



## **New Jersey Evaluation & Sustainability Plan**

**2010 – 2018**

**Submitted: July 2012**

## Table of Contents

New Jersey Evaluation & Sustainability Plan .....	1
2010 – 2018 .....	1
Submitted: July 2012.....	1
NJ EMPOWER Evaluation Plan Outline .....	4
Introduction .....	4
Ethical Standards & Guiding Principles for Program Evaluation in New Jersey.....	5
Confidentiality/Human Subjects .....	5
Culturally Appropriate Assessment/Evaluation .....	6
Cultural Competency Guiding Principles - General.....	6
Cultural Competency Standards: .....	7
Uses of Data & Data Feedback Loop.....	8
Data Guiding Principles - General .....	8
Data Standards:.....	9
Transparency & Objectivity.....	10
Transparency.....	10
Objectivity .....	11
Selection of Tools – Process & Outcome Evaluation .....	11
Capacity Assessment, Capacity Building & Capacity Considerations.....	13
State Standards .....	13
Process for Assessment .....	13
Assessment Results.....	14
Capacity Building Assessment Results & Plan.....	14
Evaluation Capacity Building Plan .....	16
Process Evaluation Plan – A Focus on Program Integrity, Documentation of Adaptations and Lessons Learned .....	17
Purpose of Process Evaluations .....	17

Statewide Standards for Process Evaluation .....	17
Outcome Evaluation Plan – A Focus on Changing Knowledge, Skills , Attitudes or Behaviors.....	18
Statewide Standards .....	18
State and Community Level Norms Change Logic Model & Goals: .....	19
State Level Policy Change/Systems Advocacy Logic Model & Goals: .....	20
Capacity Building Logic Model & Goals:.....	21
NJ Goal Specific Evaluation Strategies & Tools.....	22
Sustainability Plan.....	26
Worksheet 1: Sustainability actions for building and promoting specific strategies .....	26
Worksheet 2: Sustainability actions for building and promoting prevention system capacity .....	30
Appendix A – Evaluation Capacity Summary Results (March-May 2010).....	44
Appendix B: Process Evaluation Tools .....	49
Checklist for Process Evaluation of Bystander Intervention Strategies.....	49
Checklist for Process Evaluation of Media Literacy Strategy .....	60
Appendix C: Outcome Evaluation Tools.....	70
Bystander Pre-Post Test.....	70
Media Literacy Strategy Outcome Evaluation .....	78

# NJ EMPOWER Evaluation Plan Outline

## Introduction

This plan outlines the standards and methodology that will be used to evaluate both state plan progress and local strategy implementation. New Jersey is undertaking an **incremental approach to evaluation** that will first build infrastructure for quality program evaluation (Years 1-5) leading to an evaluation system that can take advantage of future opportunities for quantitative and qualitative research (Years 6-8).

The incremental approach also includes a recognition that current resources and infrastructure are limited and that we will need to build state and local capacity for evaluation over time. Evaluation strategies must be consistent with available resources while also including plans to continuously invest in building evaluation capacity over time.

The primary focus of evaluation efforts in New Jersey will be for **program improvement** at both the state and local level. Our approach will include **strong feedback loops** so that lessons learned locally are shared across the state and trends identified at the state level are passed along to local programs. This can only be done if there exists an integrated data collection and data analysis system that serves the needs of both local programs and state level users.

Quality program evaluation includes:

- robust and coordinated **process evaluation** methodology that tracks critical data on program integrity (consistent with workplans, core principles and curriculum design), strategy adaptation, volume of service and lessons learned
- piloted and refined **outcome evaluation** methodology that tracks changes in plan specified knowledge, skill, attitudes or behaviors

It is expected that early evaluation efforts will focus on the development of strong process evaluation methodology. Funding reductions over the last few years have also impacted the expectations related to evaluation. All funded projects under RPE will be expected to collect, analyze and respond to process evaluation data. Outcome evaluation efforts are mandatory for top funded projects but are suggested for all funded programs. We are also using extensive pilot testing of all outcome evaluation

tools and processes to ensure they meet the various needs of state and local constituencies.

We are using a **community centered approach** to evaluation that fully embraces the Empowerment Evaluation Principles of:

- **Improvement – A Focus on Success**
- **Community Ownership**
- **Inclusion**
- **Democratic Participation**
- **Social Justice**
- **Use of Evidence-based Practice**
- **Value of Community Knowledge -**
- **Capacity Building – Teaching others to fish**
- **A Culture of Organizational Learning**
- **Mutual Accountability -**

## **Ethical Standards & Guiding Principles for Program Evaluation in New Jersey**

The following ethical standards have been compiled by the SV Evaluation Standards Workgroup and align the goals of performing quality program evaluation and attaining sufficient capacity for future research opportunities. In many instances reaching the standards will require significant capacity building over time and implementation of standards will be incremental. A separate capacity building plan is included in Section 3.

### ***Confidentiality/Human Subjects***

- Adherence to IRB principles on human subjects including parental consent, confidentiality etc.
- Adherence to N.J.S.A. Title 18A:36-34 pertaining to parental consent for youth surveys in public schools. This statute can best be addressed through the development of uniform procedures and materials across the state for programs working in public schools.
- Participation in evaluation must be presented to all clients as voluntary and confidential. Informed consents must accompany any evaluation process and must be explained verbally as well as in writing.
- When including minors, informed consent must be obtained as well as assent from parent/guardian.

- The amount of identifying information (demographics) collected must be minimal and necessary.
- Risk to participants must be kept minimal (including emotional harm) and re-victimization must be avoided
- Appropriate resources should be provided to all participants in case participation brings up any issues
- All evaluation material must be kept in a safe, confidential location.
- Workgroups should review all evaluation recommendations to ensure basic ethical principles and should develop a sample informed consent.
- Each funded agency must designate at least one person as the point person for evaluation and that individual must attend a training on evaluation ethics.

## ***Culturally Appropriate Assessment/Evaluation***

### **Cultural Competency Guiding Principles - General**

- The way we think, view the world and interact with others is driven by our cultural conditioning, what we learn about our own cultural characteristics and those of others during the course of our lives. All of us are deeply influenced, both consciously and unconsciously, by aspects of our culture: our race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, immigrant status, physical ability, socio-economic status and so on.
- Members of non-dominant groups may have a strong identification to those cultural factors that have defined their marginalization: race for people of color, socio-economic status for poor people, gender identity and sexual orientation for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and inter-sexed individuals, religion for non-Christians, ability for those living with disabilities, and gender for women. Many people live at the intersection of a number of cultural factors. It is at these intersections that we often find a real understanding of how cultural differences affect all of us.
- Do not assume that all members of a group think, behave or believe the same. Assume that people from non-dominant groups are authorities on their own experience but not that any single voice represents the experience of the whole group. Ask many and ask repeatedly.
- Assume that you will be making assumptions about others who may be viewed as different– test those assumptions by asking directly. Also assume that we, by ourselves, may not be able to see our own privilege. Ask others for feedback on this also.
- Through the circumstances of our birth we each inherit cultural privileges that others may not have and that benefit and blind us in ways we don't always realize. This work requires us to be open and work to make visible the places where we walk in cultural privilege in order to understand the circumstances of those that do not.

- At the same time, any one individual can both walk in and out of privilege. This reality should make us all want to be more aware of effects of oppression and the benefits of privilege. We must also be careful about prioritizing oppression – each feels very heavy to the person who lives it. Examples of those walking both in and out of privilege include:
  - Upper middle class yet black
  - White yet gay
  - White yet female
  - Male yet poor
  
- Be open to understanding that language functions differently for different groups. Develop the habit of listening for and learning the implications about the variety of uses of language. There are differing standards for things like:
  - use of titles/honorifics (how one addresses an elder)
  - insider language (the “N” word, use of the word “Queer”)
  - culturally specific meaning of common terms (“respect” in the Black community)

### **Cultural Competency Standards:**

The following standards for culturally appropriate assessment/evaluation apply at both the state and local level:

Anyone doing the work of culturally appropriate assessment must

- have a willingness to be vulnerable and to be open to relearning and unlearning past assumptions
- create structures and processes that bring together or provide access to feedback from members of a particular community (of which the implementer is not a part). The default should be to pause and ask for feedback about:
  - Tool development
  - Tool implementation strategies
  - Data analysis – spotting trends
  - Report content and tone
- consider both similarities and differences between the evaluator and those being evaluated. Don’t rely just on similarities to get through, though this will be important – the learning comes from the differences.
- remember that the messenger matters – we may need trained community partners to establish credibility and get an honest response. If that is not available, acknowledge our differences. Don’t pretend they don’t exist.

- be willing and intentional about respecting and utilizing a variety of approaches in gathering and synthesizing data. One size will never fit all and adaptations are expected.
- be aware that historical trauma and grief is to be expected and is a critical variable. Some will feel it more than others. Some will be more aware of it than others. The evaluation process may step on landmines that neither the evaluator nor the participant had full awareness of – be ready to affirm and acknowledge this trauma. Intentionally investigate the effect of culture/history on perceptions about sexual violence and gender equity.
- leave the door open for feedback at several points in the process. Focus groups work well at the front end in tool development and implementation strategies. A standing Advisory Committee will work better during data analysis, report preparation and continuous quality improvement of the strategy.
- create a dissemination strategy that includes those who participated in the strategy. Provide feedback to the community – we morally owe them “their” data.
- institutionalize a system for continuous training and sharing of best practices on issues of cultural competency. This training should also be routinely integrated into other training opportunities regarding prevention strategy implementation and evaluation.
- Ensure that any organization that implements and evaluates primary prevention strategies must have an evaluation component that meets these standards as part of their cultural competency plan. For those organizations that do not have (or are not already required to have) an agency plan, a program specific cultural competency plan can be substituted.

