning for the women that you're serving. And then you get garbage at the end, and you don't understand -- well, this doesn't make sense. That's because you asked questions that were totally irrelevant for the people whom you're working with.

So, you follow this process, you've developed your questionnaires, and everything. So then, the evaluator team, whomever -- they hired graduate students, and whoever they could find, to go out and get the data. You've given access to your clients, and they interview them, they survey them, they have focus groups with them -- they do something with them to get information from them about what's going on

in their lives, and what their experiences have been with your agency. They're doing this, and then one day it's going to end, because I'm going to tell them, "Your grant can't go on forever. I can't keep giving you no-cost extensions." So, you have to stop. (Laughter.) Because, I have people who are above me -- congress, the director of our agency, etcetera, that's saying, "We want to know what works now." And I'm like, "But, that's not the way," they don't care. So, I have to pass that pressure on to the evaluator. So, they stop collecting their data, and then they're going to analyze this data -- as we say, in research terms, they're going to look at it and try to figure out, what does it say, what does it mean?

It's important for you to understand how they're going to do that. I'm not saying, go and take a statistics class, and not take it(?), saying, go and take a research and evaluation class, but the person you're working with, should be able to explain to you, in English, what they are doing, and why they're doing it. Because, how they do it, is going to determine what you get out of it, and what ultimately they're going to say about your program -- they're going to say something. And you can take a hands-off approach, let them say whatever they want, but then it's going to come back on you. Or, you can be intimately involved in that process -- and, we know it's hard, it takes a lot of time --

and, you all are devoting your time to providing services, managing these programs, etcetera. I face the same thing -- I have a lot of grantees that I'm overseeing, but I try to devote as much time as I can to what they're doing, because I know they're going to give me back some information, they're going to give me --

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

MS. RIGER: -- what message are we going to be communicating? We're a national organization. Whether I like to believe it or not, we do affect policy, we do affect practice. I know that there are results of the information that we disseminate. So, if it's in my purview, I'm going to try to be as careful of it as possible, about what's said, and how it's said. And that's something that you should be concerned about, too, with the evaluation. So, you want to know what they're going to do, how they're going to do it, and why. When they come to you -- we're going to do _____ -- we're going to use this method, we're going to do a regression analysis, we're going to some binary(?) analysis -- clause tabs(?), tie(?) squares, all this other stuff -- you say to them, tell me what that is, and why you're doing it, and what kind of information can I get from that? Because, then you'll know whether or not they even understand the methods that they're using, and

whether or not it's even appropriate for the type of information that they got from the people that you work with on a day-to-day basis. So, that's really important. And you can take as much ownership of the process as you want. Many evaluators won't like that, because we've all been trained to believe that what we do is objective -- that's a lie (laughter.), that we're not biased, that we don't -- our biases affect how we even analyze the data, because it's like -- you know, when I was working on my dissertation, I had in mind what I thought I was going to find -- and then, I didn't find it, so then I said, well let me use another method, because maybe using this different method, maybe I will find what I thought I was going to find originally. So, that does have something to do with what you get, and that's very important. So, you ask them, explain it to me like I'm a three-year-old -- break it down to me, so that I understand what you're doing.

Okay, we have our analysis. Interpretation of the data -- that's extremely important. And that's one of the concerns, if I recall, that was brought up. I can be tied into results being used inappropriately, being prescriptive, etcetera -- labeling, because somebody is going to interpret that information.

We find that most of the women end up going back to these men, despite all the good things that we do, and go

back to these batterers, and they continue cycle, and they keep finding these men that abuse them -- this is what we have. It's like, is that what you want to be said about your program? Because, their interpretation may be, "Well obviously, they're not providing the right kind of services, because if they were, these women wouldn't be going back to these men, and ending up in abusive relationship, after relationship, after relationship." The interpretation of the data, you have to decide who's going to be interpreting it? Is it just the evaluator, will you be involved? And what about the community, from where this data was gathered? Are you going to go back to the community, present the information to them, and say, "Well, what does this mean to you? Do you think this accurately reflects the information that we gained from you?" And let them engage in the process of interpretation, as well.

