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Introduction

This toolkit is intended to support the Champion Communities in the grassroots work of primary prevention of sexual assault and sexual violence. Communities around Minnesota are realizing that it is our communities themselves that help create the environment in which sexual assault and sexual violence can reside. Only by changing community norms that undergird the acceptance of these behaviors can we create a Minnesota free of sexual assault and violence.

Community Norms Continuum

As communities look at ways to approach this challenge, it is helpful to look at the current research and expert perspectives in what leads to an environment that fosters acceptance of sexual assault and violence. The Community Champions project has compiled a list of seven community norms found in all communities. At the left side of each norm continuum, community characteristics of an environment that fosters sexual assault and violence are listed. The right side of the continuum lists characteristics of a community that prevents sexual assault and violence.

Listed under each continuum are possible areas of focus for a community who desires to move themselves to the right on the continuum. This list continues to evolve as we learn from you what is working.

One initial team activity is for each individual on the team to mark the location on each continuum where the community is currently functioning. By compiling these results, communities can begin the discussion about which norms on which to focus. As the project team moves forward, it can return to this exercise to see where it sees change happening.
Community Norms Continuum

WHERE DO YOU SEE YOUR COMMUNITY?

Gender Roles
- Traditional Gender Roles
  - Rigid Roles
  - Value Male over Female
  - Sexual Objectification of Women
  - Heterosexism

Gender Equity in Practice

Possible Areas of Focus
- Sports Teams
- County Audit – Policies v. Practice
- Community Youth Groups
- Media Analysis
- Gender Neutral Restrooms

Who owns Sexual Violence?

Sexual Violence is an Individual Problem
- Blame Victim
- Blame Family
- Miscommunication/Distortion
- Both Victim and Perpetrator are Responsible
- Solutions focus on potential victim or families

Sexual Violence is a Community Problem
- Collective Responsibility
- We Help Raise the Victim & Perpetrator
- Systems Thinking
- Collective responsibility to not raise perpetrators
- Solutions are environmental/community based
- Solutions focus on social justice

Possible Areas of Focus
- Court System
- Media Coverage of Sexual Violence
- MENding Project
- Daycare Provider Licensing

Demonize Perpetrators

Perpetrators are Monsters
- You Can Tell By Looking at Them

Perpetrators are People We Know and Trust

Sexual Behavior Problem

Possible Areas of Focus
- Restorative Response/Youth Intervention for sexual behavior problems
- Provide and promote support and resources to individuals who are at risk to perpetrate
- Include people who work with perpetrators in community efforts

Community Categories To Consider
- Faith Communities
- Businesses and Non-Profits
- Government – City, County
- Schools – K-12
- Colleges/Universities
- Recreational Groups
- Other?
WHERE DO YOU SEE YOUR COMMUNITY?

Acceptance of Violence

- Violence Is Acceptable
- Violence is Entertaining
- Violence is Inevitable

Possible Areas of Focus
- Clean Hotels Policy
- Coaching Boys to Men program for youth coaches
- Youth Sports Policy Review/Templates

- Collaboration with existing Bullying focus
- Recognition of Sexual Violence as component
- Media Literacy education for youth, adults, businesses

Power

Possible Areas of Focus

- Power Over
- Take Power to Gain Power
- Entitlement
- Force
- Individual Goals

Private v. Public

Possible Areas of Focus

- Sexual Violence is a Private Issue
- Stigmatized
- Secret
- Uncomfortable to Talk About
- Family Bubble

- Sexual Violence is a Public Issue
- No Stigma
- Accurate Portrayal in Media
- Talked About
- Everyone Invested
- Resources Available

Sexuality

Possible Areas of Focus

- Sex Negative Community
- Exploitation
- Seen As Objects

- Sex Positive Community

Possible Areas of Focus

- Birth to Graduation Education Model
- Teenwise Pilot Site
- Faith Community Curriculums about Sexuality
- Comprehensive Sexuality Education policy in schools
Community Logic Models

One powerful way to define your community’s plan for change is to create a logic model. Logic models are a way to diagram your program or project. It is a process that helps participants clarify the changes (outcomes) they hope to accomplish with their work (activities). Logic models typically contain the following:

- Inputs – the things you need for your program to work
- Activities – the things you do
- Output – quantifiable things that result from your activities. Typically these are things you can count.
- Outcomes – this is the change you expect to happen because of your activities.
- Assumptions
- External Factors.