## ***Uses of Data & Data Feedback Loop***

### **Data Guiding Principles - General**

- Local programs will not have the capacity to analyze or manage data without more staff and more expertise/capacity. Local program staff can be trained to collect data and enter it into a centralized state level system.
- Any data system must be able to handle multiple forms of data including: state and local, process and outcome, qualitative and quantitative.
- Data will be collected by multiple sources including: the PPEC workgroups (state goals), RPE funded programs and non-RPE state/local partners (implementing plan strategies). The goal is to collect data from as many of these sources as possible, even if they are not RPE funded. We recognize that this will be a difficult task so incentives will be built into the system to support non-funded partners through specialized training, peer support and a long term connection to local collaborative partners.
- Any data system and feedback loop must be designed with the ultimate goal in mind - robust process and outcome evaluation for program improvement and impact analysis. We need to think big even if we start small and leave sufficient room for growth over time. It is better to design a comprehensive system with limited early use than to start with a very limited system and try to enlarge/enhance it later.



## Data Standards:

- The following represent the priority uses of data in New Jersey’s primary prevention evaluation initiative:
  - To inform continuous quality improvement at the local and state level to ensure fidelity to the core principles and system capacity improvements
  - To identify any further potential need for strategy adaptations that result from implementation piloting and testing
  - For meeting reporting requirements of existing and potential future funders of primary prevention efforts
  - To gauge attitude and behavior changes across the state related to primary prevention (related to changes in baseline data over time)
  - To communicate with the public about the impact of primary prevention and the need for more stakeholders/partners
  - To publish lessons learned/best practices for other state prevention initiatives
- A centralized, state level system for data entry, data management, data analysis and reporting will be required to maximize efficiencies and minimize the burden on local implementers. It is expected that any final state data system will be web based to ensure easy access and data entry by all partners/stakeholders. It is also expected that there be someone(s) with appropriate capacity dedicated to manage the data at a statewide level.
- The “ownership” of data is multi-level and must demonstrate clear accountability at all levels for:
  - Protecting confidentiality of data and controlling access to raw data
  - Data integrity (cleaning the data and ensuring accuracy)
  - Rights and limitations for publishing/presenting the data findings
  - Transmission of data (protected access and timeliness of entry/reporting)
- System level feedback to individual local partners must:
  - Be given in an accessible format that is customized for use by individual programs for continuous improvement. Any reporting will include data summaries as well as recommendations for future action.
  - Be shared by the local program with the local communities and program participants that were the source of the data
  - Result in a local CQI action plan based on the data – for a feedback loop to be useful it must be an iterative process where the data informs corrective action and the corrective action impacts future data.
  - Be reported back to programs no less than quarterly – program improvement should not be seen as a “once a year” activity. Data reports and analysis should continuously inform implementation activities on the ground and be seen as

helpful/useful to local staff. This reporting standard also assumes that data entry at the local level is timely (within a week of data collection) and accurate.

- System level feedback at the state level must:
  - Support state level collaborative learning and monitoring of plan goals regarding primary prevention efforts and system capacity building efforts
  - Result in state level CQI action plans based on data
  - Generate quarterly reports for each goal area (recognizing that many of the workplans have long term strategies that might not generate data in any one quarter)

## ***Transparency & Objectivity***

**Transparency** – ensuring that both the process and results of evaluation are accessible to all stakeholders while protecting the confidentiality of respondents.

- While protecting respondent confidentiality, it is important to create a culture of information sharing between programs, with local coalitions/communities and at the state level. It is also important that evaluation efforts and results are shared internally, within organizations, to ensure continuity of effort and ready access to critical information during staff transitions.
- Consistent documentation and reporting of decision making on strategy implementation (especially the rationale for and content of any adjustments, modifications and departures from established protocol) at the local level is critical to a strong local and state CQI process and to continuity of effort. This documentation should be timely and consistent and become a routine part of evaluation activity.
- Adequate safeguards must be in place to protect the confidentiality of raw data. Local document protection and retention policies should be evaluated to ensure there are clear protocols for limited access to both electronic and paper files including completed surveys, interview summaries and focus group discussions.
- State and local evaluation efforts must recognize that what constitutes “transparency” may differ across stakeholders, communities and organizational cultures.
- Local coalitions/target communities can play an important role in interpreting evaluation results and in providing feedback on needed changes in implementation and evaluation protocol. Summary reports (devoid of any identifying information) should be routinely shared with local coalitions and feedback should be seriously considered and incorporated when finalizing any formal evaluation report. Evaluation protocols and tools should also be openly shared with coalitions/communities for feedback.
- Groups and individuals from whom data was collected should also have an opportunity to review drafts of reports and provide feedback. Open dialogue should take place and be documented on any disputed conclusions.
- All reporting must include the source of the report (agency), the authorship and contact information on the title/opening page.

- It is assumed that local programs will use standard evaluation tools designed collaboratively at the state level. It is also assumed that local groups may want to customize these tools to meet local needs and gather information that is deemed important at the local level. Programs are asked to inform the appropriate state level entity (SV Evaluation Standards Workgroup/State Data Management Agency) of any changes to ensure that the changes do not compromise state level data collection efforts and so that local ideas can be evaluated for state level use in the future. The development of a strong evaluation strategy and system requires this routine two way communications so that local best practices can be shared and so that a core set of statewide data is consistently collected.

**Objectivity** – the creation of some reasonable and cost-effective degree of separation between those who implement strategies and those who evaluate.

- County coalition members should be considered for integration into any evaluation plan, even if members are not methodological or evaluation experts. Review of data collection plans by the full coalition can help spot potential challenges and offer alternatives as well as ensure that local plans meet the guidelines on treatment of human subjects, cultural competency and transparency. Individual members can also be used as impartial observers for process evaluation checklist completion.
- Quality evaluation requires a team process, not the work of just one individual.
- Whenever feasible, independent third parties should be utilized in the evaluation process and development of the CQI Action plan based on data findings. These potentially include:
  - knowledgeable and capable colleagues within an organization. Consider inviting a top administrator or a program director from a complementary program to join an evaluation team.
  - involving community leaders and/or representatives from community partners or the community coalition
  - a diversity of viewpoints to strengthen an evaluation team’s ability to conduct a more comprehensive and objective evaluation and to ensure that culturally appropriate evaluation is being conducted (see section above)

### ***Selection of Tools – Process & Outcome Evaluation***

- Tools used should have previous testing for validity and appropriateness with target population. If not, they must be piloted with/reviewed by the target population(s) to ensure that they are appropriate and that language used resonates with that population.
- All implementers will use a uniform tool and methodology that meets the above core standards. Local customization can be used to augment the tool and gather info that is considered critical at the local level.
- Outcome evaluation tools are not intended to be used to educate or raise awareness – the focus is on collecting targeted information in the most efficient manner possible. The tool

- development process for both process and outcomes should prioritize what we “need” to know over what we “would like” to know and therefore we will keep tools brief and simple.
- In keeping with the spirit of “continuous quality improvement” and “collaborative learning”, all tools/methodology will be reviewed by the SV Evaluation Standards Workgroup/State Data Management Agency so that timely input can be given and potential concerns addressed prior to full implementation. The concern is to avoid major redesign during implementation and to ensure reasonable adherence to core standards (within the available resources).

# Capacity Assessment, Capacity Building & Capacity Considerations

## *State Standards*

- A range of evaluation capacities should be considered when developing evaluation tools and methods and while implementing evaluation strategies that are consistent with ethical standards outlined in this document.
- The complexity of the evaluation process should be minimal to accommodate a range of capacities, and should take into account the feasibility of administering, collecting, and analyzing the evaluation data.
- It is expected that early evaluation efforts (first 2-3 years) will:
  - be paper based until a web based system can be identified and customized
  - pilot evaluation tools and templates in different communities and require on-going tool/template customization based on lessons learned
  - require longer timelines for data collection, data analysis and reporting while an effective state level system is funded, designed and implemented
  - strain current local and state capacity for implementation and evaluation tasks. All early efforts should start simply and make reasonable claims on participant's time and energy.
  - require a variety of training opportunities at both the state and local level to ensure adequate core skills in evaluation implementation and good faith adherence to ethical standards.

## *Process for Assessment*

The group brainstormed a list of items that need to be collected from local programs in order to have a more complete assessment of current capacity. A survey was developed to capture information about evaluation capacity as of March 2010. The survey includes:

- What are their fears about evaluation?
- Who is doing what strategy?
- What target population are they focusing on?
- What do local staff know/understand about baseline measurement?
- What is their anticipated start date for implementation?
- Why did they choose this particular strategy? What conditions do they hope to change?
- What is the skill level on evaluation methodology (i.e: focus groups, surveys, role plays?)
- What planning is in place locally for evaluation strategies at this time (separate from state level workgroups)?
- What is their access to and comfort level for using key technology/software for data collection and analysis? This would include:
  - General access to computers

- Access to and version of Excel
- Comfort with data entry/use of Excel (if given a template to use)
- Access to databases – i.e.-Alice

The local capacity assessment for evaluation will be repeated every 3 years to account for staff turnover and to assess on-going staff development efforts.