(Inaudible) to who will be involved? It's like -- sadly, it's the case, you'll find evaluators come, they do the work, they get the information, they never discuss anything with you -- they tell you, we're going to be writing a couple of journal articles, preparing, doing some presentations at conferences, we'll be disseminating this information, and don't worry, because it's anonymous. They don't know where we got this from, and so forth, and so on. So, nobody will know that your program is a failure,

(laughter) and so forth, and so on. Because, that's really what it's boiling down to, if you have negative results. Results that don't favor what you're doing, in terms of the services you're providing.

Regardless of whether or not there's anonymity, you should care about that, because you know what? Sometimes it happens that information gets out. There's some mistake, there's some slip up, and we figure out. Or, it might be the case that -- oops, we didn't know that there was only one program of that type in that whole state. So, even though they didn't say the name, we could identify that program, and so everyone knows what's going on in your program. So, you should be concerned about who's going to be involved in the interpretation, as well as the conclusion. What are you going to say about this information? What conclusions do you want drawn? How do you want this information to be used? Again, if you've built this in from the beginning, this information should be fed back into your program to strengthen it, to enhance it.

You have to remember that right now, we're in an era where there's more money than there has ever been for research on violence against women. This is an unprecedented time, we've never had the amount of money we have right now. So, there are a lot of people -- evaluators, who have no interest, who are not concerned,

they're not advocates, they really don't care about women who are being battered, and they don't care about your programs. What they do care about is "good science". So, they're interested in what they do -- I'm a scientist. I want to study a particular social phenomenon -- and today, it's violence against women, tomorrow, it's manufacturing problems. It doesn't make a difference, so you have to be careful in who you have evaluating your programs, because if you have that person who's only interested in science, for science sake, that's really going to set what they get out of the evaluation and what they say -- yes?

...: I just want to say that it's so true, when the -- Brad(?) came out for a research practitioner, from _____, I got a phone call from a women, from the university, who never knew anything about domestic violence, at all. She went on the Internet, she looked up all the different programs, she thought we were within the ____ question -- she calls me up and said, "Can we do this?" It was like a week, or two before the thing was due, and I thought, I don't even know you, when have you done in domestic violence? -- well nothing, but I do research. And I was like, "No, no way are we going team up. But, they will seek you out, especially when all of our programs are probably on the Internet, and Web pages, and everything else.

AMP: Exactly. And I mean, I apologize, because (laughter)

like if I wrote that announcement (laughter). The goal is -- we're trying to push out of our paradigms, we have our own paradigm within the Department of Justice, NIJ, our office of Research and Evaluation. I mean, we are still stuck in a traditional research mode, and all of those other things. We are trying to push out of it. We're trying to encourage researchers and practitioners to come together in a meaningful partnership -- and, I call it partnership, and when I say, partnership, I mean that the practitioner organization is getting money, too. It's not just going -- ...: (Inaudible) already doing research in domestic violence and men, who have been committed for 10, or 15 years. So --

AMP: Right.

...: -- practitioners, we can serve(?) with people who have a real interest in domestic violence, as opposed to somebody who just wants to be there, because the money's there today.

AMP: Right. And also, there -- but, there are people who have been doing this work for a long time, but they are not evaluators. People have different training and different skills.

One of the things that I encourage people to do is -- they're like, "We can't find somebody to evaluate our program." I always tell them, "Look locally." They were calling me, asking me for national people. And I'm like,

"You can't afford a national person, first of all. But second of all, you don't need a national person. You need somebody who knows how to evaluation, who's grounded in a reality in experiences, of women and what they're going through, and who are locally based, because they can have a better understanding of the context in which their research is being conducted. That is what is extremely important. But it's like, finding that all in one package is very difficult. Eleanor, who happens to be one of my grantees, is exceptional because she has -- all of that is wrapped up in her. But short of that, what you can do, which is challenging, but you can do it, is bring together someone who is an evaluator -- perhaps they have limited knowledge of domestic violence, and you can pair them up with somebody who is a domestic violence researcher, but doesn't have strong evaluation skills, or that type of training. Put them together, let the sparks fly, and everything else, and then when the dust settles, you may have a good collaboration team that can produce what you need for your particular program.