There are many ways to format a logic model. The following is an example from the community of Winona County. As part of their Champion Communities project, they instituted a Birth – Grade 3 Sexual Assault and Violence Curriculum initiative. The long-term outcomes come from the Community Norms Continuum document above.
Community Logic Model Example

Program: Winona Champion Community Logic Model – Develop Birth – Grade 3 Sexual Assault and Violence Curriculum

Inputs

MNCASA - technical support
Birth – Grade 3 Working Group
School Board
ECFE
Supplies/Office Support
Community Partners
Funding

Activities

Develop sexual assault & violence curriculum with Birth – Grade 3 Working Group
Gain School Board Approval of Curriculum
Create professional development program for Teachers, Day Care Providers, Administrators
Implement Child Curriculum
Develop ECFE sexual assault & violence parent curriculum
Implement Parent Curriculum

Outputs

Inputs Activities Outputs

# external curriculums reviewed

# partners in curriculum development & review - diversity, expertise, those affected by SA/V

# community members who contact school board

# category of community members trained (professionals, leaders, parents, children)

Knowledge/skill assessment of those trained

# activities to reinforce skills & knowledge

# partners in curriculum development & review - diversity, expertise, those affected by SA/V

Base of individual supporters developed

Strategic alliances are created to support our work

Leaders are developed to move our work forward

Policy changes are identified to move our work forward

Community develops skills and knowledge in SA/V primary prevention

Strategic alliances are sustained over time

Leadership for our work is expanded and enhanced

Policy changes are implemented and evaluated

Community engaged in SA/V primary prevention

Short Medium Long

Violence is unacceptable in the community.

Community views SA/V as a public issue.

The community takes collective responsibility for SA/V

Community embraces "power with" as stronger than "power against"

Community is a sex positive community

Outcomes

Assumptions

Community Leadership does not block primary prevention activities
Birth – Age 3 Working Group engaged in primary prevention efforts
Community Partners engaged in primary prevention efforts

External Factors

Politics of School Board
Funding availability
MNCASA technical support availability
Evaluation Tools and Techniques

Often organizations go into evaluation activities by say, “We should do a survey.” However, this is putting the tool before the purpose. When determining what type of data collection techniques to use, it is important to first focus on some key questions:

1. What do you want to know?
2. Why do you want to know this information?
3. Who is your population of interest?
4. What is the timing of information you want to collect? For example, do you need baseline data to show change over time?

Once you have a clear sense of the purpose, then you can look at techniques. Different techniques have different advantages and disadvantages. Things to consider include cost, time, skills required, culture and other concerns.

Overview of Methods to Collect Information

The following table provides an overview of the major methods used for collecting data during evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Overall Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Questionnaires, Surveys, Checklists** | when need to quickly and/or easily get lots of information from people in a non threatening way | -can complete anonymously  
- inexpensive to administer  
- easy to compare and analyze  
- administer to many people  
- can get lots of data  
- many sample questionnaires already exist | - might not get careful feedback  
- wording can bias client’s responses  
- are impersonal  
- in surveys, may need sampling expert  
- doesn’t get full story |
| **Interviews**                  | when want to fully understand someone’s impressions or experiences, or learn more about their answers to questionnaires | - get full range and depth of information  
- develops relationship with client  
- can be flexible with client | - can take much time  
- can be hard to analyze and compare  
- can be costly  
- interviewer can bias client’s responses |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Documentation Review** | When want impression of how program operates without interrupting the program; is from review of applications, finances, memos, minutes, etc. | - get comprehensive and historical information  
- doesn't interrupt program or client's routine in program  
- information already exists  
- few biases about information | - often takes much time  
- info may be incomplete  
- need to be quite clear about what looking for  
- not flexible means to get data; data restricted to what already exists |
| **Observation** | To gather accurate information about how a program actually operates, particularly about processes | - view operations of a program as they are actually occurring  
- can adapt to events as they occur | - can be difficult to interpret seen behaviors  
- can be complex to categorize observations  
- can influence behaviors of program participants  
- can be expensive |
| **Focus Groups** | Explore a topic in depth through group discussion, e.g., about reactions to an experience or suggestion, understanding common complaints, etc.; useful in evaluation and marketing | - quickly and reliably get common impressions  
- can be efficient way to get much range and depth of information in short time  
- can convey key information about programs | - can be hard to analyze responses  
- need good facilitator for safety and closure  
- difficult to schedule 6-8 people together |
| **Case Studies** | To fully understand or depict client's experiences in a program, and conduct comprehensive examination through cross comparison of cases | - fully depicts client's experience in program input, process and results  
- powerful means to portray program to outsiders | - usually quite time consuming to collect, organize and describe  
- represents depth of information, rather than breadth |