## ***Assessment Results***

Overall background – May 2010

- 16 counties out of 22 responded
- Predominant prevention goal is bystander intervention followed by gender equity ( 2)
- Predominant bystander intervention strategy is Green Dot (14), SCREAM (2). Predominant gender equity strategy is social norms marketing ( 2) followed by media literacy ( 1)
- Predominant target population is high school students followed by colleges (community and/or local). Many are also targeting the broader community in addition to specific target population.
- The responses regarding baseline data demonstrate confusion about the difference between community baseline data and pre-post testing on prevention strategies.
- The workgroup made an informed judgment that a number of the programs “do not know what they don’t know about evaluation” and that responses should be viewed as possibly overestimating capacity. The questions that rate low, basic, moderate and high levels of capacity should be viewed in this light

See Appendix A for full survey summary

***Capacity Building Assessment Results & Plan*** – how does the evaluation plan and match up with state and local capacity building efforts on evaluation?

### **State Level Capacity**

Status as of June 2012

- There is little infrastructure in place for systematic data collection or analysis at the state level. All current prevention reports are paper based and data across local programs is manually summarized. NJCASA has taken on the role of collecting pilot process and outcome evaluation data from RPE funded programs. While the tools are still paper based, the data is entered into specialized excel spreadsheets that have been custom designed by the Empowerment Evaluator. A preliminary Access database is under development to hold all the evaluation data collected and to prepare standard reports. This database will form the core for an eventual online database.

- There is only one staff person at the state level responsible for RPE contracting, program oversight and report preparation. The RPE Coordinator also has responsibility for contracting, program oversight and report preparation for sexual violence intervention grants. As of July 2012 the Division on Women, which house the RPE Coordinator, will be moved from the Department of Community Affairs to the Department of Children & Families (DCF). DCF has extensive experience in setting up and maintaining state level data collection systems for child abuse, addictions prevention and domestic violence services. We are optimistic that they will be better positioned to support the data needs for RPE.
- NJCASA currently has a staff person dedicated to prevention efforts who has evaluation experience and expertise. This position is RPE funded and wholly dependent on future funding levels. Since NJCASA is a member based organization, there would need to be some firewalls between their work with members and their ability to objectively analyze/report data.

### **Local Level Capacity**

#### Status as of June 2012

- Prevention staff turnover continues to be a problem and the institutional level knowledge of prevention and evaluation concepts is still relatively low. We continue to build a core knowledge base at both the individual and institutional level.
- Uncertainty about funding levels causing major staff disruptions in local programs though the motivation level for evaluation processes remains high. Those funded at the low end of scale barely have resources to cover prevention activities and adding significant evaluation tasks to the mix is unrealistic. We have adjusted expectations based on funding levels so that those minimally funded will be required to do process but not outcome evaluation. Those funded at the top levels must do both process and outcome evaluation.
- All funded programs have had an opportunity to participate in both the development and pilot testing of the process evaluation tools over the last year. There has been significant interest in this work on the part of local prevention coordinators and the first round of pilot testing and tool revision is complete. There exists a strong core group of local leadership that has taken on responsibility for building a quality process evaluation system. Two separate task forces exist (a Bystander Evaluation Taskforce and a Media Literacy Evaluation Taskforce) for tool development, data analysis, development of an evaluation manual and data systems design. These workgroups report back to the Bystander/Gender Equity Workgroup on a monthly basis.

## ***Evaluation Capacity Building Plan***

Task	2011-2012	2013-2014	2015-2016
<p>Training on core evaluation concepts needed for CQI tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process Evaluation Beginner &amp; Advanced</li> <li>• Outcome Evaluation Beginner &amp; Advanced</li> <li>• Data Collection &amp; Analysis Techniques Beginner &amp; Advanced</li> <li>• CQI concepts Beginner &amp; Advanced</li> </ul>	<p>NJCASA Training Institute to offer new multi level training to accommodate needs of new staff and experienced staff at local SVPs. Advanced topics will be added over the two year period.</p>	<p>Multi level training on evaluation expanded to include local implementation site staff.</p>	<p>Research techniques introduced in addition to multi level evaluation training</p>
<p>State data system designed, funded and implemented</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper tools &amp; Survey Monkey used during pilot phase</li> <li>• Clicker technology purchased for all funded projects, customized and pilot tested</li> <li>• Access Database for process and outcome data designed and pilot tested</li> <li>• Research cost and practicality of transitioning to web based system</li> </ul>	<p>Fully implement state level data collection, analysis and CQI systems</p> <p>Fully implement local CQI process</p>	
<p>Research funding</p>		<p>Identify specific research project and methodology, research funding opportunities.</p>	



# Process Evaluation Plan – A Focus on Program Integrity, Documentation of Adaptations and Lessons Learned

## *Purpose of Process Evaluations*

- i. Accountability
- ii. Telling your story
- iii. Triangulation with outcome data

## *Statewide Standards for Process Evaluation*

- Must document adherence to all the core principles outlined in the plan for that particular strategy (program integrity/fidelity).
- Must also document the following items:
  - i. Any local customization/adaptation of the strategy/curriculum or evaluation methods. This includes both what was adapted and why.
  - ii. What worked and didn't work in strategy and evaluation implementation/piloting
  - iii. Number of attendees/participants or other key volume indicators. It is important to be able to answer the "so what?" question on volume indicators – what do we hope to learn from the information and why should we bother to collect it?
  - iv. Lessons learned along the way (CQI) and how this informs other providers/similar efforts
- Outputs described in the plan logic model/workplan for that strategy: i.e.-
  - Types of schools (public, private, parochial)
  - Grade levels (middle/high/college age)
  - 1-3 community partners in each county to share in implementation

**Note: All workgroups should review the workplan for their area and ensure that it is still relevant and realistic. These workplans should be revised as needed before an evaluation plan is completed.**

- **The development of a process evaluation "checklist" or "monitoring sheet" by workgroups will assist programs in gathering process evaluation information.**

# **Outcome Evaluation Plan – A Focus on Changing Knowledge, Skills , Attitudes or Behaviors**

## ***Statewide Standards***

- Tools used must assess the outcomes identified in the Impact section of the logic model (see below).
- All workgroups should regularly review the plan outcomes for their area and ensure that they are still relevant (conform to the RPE Theory of Change), realistic (are neither too easy nor too hard to achieve) and based in research (on risk and protective factors). These outcomes could be revised as needed as evaluation plan is implemented.
- Some level of baseline data must be collected prior to implementation to ensure we can track changes over time. Retrospective pre-testing/baseline data collection is strongly discouraged. Baseline data can be collected through pre-tests or inventories or other data collection strategies.
- Where possible, post testing should occur sometime after the intervention, not just immediately after the intervention. Adequate time must elapse post training to allow opportunities for behavior change to take place.

***State and Community Level Norms Change Logic Model & Goals:***

- **Create and market social norms in New Jersey that promote gender equity and respect for women and girls by reducing rigid sexual stereotypes and increasing male accountability for the prevention of sexual violence**
- **Increase bystander intervention along the continuum of sexual violence behaviors among middle school, high school, and college communities.**

Inputs	Strategies in Use	Outputs	Interim Outcomes	Impact
<p>22 Local SVPs currently providing foundational prevention services</p> <p>DOW</p> <p>NJCASA</p> <p>Interested community partners (other non RPE funded prevention providers and community groups)</p>	<p>Gender Equality: New Mexico Media Literacy</p> <p>Bystander: Green Dot</p> <p>Learning to Scream</p> <p>Other approved locally designed strategies that meet core principles of each goal area</p>	<p>A minimum of one strategy implemented in each funded county</p> <p>Private, public and parochial schools implementing bystander or media literacy strategy at the middle school, high school and college level</p> <p>Each county program will recruit and fully engage 1-2 community partners to share in implementation for up to a 2 year period.</p>	<p>Strategy customization to meet core principles of plan</p> <p>Local SVPs will transition foundational services to align with plan strategy choices and/or core principles</p> <p>Community partners will adopt, implement and sustain plan strategies in cooperation with local SVPs</p>	<p>Social norms that are supportive of rigid sexual stereotyping will decrease by 20%, and social norms which support healthy sexuality and male accountability will increase by 20%</p> <p>Recognition of the impact of sexualized mass media on gender inequality, healthy sexuality and gender roles will increase by 20%</p> <p>Student’s skills and knowledge on how to intervene will increase by 50%</p> <p>Skills and knowledge on how to intervene will also increase for other allies by 50%</p> <p>Students' willingness to intervene as engaged bystanders will increase 25%</p> <p>Students' helping bystander behaviors will increase by 25% for those who have the opportunity to intervene</p>

***State Level Policy Change/Systems Advocacy Logic Model & Goals:***

- **Create and implement institutional and agency strategies that prevent the perpetration of sexual violence against people with developmental disabilities and inmates of correctional facilities.**
- **Identify and support delivery systems that would increase parental/caregiver attachment and increase empathy skills in children.**
- **Increase opportunities for healthy community connectedness for young males (middle, high school and college level) who have been exposed to family violence.**