Was there another question? Yes, sir.

...: I was just going to say, in a case we don't know -- talking about this person that you're going to have to waste(?), or keep looking for someone -- look at what they've published, and see if it goes along with what you're

doing. If they've never done anything with domestic violence, and you're going to (inaudible).

AMP: Exactly. When someone calls you, when they approach you -- and, if they're calling you right before the grant is due, you don't want to work with them -- that's one thing. Because, I encourage people -- it's like, I tell them, "We've just finished, we've just about done our fiscal year." You should be doing -- if you're going to do some work with some organization, you should be doing the prep work now for the announcement that will come out next Spring, that's the first thing. No one should suffer because of your procrastination.

Secondly, what I say to them is, "If somebody is approaching you, interview them." If somebody was approaching you to do some work, any kind of work, some work on your house, or something, you wouldn't just let them call you up and say, "Oh, I want to provide this service for you." You want references, you want to check them out, you want to know what they've been doing. That's the same thing you need to do with an evaluator. Say, "Okay, send me your resume, your _____, or whatever. Send me some of the articles that you've published." And, if they want to do work for example, with native people -- show me the publications that you have with native people -- oh, I've never done any work with native people. You can't just go

into a community and think you're going to understand all the complexities of that community and be able to do research. So, you can get information from them -- programs, agencies, organizations, you're much more powerful than you think. It's like, the researcher may know about research, statistics, evaluation, but they don't know about what you do, they don't know about your day-to-day experiences. They don't have that knowledge for the most part, and so you are as much an educator as they are. And, it should be working both ways, you should be educating them about what you do, and they should be educating you about what they do. That will help to build infrastructure, capacity to continue on in this evaluation-based work.

Any other questions? Yes?

....: I think something else that's really important is (inaudible). And, I think there's a tendency for people to try and link that into processes without maybe -- there are all kinds of barriers, but to have to be more(?) understanding of the way (inaudible). Maybe someone who was knowledgeable about a particular culture, if they're going to be working with that group of (inaudible).

AMP: Right now, I have a problem -- I struggle with this terminology, cultural competency, because when people say that, I don't know what that means. Does that mean -- you're competent, is that a checklist? I know most of the

terms, in that -- and, I think we need to define that -- I say, "Are you grounded in the experiences and realities of the people that you want to work with? Can you look at things from their perspective, not from yours?" What does that mean -- the information that you're getting, what does that mean from their perspective, not yours.

...: I mean, in a _____ sense, we don't go into _____ research, or Hispanics. We don't go into an Hispanic community, not knowing the culture, and try to design measures to get to the people. (Inaudible.) But, that's important, that might be something to think of.

AMP: Oh, absolutely. And I think everything should be defined, and it should be defined by the people that you're working with, because -- it's like, my family is Hispanic, but I'm a second generation, so I don't pretend to know Hispanic culture just because of my ancestry -- I don't say that, because I've grown up as an American, in American culture and society, and whatever American culture and society is. So, I just think it has to go beyond your level, your knowledge base, and it needs to come from the communities that you're working with. I think that's extremely important -- yes?

...: (Inaudible) the usefulness, do I listen to them? So that if I'm bringing numbers (inaudible) it's not just up to the conversation, or the _____, but to (inaudible) some of

your -- an agreement that you're starting(?) We had
(inaudible). (Inaudible) you don't understand (inaudible)
in a shelter. (Inaudible.)

AMP: Absolutely, and that's why you have to have ownership
of the process. It's like -- you want to evaluate our
program? Well, here's the rules. And you lay it out to
your evaluator -- that's extremely important.