In Appendix A, you will find more information about these and other techniques, as well as links to examples and more detailed information.
Common Types of Evaluation

The following section highlights some common types of evaluation in a Champion Communities project. A description of the phase, as well as some suggestions for types of evaluation techniques is listed for each phase. When determining evaluation techniques to use, it is important to go back to the purpose of the evaluation. What do you want to know and why? This should guide your choice of technique.

Community Assessment
During the Community Assessment, project teams are trying to understand both the assets and challenges that exist in their particular community. This will help the project team determine the activities that will best lead them to their desired project outcomes. There are a variety of techniques that can be used for this phase. Some common techniques include key informant interviews, surveys and focus groups.

Community Collaboration Evaluation
Community collaboration evaluation looks at how the community is working together to achieve a common purpose. Some techniques that can be used include ripple effect mapping, surveys and interviews.

Outcomes Evaluation
Outcomes evaluation looks at how well the program or project is achieving its desired outcomes.

General: Outcomes Evaluation

Some techniques for outcomes evaluation include community continuum mapping, stories/narratives, and surveys.

Team Collaboration Evaluation
A critical component in these types of programs is the strength of the team involved in the work and the collaborations it develops. Techniques can include surveys and ripple effect mapping.

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
Prevention Institute - Building Cross Sector Collaboration

Process Evaluation
A process evaluation looks at how well the project processes are working. This can be done at various points in the project. However, it is often completed mid-project. Techniques that can be used include interviews, surveys and observation.
Appendix A – Evaluation Tools and Techniques

Community Norms Continuum Mapping – Pre and Post
One technique to show change in community norms is to track community member or team assessment of where the community resides for each norm over time. Below is an example of an initial community norm evaluation session.

Focus Groups
General: Focus Group Interviews
Analysis: Focus Group Analysis Tips

Key Informant Interviews – Pre and Post
Community Readiness Handbook

Meeting Minutes, Feedback, and Debrief
We can learn a lot about an initiative or program by systematically reflecting on and documenting group meetings. Detailed meeting minutes provide an official record of proceedings, while gathering feedback and debriefing after meetings tells us how people experienced it. Recording both the content of and reactions to meetings is a simple way to track process and progress.

Meeting Minutes Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Champion Communities Meeting – January xx, 201X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January xx, 201X 6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Debrief Example

Facilitator Session Debrief

1. What things did you observe in this session? What stood out for you?
2. What do you think were the highpoints?
3. Where did things miss their mark?
4. Do we have any new vantage point(s) from this session?
5. What significant shifts occurred during this session?
6. What’s important to place on the parking lot/to make note of for the future?
7. What’s the most important next step?
8. What else needs to follow?

Project Debrief

Debriefing after a project, activity, or event is an often overlooked, but important opportunity to gather data. It is also a formative/developmental approach for improving programming.

http://leadership.uoregon.edu/resources/exercises_tips/skills/leading_a_group_debrief

Policy inventories – pre and post

Another technique for measuring community change is to create a primary prevention community policy inventory. This is a simple tracking document, such as a spreadsheet. This document can be updated over the course of the project to show change in primary prevention policies.

Ripple Effect Mapping

Ripple Effect Mapping (REM), uses elements of Appreciative Inquiry, mind mapping, and qualitative data analysis to reflect upon and visually map the intended and unintended changes produced by a complex program or collaboration. It is a powerful technique to document impacts, do network diagramming and engage stakeholders.

**Stories/Narratives**
Stories come from people. They tell us about how individuals experienced an event, a program or opportunities offered by an agency or organization. Single stories give us insight, but a collection of stories can help us identify trends and patterns that help us evaluate programs and services.

http://www.tc.umn.edu/~rkrueger/story.html
http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/stories

**Survey**
General/basic: https://www.whatisasurvey.info/
General/online: http://s3.amazonaws.com/SurveyMonkeyFiles/SmartSurvey.pdf