***Special Note: Due to funding reductions, several of the following strategies have been delayed.***

Inputs	Strategies	Outputs	Interim Outcomes	Impact
Federal PREA Standards	Systems advocacy for Central registry of offenders in DDD system of care	Registry implemented	Central registry lists all identified perpetrators who care for DDD population	Known perpetrators not re-hired in DDD system of care
DDD current work on central registry and consent redefinition	Policy change on Consent definition in 2C14	DDD representation added to goal workgroup	2C14 amended	Caregivers held accountable for consent, rather than victim
NJ Dept of Children and Families (Strengthening Families)	PREA policy adoption, monitoring and adaptation	Formal agreement for policy implementation by DOC, DDD and DMH	Implement PREA standards for Prisoners, DD and MH clients	Increased screening and supervision in institutions and community care facilities
NJ Dept. of Community Affairs – Div. On Women	Bystander strategy for caregivers	State level caregiver groups attend bystander training	Customized bystander strategy for caregivers	Increased caregiver intervention in institutions and community care settings
NJ Dept. of Education – Office of Educational Support Services – Drug Free Schools (I Can Problem Solve, Incredible Years, Second Step, Social Decision Making, Dare to be You)	Cross systems advocacy and training with others who deal with violence prevention	At least one cross system summit followed by increased engagement between systems	Violence Prevention Blueprint developed	Increased early intervention for potential risk factors of perpetration Increased funding for both systems
Prevent Child Abuse NJ (Healthy Families America)	DV systems advocacy for targeted community connectedness	EBI identified	Goal inclusion in DV Prevention Plan	Increased protective factor of community connectedness for targeted high risk youth
NJCBW				
Rutgers VAWC				

**Capacity Building Logic Model & Goals:**

- **Increase funding available for sexual violence prevention strategies, data collection and system capacity upgrades and minimize negative financial impact on intervention activities**
- **Build a coordinated system for data collection and analysis in New Jersey**
- **There will be sufficient skill, experience, leadership, information, human resources, evaluation tools and collaboration in RPE funded SVP’s to implement and sustain viable strategies for long term reduction and primary prevention of sexual violence in New Jersey.**
- **Develop a baseline and track changes for New Jersey on societal perceptions, norms and attitudes toward key risk factors of sexual violence.**

**Special Note: Due to funding reductions, several of the following strategies have been delayed.**

Inputs	Strategies	Outputs	Interim Outcomes	Impact
\$1 million dollars per year in RPE funding for prevention	Research and advocacy for dedicated funding stream	Feasibility plan with options for dedicated funding stream	Sponsors in Assembly and Senate and Governor’s Support	At least a 100% increase in funding available for prevention and intervention
\$1 million dollars per year in state funding for intervention	Collection of baseline attitudinal and norms data	\$100K in public/private funding for data collection	State/SVPs use data for implementing norms change strategies and evaluation	Comparative norms data available for strategy refinement and evaluation Measure change in attitudes on gender norms over time
22 Local SVPs currently providing foundational prevention services	Integrate prevalence data collection and analysis	Formal affiliation agreements with State Police, DCJ, DOW, DOE, DHSS	Core standards in place on data collection and sharing	Demographic and trend data on perpetration informs future targeting of prevention resources
NJCASA Training Institute	NJCASA Training Institute focus on strategy implementation, cultural competency, evaluation and community mobilization	Minimum of 1 training biannually on each prevention strategy, cultural competency and evaluation for SVPs and community partners	Plan strategies implemented consistently across state and in a culturally competent manner	Fidelity of strategy implementation is at least 80%
Interested community partners (other non RPE funded prevention providers)				
DOW mandated technical assistance in RPE contracts				

# NJ Goal Specific Evaluation Strategies & Tools

New Jersey Goal: Bystander Intervention						
Evaluation Questions	Indicator(s)	Data collection			Data Analysis	Feedback Loop for CQI
		Source	Method	Timing		
<p><b>Process:</b> Fidelity to core principles and curriculum content and local adaptations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Going deep</li> <li>• Gender inclusivity</li> <li>• Cultural sensitivity</li> <li>• Audience adaptation – language &amp; examples</li> <li>• Introduction to services</li> <li>• Connection to issue/facilitator</li> <li>• Empathy to victims</li> <li>• Bystander process explanation and examples</li> <li>• Culture change</li> <li>• Next steps</li> <li>• Skills training content</li> <li>• Dosage (subsequent exposures)</li> </ul>	Quantitative data and demographics	Process Checklist at each dose	<p>Impartial local observers trained to complete checklist</p> <p>SV Prevention Coordinator to enter data in survey tool and provide info on adaptations made</p>	<p>Pilot test Jan-December 2011 in local programs</p> <p>Full implementation by June 2012</p> <p>Collected at each persuasive speech, skills training and subsequent exposure</p>	<p>2011/12 Analysis done by Bystander Workgroup for development of final checklist for broader use</p> <p>2013+ Data entered into state level system and analyzed by state level evaluator at least quarterly</p>	<p>2011/12 Checklist submitted to NJCASA for review by Bystander &amp; Gender Equity Workgroup</p> <p>2013+ Quarterly reports to individual programs and full Bystander &amp; Gender Equity Workgroup</p>
<p><b>Outcome:</b> Key areas for measurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Recognize points of intervention</li> <li>o Assess willingness to intervene</li> <li>o Actual Intervention</li> <li>o Movement along bystander stages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> notice event</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> interpret as a problem</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> see oneself as part of the solution</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> skills to intervene</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> actual intervention</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Identifying obstacles</li> <li>o Continuum/List of SV – what do they notice?</li> <li>o Diffusion – will you be a P.O.L.?</li> <li>o Type of intervention? Direct, Distract, Delegate?</li> </ul>	Quantitative and demographic	Collected from peer leaders and POLs pre and post skills training Baseline data collected from broader community in select communities	<p>Pre- post paper surveys by program staff</p> <p>Use of clicker technology by end of 2012</p>	<p>Tools developed by October 2011 and pilot tested for 6 months</p> <p>Use at beginning of skills training and 90 days after completion of skills training</p>	Data entered into state level system and analyzed by state level evaluator/program representatives at least quarterly	Quarterly reports to individual programs and full Bystander & Gender Equity Workgroup

New Jersey Goal: State Level Collaboration for Data, Vulnerable Populations, Empathy & Attachment Goals						
Evaluation Questions	Indicator(s)	Data collection			Data Analysis	Feedback Loop for CQI
		Source	Method	Timing		
Process: Fidelity to workplan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tasks</li> <li>• Timeline</li> </ul>	Qualitative data	Workgroup Chair after Workgroup meetings	Workplan checklist – initially paper version and then online version	Revise plan based on data collected annually	2011+ Analysis done by SCBT	2011+ Shared with PPEC partners at regular meetings Workgroups create amended workplans based on results
Outcome: Levels of collaboration among critical partners including factors related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment</li> <li>• Member characteristics</li> <li>• Process &amp; Structure</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Purpose</li> <li>• Resources</li> </ul>	Quantitative and Qualitative data	Workgroups identify critical collaborative partners based on workplan for distribution of survey EE to send out survey in latey 2012.	Wilder Collaboration Factors Index as online survey (amended)	Baseline Fall 2012  Annual survey compared to baseline 2013+	Analysis done by EE in 2012 with review by Evaluation Standards Workgroup	Shared with PPEC partners at regular meetings Workgroups create amended workplans based on results

New Jersey Goal: Capacity Building – Funding & Training Institute						
Process: Fidelity to workplan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tasks</li> <li>• Timeline</li> <li>• Lessons learned</li> </ul> Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction with format, presenter, facilities</li> </ul>	Qualitative data	NJCASA to submit workplan checklist  NJCASA to collect from attendees	Workplan checklist – initially paper version and then online version  Paper surveys	Pilot test Spring 2011 Full implementation in 2012	2012+ Analysis done by SCBT	2012+ Shared with PPEC partners at regular meetings NJCASA creates amended workplans based on results
Outcome: Customized to each training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of core content covered</li> <li>• Increased skill in applying content covered</li> <li>• Behavior – long term use of content in the field</li> </ul> Outcome: Increased system evaluation capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of core concepts</li> <li>• Use of tools in the field</li> <li>• Adaptations based on results</li> </ul>	Quantitative and Qualitative data	NJCASA to collect from attendees attending trainings  NJCASA to conduct annual evaluation capacity survey	Pre/post tests: Hard copy post test only for one time sessions Online pre-post test for strategy trainings Online survey of all programs using tool developed in 2010	Before session, after session and 6 months later for strategy training sessions  June of each year 2011+	Changes in pre-post scores per topic  Evaluation Standards Workgroup to analyze results of annual survey	Shared with SCBT NJCASA creates corrective action workplans based on results