I'll get to you in one minute, because I know I'm
running out of time.

In terms of the final products, it's very important --
what will they be, who makes the decision, and who will be
the audience, that's extremely important. I know one of the
things -- one of our standard requirements is that you do
this final report -- that's a government requirement. We
make our grantees -- another thing that we do, which is very
annoying, we make our grantees turn over -- give us a copy
of their data. So, that makes people extremely nervous,
because it's like, wait a minute, all this data you
collected, you said it was anonymous, and all of this stuff,
and it was safe and protected, and now you're telling me
that you have to give this data to the federal government?
Yep, and then we're going to take and make it public.
That's why, if you were not careful about what was done in
the beginning, your information can get out to the public,
because we are going to make it available for researchers to

do secondary data analysis -- looking at your data a different way, another cut(?), asking a slightly different question, and using that particular data. Those are our requirements.

But, what do you want? Do you want to take this information and provide it to the women that you serve? If you want that, then you don't want that journal article that the evaluator's going to produce, and you don't want that final report, that is not useful for you. Nobody is going to read 100 and 150 page document, except me, because I have to. (Laughter.) So, you need to negotiate what you're going to get out of it -- and, you need to do that up front, because usually the way these grants work, the least amount of money goes into the final products. So, you're spending all your money -- the evaluator, getting all of this data. And then, it's like, when we have time, we're going to write the final report, and turn in the data, and all of that stuff. So, if you don't have that up front, you could be stuck with a report that's useless, you've not provided anything back to the community that you're serving, because you didn't negotiate all of that at the beginning -- it's very important. What's going to come out of it -- how is it going to be -- how is this information going to be disseminated? If people have a problem leaving, how are you going to make that information accessible to them? It's

like, you know, often we don't think about it. What are you giving back to people? They took the time to fill out your questionnaire, your survey, and all of this stuff, what are you going to give back to them for what they did? It's like, there's a responsibility, and you have to hold the evaluator accountable for being responsible with the information, as do you need to be responsible with that information, as well. So, it's very important that you think about this in the process. Along with that, the questions that you have to ask -- what are going to be the dissemination strategies, the accessibility?

Every grant now that we get, their researcher or evaluator says, "You know, we're going to post this information, we're going to set up a Web page, we're going to set up a list serve," and all of this other stuff. It's like -- I, personally, have an old computer at home, so I can't even access the Internet from my house. It's like, I can do all of this at work. So personally, if I was involved in a study, and I do get asked to provide information, I write back to them and I say, "I don't have access to that. How are you going to get this information back to me?" That's what you need to be thinking about for the individuals that you're working with. How are they going to get that information to the people who need it -- you, your staff, and the individuals that you're working

with, the individuals who were so kind to provide that information to you? They don't have to do that.

It's one thing to fill out an intake questionnaire, it's another thing to fill out an hour long questionnaire about everything -- you know, since your birth -- has anything ever happened to you, has anybody ever done anything? We ask people a lot of intrusive stuff, we want them to give us an enormous amount of information, and then we don't even give them back the results of the questionnaire, or the survey, or whatever -- that's extremely important. Who does the work, and who gets the credit?

If you spent a year working with the evaluator, helping them develop the instruments, helping them get access to the people that you work with and you serve -- if you did all of that, why shouldn't your name also be on the papers they write? Why shouldn't you also go to the Millennium conference and make the presentation with them? You need to get credit. If you don't, again, negotiate that, you will not get credit for the work that you've done -- and, that's very important.

And lastly, ownership, who owns the end products? Do you just leave it with the evaluator? Do you have some type of agreement as to what's going to happen with that information? Do you tell them, I don't want you to keep

publishing 10, 15 papers off of that data, or it's negotiated every time you publish, we're in this together? You're going to get publications, too? You will do your part, you'll do your work for it, but you want a part of that. Who owns this stuff? There's going to be reports, data files, reproduction rights, copyrights, all of that stuff.