New Jersey Goal: Media Literacy Full Strategy						
Evaluation Questions	Indicator(s)	Data collection			Data Analysis	Feedback Loop for CQI
		Source	Method	Timing		
<p><b>Process:</b> Fidelity to core principles and curriculum content and local adaptations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7-9 doses</li> <li>• Basic, intermediate and advanced coverage of 4 skill areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Media Literacy</li> <li>○ Persuasion</li> <li>○ Deconstructing Ads</li> <li>○ Reconstruction/Action</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Use of core activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender boxes</li> <li>○ Deconstructing ads</li> <li>○ Making counter ads</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Demographics of attendees</li> <li>• Adaptations</li> </ul>	Quantitative data and demographics	Process Checklist at each dose collected by trained impartial observer	<p>Impartial local observers trained to complete checklist</p> <p>SV Prevention Coordinator to enter data in NJCASA survey tool and provide info on adaptations made</p>	<p>Pilot test Fall 2011 in select sites</p> <p>Full implementation in 2012</p> <p>Collected at each dose</p>	<p>2011/12 Analysis done by Bystander /Gender Equity Workgroup for development of final checklist for broader use</p> <p>2013+ Data entered into state level system and analyzed by state level evaluator at least quarterly</p>	<p>2011/12 Checklist submitted to NJCASA for review by Bystander &amp; Gender Equity Workgroup</p> <p>2013+ Quarterly reports to individual programs and full Bystander &amp; Gender Equity Workgroup</p>
<p><b>Outcome: key areas for measurement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Knowledge of media literacy concepts</li> <li>• Knowledge of persuasion techniques</li> <li>• Knowledge of deconstruction techniques</li> <li>• Knowledge of and possible behaviors that demonstrate reconstruction skills</li> <li>• Perceptions of gender equity/male accountability &amp; link to media</li> <li>• Demographic Data needed</li> </ul>	Quantitative and demographic	Collected from peer leaders and POLs pre and post skills training Baseline data collected from broader community in targeted sites	Pre- post paper surveys by program staff Use of clicker technology during curriculum implementation	Tools developed by December 2011 and pilot tested for 6 months. Pre test conducted as part of first three does of curriculum. Questions are integrated into the curriculum. Post test conducted during the last two doses Considering longer term follow up to identify actual behavior change	Data entered into state level system and analyzed by state level evaluator/program representatives at least quarterly	Quarterly reports to individual programs and full Bystander & Gender Equity Workgroup

# Sustainability Plan

## *Worksheet 1: Sustainability actions for building and promoting specific strategies*

**Describe the strategy that is being reviewed for sustainability: Bystander – Assorted local strategies & Media Literacy Strategy**

Strategy-specific sustainability actions	Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote the sustainability of this strategy
General actions which apply to any strategy	
1. The strategy aligns with the needs of universal or selected populations.	Concentration is on middle school, high school and college campuses. The media literacy strategy needs the support of the broader community among parents and caregivers but the focus is still on supporting youth in building literacy skills.
2. The strategy is compatible with implementers.	The goal with both strategies is to train other trainers. RPE funded staff will initiate the strategy and support it in the first two years but it is expected that school personnel and other community stakeholders will take primary responsibility for long term implementation at specific sites.
3. There are relationships among key stakeholders.	Local coalitions/collaborations have been formed and attention needs to be paid to building up engagement from a wider variety of community stakeholders. The required MOU with implementation sites in each county will help assure consistency of efforts and adherence to core strategies. A sustainable process for engaging local collaborators is currently under review & discussion and will be implemented by end of 2012. Focus had shifted away from Coalition “meetings” to evidence of collaboration.

<p>4. The strategy has been shown to achieve stated goals and outcomes.</p>	<p>Process and outcome evaluation tools are being implemented for all projects and the CQI process needs to be maintained to make best use of the data in adapting strategies and improving fidelity.</p>
<p>5. The strategy has stakeholder ownership.</p>	<p>Both strategies are being implemented as train the trainer models. Local partners join together in a local coalition to share best practices, evaluate efforts and build broader community support over time.</p> <p>The sexual violence program implements the strategy in the first 2 years and while developing a long term sustainability plan with each implementation site.</p>
<p><b>Specific actions which help lead to institutionalization</b></p>	<p><b>Describe actions that can be taken to further ensure the institutionalization of this strategy</b></p>
<p>1. The key activities associated with implementing and evaluating the strategy have been integrated into job descriptions, requirements and staff assessments.</p> <p>2. Key staff and leaders responsible for strategy implementation and evaluation have been retained.</p>	<p>The SCBT will develop specific job description criteria related to strategy implementation, evaluation, coalition building and community mobilization.</p> <p>The Division on Women (DOW) will monitor compliance with the core job criteria during the RFP process and annual site visits.</p> <p>DOW will provide technical assistance to agency executive directors on integrating core job requirements into any performance evaluation system.</p> <p>The SCBT will develop a peer recognition program that lifts up those who:</p>

	Implement cutting edge prevention practices or Overcome significant local barriers in implementation
3. Supplies, materials, space and equipment needed to continue implementing and evaluating the strategy are available.	<p>DOW will allow for reasonable purchases with RPE grant funds related to strategy implementation. We will research the option of bulk purchasing for collateral materials across programs.</p> <p>Investments in the development of a centralized data system for process and outcome evaluation data is underway and will be continued as resources are available. Stage 1 is the purchase of clicker technology for local programs and Stage 2 is the development of the core database.</p>
<p>4. Staff training and continuing education needs associated with implementing and evaluating the strategy has been incorporated into on-going operations.</p> <p>5. The skills needed to implement and evaluate the strategy have become part of the (organization's/profession's) standards.</p>	<p>All Prevention Coordinators will have continued access to peer support through the NJCASA Prevention Coordinators meetings and the SPT's Bystander/Gender Equity Workgroup.</p> <p>NJCASA will continue to provide multi-level strategy implementation and evaluation training through the Training Institute. This training is available to all funded programs and community partners.</p> <p>Professional standards for sexual violence prevention work will be incorporated into all RFP documents, monitored at site visits and integrated into NJCASA training curricula.</p>
6. The strategy is integrated into manuals, procedures, and regulations of the implementing organization, implementation site, planning team or prevention system.	<p>A model MOU is under development for all implementation sites. This MOU will focus on ensuring fidelity to the core content and processes and continued cooperation with process and outcome evaluation.</p> <p>Guidance documents are in development for all process and outcome evaluation tools and procedures.</p>

	DOW will act as an advocate for programs at the implementation site at all site visits to support fidelity to core content and processes.
7. An implementation monitoring process has been integrated into the strategy's on-going process evaluation activities.	<p>The pilot phase for process evaluation of both strategies will be over in April 2012. Final tools for use by funded programs and partners will then go into full use. Data from the process evaluations is being submitted to NJCASA &amp; DOW for review by the Bystander/Gender Equity Workgroup for lessons learned. Review of data will occur quarterly with feedback to all funded programs.</p> <p>The process evaluation tool ensures fidelity to core content and processes and captures adaptations made locally. All funded programs are required to conduct process evaluation.</p>
8. On-going outcome evaluation activities have been established and maintained.	<p>The pilot phase for outcome evaluation of both strategies will be over in December 2012. Final tools for use by funded programs and partners will then go into full use. Data from the outcome evaluations is being submitted to NJCASA &amp; DOW for review by the Bystander/Gender Equity Workgroup for lessons learned. Review of data will occur quarterly with feedback to all funded programs.</p> <p>Only programs funded at the top two levels are required to conduct outcome evaluation.</p>
9. The strategy is supported by continuous soft or hard money.	<p>Funded programs are encouraged to work with school systems to integrate the strategy into core classroom curricula rather than only as a standalone or afterschool strategy. We will also be submitting the curriculum for both strategies to the NJ Dept. of Education for inclusion in their database of curricula meeting core education standards.</p> <p>While RPE funding continues to be the largest source of funding for local prevention strategies, we are researching the success of local programs to access other funding to</p>

	support these efforts.
10. The strategy has survived annual budget and grant cycles.	The Media Literacy strategy has a higher likelihood of long term sustainability since there is no additional cost for training others to implement in the community. We are researching the development of our own curricula for the bystander strategy, using lessons learned from Green Dot and Learning to Scream implementation to date. The cost of training new implementation sites for Green Dot is not sustainable at this point.

***Worksheet 2: Sustainability actions for building and promoting prevention system capacity***

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>	<b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b>	<b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b>
<b>1. System profile</b> – The existing environment, relationships, and challenges that your state’s SV/IPV prevention system operates in, and the key influences and/or constraints on the system.		
<b>System profile elements:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A well-delineated and integrated statewide SV/IPV prevention system is evident.</li> <li>SV/IPV is embedded in the state’s</li> </ul>	The State Prevention Team worked very effectively throughout the initial planning and goal setting process. We had high level of engagement from a variety of stakeholders	NJ is at a crossroads in the “institutionalization” of sexual violence into state government. After being housed at the DOW for the last 16 years, there will be a

<p>regulatory, legal and statutory environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SV/IPV prevention is well integrated into state administrative structures, relatively protected from shifting political priorities.</li> <li>• Relationships, partnerships, and networks that integrate SV/IPV prevention into a broad diversity of state and local constituencies are well established.</li> <li>• Multiple stakeholders are consistently able to define common ground to achieve a high degree of functional alignment of missions, visions, and values.</li> <li>• Strong commitment to primary prevention, planning, and evaluation is evident throughout the system.</li> <li>• Multiple funding streams for SV/IPV prevention at state, local,</li> </ul>	<p>across state government and in the broader nonprofit sector. The most effective strategies for engagement included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customized training for members on the core issues surrounding primary prevention of sexual violence</li> <li>• Member leadership of workgroups</li> <li>• Interactive and informative agendas led by a strong SCBT</li> </ul> <p>Once we moved to implementation and evaluation it became more difficult to sustain the energy of state level SPT team members. Local programs became much more engaged since the majority of the work of implementation and evaluation fell on them. The Evaluation Standards Workgroup remained highly engaged and produced strong standards for the evaluation plan.</p> <p>The sexual violence prevention plan is very well integrated into the work of the current cognizant agency (DOW), the workplan of NJCASA and in RPE grants to local providers.</p> <p>The challenge has been and remains one of getting the plan better integrated into state data systems related to sexual violence and building stronger coalitions across fields.</p>	<p>major change as of July 1, 2012. Sexual violence will be integrated into the Department of Children &amp; Families. Sustainability efforts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that sexual violence funding and program planning remain intact and protected as a distinct issue</li> <li>• Building stronger alliances with other fields covered by the department, including child abuse and domestic violence</li> <li>• Retaining our linkage to the Dept of Health especially with their efforts to better integrate work across key risk factors and the synergy with the Community Transformation Grant planning/implementation process.</li> </ul> <p>It is our hope that this new administrative structure will protect the plan progress to date and provide even more opportunity for cross field integration.</p>
--	--	---

<p>and federal level are evident, with continuing development to achieve financial sustainability.</p>	<p>There has been progress in the last few years but it has been slow and uneven.</p> <p>While there is a plan for increasing financial sustainability, recent budget cuts at the federal and state level have moved us further from the goal.</p>	
--	--	--



<b>System capacity dimension:</b>		
<p><b>2. Leadership</b> – The leadership environment in your state.</p>	<p><b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>2. Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>2. New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>Leadership elements:</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state has strong, recognized and stable leadership for SV/IPV prevention and established legitimacy with multiple constituencies throughout the state.</li> <li>• Leaders consistently and actively model principles of inclusion, collaboration, and democratic participation, encouraging creativity and continuous learning.</li> <li>• Leadership values reflect sensitivity to cultural perspectives of broader constituencies and are continuously assessed as constituencies change.</li> <li>• Shared values and a common vision for SV/IPV prevention are strongly in evidence across the</li> </ul>	<p>There is emerging leadership within the field as local programs move more deeply into strategy implementation and evaluation.</p> <p>The work of the Prevention Coordinators Workgroup of NJCASA and the Bystander/Gender Equity Workgroup of the SPT has encouraged and supported leadership development among local program staff. We have a number of local programs that are recognized as early adopters and whose staff are taking leadership roles in the refinement of best practices for strategy implementation and evaluation tools/processes. Even with staff turnover, we have been able to build a strong and diverse base of leaders that are playing critical roles in building capacity across the state.</p>	<p>Future actions include continued support for the current and future leadership. This support includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of a formal process for ongoing peer recognition</li> <li>• Increased support for state RPE staff with the transition of the Division on Women to the Department of Children and Families</li> <li>• Further refinement of the RFP process to give credibility and extra consideration for those who take leadership roles.</li> <li>• Continued staffing and technical assistance by NJCASA and the EE for the workgroups</li> </ul>

<p>leadership spectrum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership exhibits strong and sustained commitment to public health approach to primary SV/IPV prevention through their actions.</li> <li>• Leadership development is systematic, ongoing, continuously evaluated and improved.</li> <li>• New leadership cadre is emerging, reflecting diverse non-traditional constituencies and new ideas.</li> <li>• Leadership routinely explores and develops new opportunities for younger persons to take on new leadership roles.</li> </ul>	<p>The work of both groups is highly collaborative &amp; inclusive and has resulted in the development of a strong culture of continuous learning.</p>	
---	--	--

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>		
3. <b>Strategic planning</b> – The development of statewide strategic objectives and actions plans around SV prevention.	Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:	Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:
<b>Strategic planning elements:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goals that address specific elements</li> <li>2. Progress already made toward goals</li> <li>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further development of existing goals</li> <li>2. New activities involving new elements</li> <li>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</li> </ol>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning is recognized as critical to SV/IPV prevention, independent of funding requirements.</li> <li>• Statewide SV/IPV prevention planning is well developed, systematic, and integrated.</li> <li>• A focus on primary prevention is clearly reflected in statewide strategic goals and objectives that are continuously evaluated and revised.</li> <li>• Statewide SV/IPV prevention planning is consistently evidence based.</li> <li>• All SV/IPV prevention constituencies and communities are</li> </ul>	<p>The sexual violence prevention plan is well integrated into the state and local systems. The SCBT has had primary responsibility for monitoring progress on the plan goals and in suggesting modifications to the SPT based on a changing environment.</p>	<p>We are very highly focused on what we have determined to be the core plan goals for the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving data collection and integration across all state systems and between local programs and state entities.</li> <li>• Developing a prevention blueprint that cuts across a number of fields that have shared risk &amp; protective factors. This blueprint will delineate integration of efforts in a number of areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Our shared language about primary prevention</li> <li>○ Shared advocacy efforts for funding and policy change at the state and local level</li> <li>○ Shared best practices for the coordinated recruitment of new implementation sites at</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>well integrated in the planning process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning systematically involves a broad diversity of constituencies across the state at multiple levels of the SV/IPV prevention system.</li> <li>• SV/PIV prevention planning routinely incorporates feedback from communities and constituencies across the state, to maintain accountability.</li> <li>• SV/IPV prevention action plans are actively being carried out across the state and are continuously evaluated and improved.</li> <li>• Progress against planning goals and objectives is routinely measured, and evaluation results are fed back into the prevention planning process.</li> </ul>		<p>the local level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Data sharing</li> <li>• Merging the NJ Sexual Violence Primary Prevention Plan into the Department of Children and Families' Strategic Plan</li> </ul>
---	--	--

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>		
<p><b>4. Information</b> – The current state of measurement, analysis, and management of information for knowledge-driven performance in your state SV prevention system.</p>	<p><b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>2. Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>2. New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>Information elements:</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A systematic, collaborative approach to measurement and analysis is evident and well integrated across the SV/IPV prevention system.</li> <li>• IT systems are well developed to support data gathering and analysis and to ensure data quality; IT systems are continuously evaluated, updated, and improved to support system wide information needs.</li> <li>• Data is systematically analyzed and consistently used to assess needs, inform planning, and evaluate performance, and information is routinely shared across the system.</li> <li>• Data of high quality are routinely available and are continuously evaluated and improved to ensure their utility.</li> </ul>	<p>We have started work on the development of a state system for data collection, trend analysis and management of data. Our evaluation standards document has clearly delineated our goals in this area and investments are already underway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clicker technology for all local programs has been budgeted and is in the early process of customization/implementation.</li> <li>• An Access database for process and outcome evaluation has been started, though local data is still be collecting on customized Excel spreadsheets for upload</li> <li>• Specific teams have been assembled to review pilot process and outcome data for both the Bystander &amp; Media Literacy strategies. These teams have identified tool refinement as well as strategy adaptations based on early data</li> </ul>	<p>Future investments in a state data system include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The creation and implementation of an online system for data entry for both process and outcome evaluation.</li> <li>• Continued training on evaluation processes and trend analysis.</li> <li>• A one year extension of funding for EE services to ensure that the data systems match the plan goals and that data analysis becomes integrated into routine monitoring activities.</li> </ul>

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>		
<p><b>5. Community and constituency focus</b> – How your state SV prevention involves, understands, and maintains accountability to SV prevention constituencies and communities.</p>	<p><b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>2. Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>2. New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>Community and constituency elements:</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationships with broad diversity of communities and constituencies across the state are well established and strong.</li> <li>• Relationships with those who traditionally lack voice, power, or representation are well established.</li> <li>• Active outreach to those who have not participated in the past bringing demonstrable results; assessments are ongoing to identify and reach out to new and/or underrepresented communities, given demographic changes in the community.</li> <li>• Mechanisms for keeping knowledge about communities and constituencies current are well established and well integrated into system wide SV/IPV prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p>All local programs are required to develop and sustain a local Coalition/Collaborative effort that supports long term community implementation and evaluation activities.</p> <p>The evaluation standards include strong recommendations for the inclusion of diverse community voices in the entire evaluation process.</p> <p>Coalition members are participating as third party observers for process evaluation during the pilot phase.</p>	<p>A standard MOU for implementation sites is under development to ensure that relationships with local sites are based on core expectations and are sustainable.</p> <p>DOW is establishing a stronger system for monitoring grant performance that includes better evaluating the work of the local coalitions/collaborations. High risk sites will be provided with extra technical assistance and site visits to support the development of strong and sustainable Coalitions/Collaborations.</p> <p>A new model for local collaboration is under review and will be decided by the end of 2012. Collaboration criteria will match the Wilder Inventory indicators.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mechanisms for eliciting community feedback and ensuring accountability are well integrated into system wide SV/IPV prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation.</li><li>• A broad diversity of communities and constituencies are actively involved in SV/IPV prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation and convey a strong sense of ownership through actions.</li></ul>		
--	--	--