I know this is probably things that maybe you might not think about, but certainly, the evaluator is thinking about it. It's like, I need tenure -- how many publications am I going to get out of this? How much can I milk it? What is it worth to me? And you should think about that, too. Because, you have to remember, the evaluator has different goals than you. Yeah, maybe some of the evaluators are really concerned about the safety and well-being of women, but again, many are concerned about science, and they want to get that out of this process. So, you need to be concerned about what you want to get out of the process.

That's it. (Applause.) (Background conversation.)

MS. LYON: Those of you that weren't here for part one, probably think that was the end. We actually distributed an agenda, and we have a couple more things -- a couple more issues that I think are particularly important to talk about.

I'm getting to spend three minutes on safety issues,

when you're doing research with women who have experienced partner violence. However, I'm lucky, because probably most of you already are familiar with these issues. I think I will probably go through, really quickly, a couple of them, because it may give you extra strength when you're negotiating design and measurement questions with a researcher to say, you know look, you don't have to do it this way, or you're going to endanger women if you do it that way.

So, one of the things that I've seen in a lot of evaluation that have been proposed, or developed, is that they say, "Okay, we're going to interview a lot of battered women, and what we're going to do is, we're going to call them on the phone. And, we're going to get the numbers from the court or from the intervention program. So then, we're going to call them, and we're going to tell them to do this study, and maybe we'll give them some money." Well, I always react with a great deal of cringing, sort of like you just did.

I think it's very important, first of all, that a collaborative approach to even developing an approach to how you're going to talk to women be developed. In other words, involve women in talking about how they can safely be contacted to begin with.

I think that it's important that whatever process you

come up with is a process that they can exercise some control over, and that they're not getting especially an anonymous phone call without any kind of preparation, or advance notice. I can go through a lot of reasons why a cold telephone call is a lousy idea, but you're probably really familiar with that. You don't know who's there, she has no control, she can be completely unsafe, someone else can be in the room, she can be in danger while she's talking on the phone -- a whole host of those kinds of issues. But, I think even if you said, "Hi, I'm calling, and I want to do some research. I have a study that I want to do, I would like to interview you, are you safe now," that even that is a bad idea. The kind of approach that we have used is to work with women with advocates, that women were working with to begin with. To have the advocates, in the course of their normal work with the women, to describe the study to - - describe what it was about, what its purpose was, to describe the fact that they would get paid out of respect for the time that they would be investing in doing this, and give them the option to participate, or not to participate.

When we do the research, we only learn the identity of women after they've expressed an interest in doing it. Now, that has some disadvantages from scientific "rigor" points of view, but I think it's very important, both for safety and empowerment reasons that that kind of control be

available.

One of the things that I've also seen is people say, "Well, we'll mail them a check." (Laughter.) Uh huh. (Yes.) Well, to think -- okay, so I don't need to talk to you about how that can be a source of some danger to a woman. So, I think that the most important part is that the whole design of how you ever -- as a researcher, have contact with women, or you allow evaluators to have contact with women in your program, is that you develop that approach collaboratively with the women, so that they feel that is a safe approach to them. And then, if they're going to be in touch with a researcher, that researcher should have as part of a protocol that the time, the place, and the strategy for doing that be left up to the woman. That it can be done by telephone, it can be done in person, but it's something that she exercises control over, and that she has every assurance -- and has control, so that she feels maximally safe.

I also have sometimes done telephone interviews, because women have said that they feel safest proceeding that way. And when that is going on, since you don't -- you have to have a relationship with the woman so that you know that she can say that if she becomes unsafe, while you're in the course of talking with her, that you have a kind of signal that you can give so that she can terminate that, and

that you know how you're going to proceed from there, so that she's not put into any kind of jeopardy by virtue of talking to you.

Also, issues around new technology, particularly if you're thinking about anything by telephone, or using any other technological means, it's getting amazing how much the new technology can put people at risk. Caller I.D., sort of automatic redial kinds of functions on telephones are something that people don't often think about, but that can be incredibly risky and should be taken into account. I know that there are some people who are using various kinds of web sites to do Internet research now, and that can be very creative, it can be incredibly useful, but I think it's important to recognize that there need to be a lot of safety precautions put into place in doing that, because there are also stalkers and other folks, who are very technologically savvy, and so that can be risky. So, just to sort of sensitize you to potential risks that can be involved.

There are also issues of storage of information that the researchers need to be extremely careful about, any kinds of names, and those kinds of things. And then, finally I think, the wording of questions that are asked are incredibly important, because the potential is there for jeopardizing emotional safety through the process of going through an interview. We really find that it's incredibly

important that we be more sensitive to and provide opportunities for women's voices to guide our interpretation, and our understandings of the services, and the interventions that we're involved with, but -- I forgot my point now. Oh dear --

...: Emotional safety.

MS. LYON: Emotional safety, yes. Thank you, you were listening -- I wasn't, I was talking. (Laughter.)

While that's incredibly important, it's important that the kinds of questions not put women at greater risk. But I think also, on the flip side of that, we need to recognize -- and, I think advocates are sometimes very concerned, that interviews can be incredibly intrusive, and are necessarily re-traumatizing, when in fact, the reverse can be the case. Having the opportunity to tell your story to someone who really cares, and who is paying careful attention can be an incredibly empowering experience. So, not to make blanket judgements about, we automatically assume that an interview is going to be intrusive. If it's done right, by someone who is appropriate and sensitive to the issues they need to be sensitive to, it can be a very empowering experience. So, some quick thoughts on safety. (Background conversation.)

MS. SHARMA: During the -- for those of you that were here earlier, I spent most of my time focusing around issues

relating to under served battered women in communities. So here, I'll just pick up a little bit where I left off, and provide some concrete examples in terms of some questions that I think would be useful to be reflected in some evaluations, or their nature of questions.

The main issues -- just to recap, were not to leave under served, battered women -- marginalized battered women, invisible in the evaluation process. Some of the groups that I'm talking about here are battered older women, battered women with disabilities, Latino, Asian, Native, African-American women, and different groups of women of color, battered immigrant women, LGBT persons, rural women -- I mean, there are -- and the list is long. Oh, people with same sex relationships, or bi-sexual relationships -- I mean, looking at some of these axes of marginalization in terms of race, or class, ability, and many ways in which people in our world are oppressed by structures, and privilege, and hierarchies, and so forth. So, to really impress upon you all not to leave that as a tack-on item, or something that we do if we have time. It really is -- what's at stake, is the safety of women from these communities. And, also not to assume that people have one singular identity -- it's much more complex than that.

I think this also impacts on what the evaluation team is comprised of in addition to having advocates present with

the understanding around violence against women issues. But additionally, to understand issues around race, and class, and sexism, and some of the different multiple oppressions is very critical. And to look at evaluation in terms of moving us from just saying that we have all the successes, but to really look at where we're going in terms of certain kinds of change.

Some of the kinds of questions that -- these are not the exact questions that you might want to use, but they speak to some of the realities that are occurring in our programs around the country. And, this comes from work that I did while at the NRC, the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, working with about 100 women from around the country, from these different groups that I just mentioned. Looking at practices, which perhaps are dismissive, or turning away certain groups of battered women for perhaps -- for instance, African-American women having certain attitudes of parenting styles that are not appreciated by the people who are perhaps the policy makers, or the advocates in the program, which are from -- they're from different backgrounds. And, we need to be at a place where we can understand those issues, and not just evaluate a certain parenting style as successful, and another one as something that we actually are punitive.

There's also an issue with programs having regulations

around -- everyone must be in a support group. If you speak a different language, or you -- then you may not be able to fulfill the program's requirements, and then you may not be a successful participant in that program, which could facilitate your not being able to be a part of that program. And that has been happening simply by _____ of battered women has an accent -- well, an accent and being able to speak a language can be very different. So, just really challenging ourselves around where we might be falling short, and putting women in the cracks.