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>	<b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b>	<b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b>
<p><b>6. Human resources</b> – The organization, development, and support of the workforce around SV prevention in your state.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>2. Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>2. New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<b>Human resources elements:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work systems to support primary prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation are well established at state and local levels, demonstrating long-term sustainability.</li> <li>• The workforce at all levels reflects the broad range of SV/IPV prevention and related constituencies and communities.</li> <li>• Retention is consistently high.</li> <li>• Job descriptions and performance management are well aligned with principles of primary prevention and strategic goals and objectives.</li> <li>• Training and education are responsive to the continuing needs of the workforce and aligned with strategic goals and objectives for SV/IPV prevention.</li> <li>• Strong collaborative teams and</li> </ul>	<p>Through the RFP process we have upgraded and clarified the core expectations for prevention staff at the local and state level. There is a much stronger emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary prevention over awareness raising. 75% of funded staff time must be devoted to specific primary prevention activities</li> <li>• Prevention Coordinators cannot have core responsibility for intervention activities</li> <li>• Full organizational commitment to primary prevention</li> <li>• Prevention staff participation in state level capacity building and peer support activities.</li> </ul>	<p>Future sustainability of the progress made in human resources is entirely dependent of funding available to support adequate staffing.</p> <p>Staff turnover continues to be high based on low salaries and unpredictable funding levels. The current financial demands on sponsoring agencies make it unreasonable to ask/expect that they will retain staff without clear budget authority.</p> <p>No future training or peer support will overcome the unpredictability of the funding.</p>



<p>support networks addressing the needs of the workforce are in evidence throughout the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Work environments are strongly supportive of primary prevention planning, implementation, and evaluation, with an eye towards long-term sustainability and improvement.</li></ul>		
---	--	--

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>	<b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b>	<b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b>
<b>7. System operations</b> – The core operational programs, processes, and strategies that achieve results in SV prevention across your state.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goals that address specific elements</li> <li>2. Progress already made toward goals</li> <li>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further development of existing goals</li> <li>2. New activities involving new elements</li> <li>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</li> </ol>
<b>System operations elements:</b>	See leadership	See leadership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local and community-level SV/IPV prevention programs, processes, and strategies and state strategic objectives are well aligned for SV/IPV prevention.</li> <li>• State and local SV/IPV prevention programs systematically involve broad constituencies at multiple operational levels.</li> <li>• Shared learning and diffusion of innovations throughout the system are active and continuous.</li> <li>• SV/IPV prevention programs are routinely well designed and intensive, evidence-based, addressing multiple levels of the social ecology, to prevent sexual violence.</li> <li>• State and local SV/IPV prevention programs are actively engaged in systematic and ongoing program planning, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement.</li> <li>• State and local SV/IPV operational programs consistently demonstrate that they are sustainable.</li> </ul>	See leadership	See leadership

<b>System capacity dimension:</b>		
<p><b>8. Results/outcomes</b> – The achievements of your state SV prevention system, as demonstrated through identified near-and long-term performance indicators.</p>	<p><b>Describe actions already taken to help build and promote the sustainability of your prevention system. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Goals that address specific elements</b></li> <li><b>2. Progress already made toward goals</b></li> <li><b>3. General actions taken that help promote progress on elements</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Describe actions that can be taken to further build and promote sustainability of each element. This could include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Further development of existing goals</b></li> <li><b>2. New activities involving new elements</b></li> <li><b>3. Concentrated efforts involving one dimension at a time</b></li> </ol>
<b>Results/outcomes elements:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reported indicators and trend data demonstrate continuous and/or sustained improvement across all dimensions of system capacity.</li> <li>• Indicators demonstrate sustained achievement in increasing protective factors and/or reducing risk factors across communities.</li> <li>• There are clear indicators of reduced incidence of first-time SV/IPV perpetration and/or victimization.</li> </ul>	<p>Outcome tools that are consistent with stated risk and protective factors are in the pilot stage.</p>	<p>All programs funded at Level 2 and above are required to use the identified outcome evaluation tools and processes.</p> <p>The Bystander/Media Literacy Workgroup, SCBT and DOW will monitor that data on a quarterly basis and report back to the SPT on an annual basis.</p> <p>Continual upgrades to the state data system will make data tracking more efficient</p> <p>Continued focus is on an integrated data system across state government will provide cleaner indicators of reductions in first time perpetration.</p>

## **Appendix A – Evaluation Capacity Summary Results (March-May 2010)**

### **Have you discussed or determined what changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior you are hoping for by implementing your chosen primary prevention strategy?**

Most programs indicated a desire to increase awareness of and recognition of behaviors that form a continuum towards increased SV and increase those who can successfully intervene as a bystander.

Sample responses include:-

- Educate youth to recognize unsafe situations, be a successful bystander, and recognize toxic media messages surrounding sexual violence and violence against women.
- Increase in pro-social bystander behaviors toward the prevention of power based personal violence and increased support for victims reporting violence.
- Basically the concept is to identify actions, behaviors and language used to hurt another person. When these have been identified, intervene in a safe way to stop those behaviors from occurring.
- By-standers getting more involved by intervening directly, as well as positive changes in attitudes and beliefs.

### **Anticipated Start date**

- Predominantly Sept 2010
- 2 programs are looking at June 2010
- 2 programs have a timeline that is fluid and not established but will be 2010 or early 2011
- 1 program already started skills training

### **Have you discussed possible evaluation for these strategies?**

Majority have considered evaluation (12) with 3 of them saying no.

### **Types of evaluation being considered**

Pre and post using Dorothy's SEEDS tools and modifying it.

### **Are you considering doing a baseline measurement? If yes, please specify how you are planning on collecting data for baseline measurement.**

Mixed responses. Some programs indicated that they will use the pre-test as a baseline. However couple of programs indicated they are unsure as to how they will collect data on baseline.

**What are your concerns about evaluating the strategies?**

- The ability and resources to compile and analyze and the time it takes to do it.
- Concerns regarding whether the information I have been collecting is what is expected or needed by NJCASA, DOW, PPEC, etc.
- Accuracy of reported answers to evaluation

**To What extent do you feel comfortable doing evaluation?**

Majority feel somewhat prepared with only two programs who felt “well prepared”

**Has your agency done evaluation work previously? If yes, please specify briefly when and how**

- Majority have done some evaluation work ( evaluation of school presentations, services , volunteers)
- A few have not done any evaluation work previously

**How would you rank your agency’s overall capacity to do evaluation?**

- Basic level of capacity in place – 9
- Moderate level of capacity in place- 4
- High level of capacity in place- 1

See table for definitions

<b>Very low or no capacity</b>	<b>Basic Level of capacity in place</b>	<b>Moderate level of capacity in place</b>	<b>High level of capacity in place</b>
Very limited evaluation measurement and tracking , all or most evaluation based on anecdotal evidence, organization collects some data on evaluation ( eg no of services etc ) but has no social impact	Evaluation partially measured and progress partially tracked; organization regularly collects solid data on program activities, process and outputs but lacks data driven externally validated social impact	Evaluation measured and tracked in multiple ways ; several times a year ; considering process and outcome impact of program and activities ; multiplicity of evaluation indicators measured but lack of longitudinal type of	Well developed Evaluation plan in place that measures and track program process and outcomes including feeding back evaluation results into program design adjustments.

measurement)	measurement	evaluation and continuous quality improvement process.	
--------------	-------------	--	--

**What type of evaluation methodology has your agency/program used before and how would you rank your agency’s skill level with using it (select all that applies):-**

- Questionnaires or Surveys were the most common type of evaluation methodology used. Nearly 53% of respondents were moderately proficient with it with the remaining saying they were strongly proficient.
- Checklist and focus groups were the second most common methods used. Majority indicated they were moderately proficient using this, with a few saying low proficiency (especially for focus groups) and a very small few indicating strong proficiency.
- Interviews, documentation review and observations formed the third common methods used. Proficiency varied with equal percentages indicating low proficiency and moderate proficiency and some indicating having never used them.
- Case studies were the least used evaluation methodology

**Please rate your agency’s/program’s/ technology / infrastructure**

Basic level of capacity- 3

Moderate level of capacity- 7

High level of capacity – 5

<b>Very low or no capacity</b>	<b>Basic Level of capacity in place</b>	<b>Moderate level of capacity in place</b>	<b>High level of capacity in place</b>
Limited/no use of computers or other technology in day-to-day activity; and/or little or no usage by staff of computers. Existing hardware/software is very old and needs to be updated for any adequate use.	Incomplete/limited Computers or other technology for all staff; equipment sharing may be common; satisfactory use of IT infrastructure by staff. Hardware/ Software versions are mixed with many needing updates.	Solid hardware and software infrastructure accessible by all staff; no or limited sharing of equipment is necessary however a few staff have limited accessibility; high usage level of IT infrastructure by staff. Hardware/software versions are recent with	State-of-the-art, fully networked computing hardware with comprehensive range of up-to-date software applications; all staff has individual computer access; used regularly by staff; effective and essential in increasing staff efficiency. All Hardware/software

		a few older versions.	versions are most recent.
--	--	-----------------------	---------------------------

**Please rate your data collection systems and access for your agency/program**

Basic level of capacity- 5

Moderate level of capacity- 7

High level of capacity- 3

<b>Very low or no capacity</b>	<b>Basic Level of capacity in place</b>	<b>Moderate level of capacity in place</b>	<b>High level of capacity in place</b>
Very basic data systems for tracking clients, staff volunteers, program outcomes and financial information. Information is stored manually at times. Very few staff have access to and training to use this.	A limited range of electronic data storing & reporting Systems (Access and or Excel) existing in only in few areas; systems perform only basic features, used only occasionally by staff Not all staff have access and or training in use of this.	Electronic data storing reporting Systems (Access ,Excel etc) exist in most areas for tracking clients, staff, volunteers, program outcomes and financial information; commonly used and help increase information sharing and efficiency. Most staff have access to such systems and training.	Sophisticated, comprehensive electronic database and reporting systems (Access, Excel or other in house developed) exist for all areas of agency; widely used and essential in increasing information sharing and efficiency. All staff has access and training in using this.