There are issues around, I've heard from Native women, around some of the mental health outcome measures that affect child custody issues -- that there isn't a full disclosure around evaluators, of mandatory reporting. Evaluators need to be up front, as do all researchers around communicating with participants -- particular participants, who would be less familiar with some of these practices.

Also, looking at work being done in programs around supporting advocates, who many times, there may be one or two advocates of color within a program, even how is that supported? Where did these advocates -- where are they in the program? What's the nature of the work that they're doing? Are there efforts, in terms of white women working against racism in a program. I think these are some of the kinds of questions to critically look at what's happening.

There are also strategies that people have put in place -- for example, a group of rural women, in order to get around some of the barriers relating to the distances involved, created -- were able to advocate and create a situation where protection orders could be faxed in, so that it could eliminate some of the distance difficulties that really are very problematic in rural areas. And, I think acknowledging those successes, as well, is critical.

And, negotiation situations, where older women, or women with disabilities are able to have some type of caretaking, if it's necessary, within a program, where -- or having a program not just be physically accessible, but be accessible in the minds of the people running the program.

So, I think if we don't get at some of these issues, we do a very cursory, superficial type of evaluation, and we gear it only to certain sort of more main stream group of women. And so, I'm just -- I think my main point is really to recognize the privilege of doing evaluations. The privilege of being in a position to administrate a program, and really looking at the impact that just this whole process of evaluation can have, both in a positive way and in a negative on women, who -- we say, "We do this work in the name of -- (coughing.)"

MS. PARMLEY: We are running out of time, so what I -- for the sake of time, there was two things that I was going to

briefly mention on was, human subjects and getting resources.

For those of you, who didn't get the handouts on human subject issues, please make sure that you've signed up, or you give me your card, so you can get that. Because, that really goes through a lot of information about why you need to pay attention to human subjects issues that go right along with Eleanor was talking about, in terms of safety, of the individuals that are involved in research or evaluation. And the handout I gave you, just shows you some of the statutes -- there are federal statutes, we have them within the Department of Justice. Also, there's statutes for HHS, and other federal agencies that guide research and evaluation. And I just gave you some examples of that, because it's very important. And the key with those handouts for you all, is to make sure that whoever you work with, that they are in tune to those issues, and that there's nothing that they're going to do that could further jeopardize the safety and well being of the women that you all work with.

In terms of resources, again, there was two green sheets that gave a listing of federal resources, their web sites that provide information about just about every foundation and organization that does provide funds for research and evaluation. My agency, the National Institute

of Justice provides funds for research and evaluation. So, if you want more information, specifically about my agency, I'll be more than happy to give it to you. And there's other organizations like CDC, and ACF, etcetera, that's listed on that handout. So, if you didn't get it, just get in contact with me, and I'll make sure you get that information.

MS. RIGER: Okay, I'm going to say two sentences. I'm supposed to talk about collaboration between researchers and service providers.

The first sentence is, there's a wonderful article exactly about guidelines for creating collaborations between researchers and community organizations for research at the following web site -- I didn't write this, it's a very good one -- w-w-w dot s-s-w -- stands for school social work -- u-m-I-c-h -- stands for University of Michigan, dot edu, slash trapped, which stands for trapped by poverty, trapped by abuse, slash -- we're almost at the end, hang in there -- I-r-w-g, which stands for Institute for Research on Women in Gender, dot h-t-m-l -- and, I've never known what that stands for.

MS. RIGER: That was my first sentence. My second sentence is that the relationship between the evaluator and an agency is a relationship -- and like any other relationship, requires ongoing negotiation, a lot of conversation. You

may think when you're going into a relationship, you know what it's about, you know what to expect, but in this relationship, as in many others, there are always surprises. So, you need to constantly renegotiate, etcetera. That's the last word. We will all stay here for just a few minutes if anybody wants to talk with us individually. Thank you all for your patience and your participation. (Applause.)
(Background conversations.)
(End of recording on side B.)