**What kinds of additional support would be useful to help you evaluate your strategies?**

- Knowledge of evaluation methods and resources that have been used successfully to compare to what we currently use.
- We really need help with inputting data we get. Our staff is small and getting smaller as funding cuts keep coming. We also have computers that are old and that we struggle with using at time because they can't handle certain software.

- Understanding what is expected of the evaluation, making the most out of evaluations, long-term evaluation methods and continued support.

**Would you or your staff be interested in receiving further information/training on evaluation? If yes please specify what type of information.**

- General training in evaluation, training in tools for baseline, pre and post, method of evaluation, peer to peer support and sharing of tools and/ or methods.



## Appendix B: Process Evaluation Tools

### *Checklist for Process Evaluation of Bystander Intervention Strategies*

#### ***Goal: Bystander Intervention***

To increase bystander intervention along the continuum of sexual violence behaviors among middle school, high school, and college age communities.

#### **Recommended Strategies:**

- Green Dot
- Mentors in Violence Prevention
- SCREAM Theater: Screaming to Prevent Violence

**Core Principles & Components:** These include strategy requirements and NJ specific adaptations.

1. Strategies need to educate, train, and utilize peer educators or popular opinion leaders (POLs) from the targeted community/school. These peer educators/POLs must receive the CDC – recommended dosage of 7-9 sessions of education. Social norms marketing or other follow-up activities should be used in order for the larger community to get sufficient dosage.
2. Strategies must have administrative, top-down support. Included in this support is education for all key stakeholders/administrators on sexual violence prevention and bystander intervention.
3. Strategies must incorporate a specific component on bystander skill development- how to intervene effectively and safely.
4. Strategies must include a component on sexual violence education, including information on the continuum of sexual violence and what actions constitute prevention.
5. Strategies need to be implemented deeply and in accordance with the socio-ecological model for prevention by addressing individual, relationship, community, and environmental levels.

#### ***Process Checklist***

The purpose of the Process Checklist is to accomplish the following:

1. Maintain fidelity of implemented strategies
2. Track adaptations of strategies
3. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)
4. Enhance tracking for potential funding opportunities
5. This checklist is being designed for use by an “impartial” observer - either a member of the County Coalition or other trained volunteer.

# Section 1

*To Be Completed By Facilitator Before Session: Enter Data on Worksheet All for Section 1*

Name of Facilitator/Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Observer: Coalition Member \_\_\_\_ Volunteer \_\_\_\_ AmeriCorps Member \_\_\_\_  
 Staff Advocate \_\_\_\_ Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Implementation Site: \_\_\_\_\_

Start and End Date of Session: \_\_\_\_\_ Duration of Session: \_\_\_\_\_

Sexual Violence Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Strategy Name: \_\_\_\_\_

*To Be Completed By Evaluator Before Session:*

Have you, the evaluator, been trained in any type of bystander intervention program?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

If yes, what strategy have you been trained in?

\_\_\_\_\_ Green Dot

\_\_\_\_\_ SCREAM Theater

\_\_\_\_\_ Mentors in Violence Prevention

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

## **Macro-level Components (To be used with both the first exposure and skills training):**

### **Going Deep**

A1. Do(es) the facilitator(s) make reference to additional exposures of violence prevention messaging in this community (i.e. other presentations, events, promotional materials, etc.)?	Yes	No
A2. Have you, the evaluator, observed or heard about the violence prevention messaging referenced by the facilitator(s) prior to attending this presentation?	Yes	No

### **Gender Inclusivity**

A.3 Is the gender of the facilitator(s) representative of the audience?	Yes	No
Do(es) the facilitator(s) include references that anyone (regarding gender) can be a possible:		
• A4a. Perpetrator	Yes	No
• A4b. Victim	Yes	No
• A4c. Bystander	Yes	No

### **Cultural Sensitivity**

A5. Is the race/ethnicity of the facilitator(s) representative of the audience?	Yes	No
Do(es) the facilitator(s):		
• A6a. Use examples of culturally relevant high-risk situations (i.e. dance party, gang activity, work environment, etc.)	Yes	No
• A6b. Use language that is culturally relevant to the audience?	Yes	No
• A6c. Use language and examples that are relevant no matter one's sexual orientation?	Yes	No

### **Audience Adaptation**

Do(es) the facilitator(s) :		
• A7a. Use language that is developmentally (age) appropriate for the audience?	Yes	No
• A7b. Use examples from developmentally (age) appropriate high risk situations (i.e. bullying behavior, parties, work environment, etc.)?	Yes	No

## Section 2

### First Exposure to Bystander Intervention:

*Enter Data on First Exposure Worksheet*

#### **Introduction to Services**

B1. Do(es) the facilitator(s) mention the services provided by their program/agency/organization?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

#### **Connection to the Issue/Facilitator**

Do(es) the facilitator(s) :		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B2a. Mention their motivation for discussing sexual violence prevention?</li> <li>• B2b. Specifically mention why this particular audience should care and/or act to prevent sexual violence?</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	No No
B3. Was the audience generally attentive and engaged during the presentation?	Yes	No

#### **Empathy to Victims**

B4. Do(es) the facilitator(s) provide an opportunity for audience members to connect with the experience of victims?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

#### **Introduction to Bystanders**

Do(es) the facilitator(s) explain:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B5a. Who bystanders are?</li> <li>• B5b. The role of the bystander to prevent violence?</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	No No

#### **Examples of Bystander Intervention**

Do(es) the facilitator(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B6a. Identify different methods of intervening to prevent violence?</li> <li>• B6b. Mention obstacles to intervening as a bystander?</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	No No

### Culture Change

Do(es) the facilitator(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B7a. Address the need for culture change in order to increase bystander intervention and prevent violence?</li> </ul>	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B7b. Speak to the feasibility of bringing about a culture change to increase bystander intervention?</li> </ul>	Yes	No

### Connection to the Big Picture

B8. Do(es) the facilitator(s) speak to the audience’s role in bystander intervention?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

### Now What

Do(es) the facilitator(s):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B9a. Offer opportunities to get more involved with their program/agency/organization (i.e. volunteer work, advocacy, additional training, peer education, etc.)?</li> </ul>	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B9b. Provide information about services and resources (i.e. brochures, web addresses, etc.)?</li> </ul>	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B9c. Distribute promotional items (i.e. announcements for future trainings, giveaways, etc.)?</li> </ul>	Yes	No

**Worksheet All – complete for each dose**

# of attendees in audience: \_\_\_\_\_ # of facilitators/presenters: \_\_\_\_\_

**Observable Demographics of participants for this exposure:**

Broadly categorize the observable racial breakup for this group (%)?

\_\_\_\_\_ White

\_\_\_\_\_ People of Color

Broadly categorize the observable gender breakup for this group ( %)?

\_\_\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_\_\_ Female

Broadly categorize the observable age breakup for this group (%)?

High School: Ages 14 - 18

\_\_\_\_\_ 9th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 10th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 11th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 12th Grade

College: Ages 18 – 25

\_\_\_\_\_ Freshman

\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore

\_\_\_\_\_ Junior

\_\_\_\_\_ Senior

Other age groups:

- Teachers \_\_\_\_\_
- Parents \_\_\_\_\_
- School Administrators \_\_\_\_\_
- Non- Teaching Staff \_\_\_\_\_

Number of doses received by implementation site so far in this school year: \_\_\_\_\_

Any additional comments on why a specific core principle or specific curriculum requirement was not met.

---

---

## Section 3

### Second and Subsequent Exposures to Bystander Intervention:

*Enter Data in Skills Training Worksheet*

C1. Do(es) the facilitator(s) provide skills training?	Yes	No
C2. Do Peer Educators assist with the training?	Yes	No
C3. Are popular opinion leaders attending the training – i.e.: individuals selected by others based on their role as formal or informal leaders in the community?	Yes	No

### **Skills Training**

Do(es) the facilitator(s):		
• C4a. Offer opportunities for participants to practice bystander intervention through role plays?	Yes	No
• C4b. Offer opportunities for participants to process information through small group discussion?	Yes	No
• C4c. Define the type(s) of violence to be prevented?	Yes	No
• C4d. Provide examples of behaviors and situations that could potentially escalate into violence?	Yes	No
• C4e. Offer opportunities for participants to identify ways to intervene safely and effectively?	Yes	No
• C4f. Offer opportunities for participants to identify personal obstacles to intervention:		
○ PRIOR to an act of violence?	Yes	No
○ DURING an act of violence?	Yes	No
○ FOLLOWING an act of violence?	Yes	No
• C4g. Provide solutions to obstacles that typically inhibit intervention?	Yes	No
• C4h. Provide information about services and resources (i.e. brochures, web addresses, etc.)?	Yes	No
• C4i. Provide information about who could be a victim of violence?	Yes	No
• C4j. Provide information about who could be a perpetrator of violence?	Yes	No
• C4k. Offer opportunities to get more involved with their program/agency/organization (i.e. volunteer work, advocacy, additional training, peer education, etc.)?	Yes	No

See above – ask this once for each dose

# of attendees in audience: \_\_\_\_\_ # of facilitators/presenters: \_\_\_\_\_

**Observable Demographics of participants for Second Exposure:**

Broadly categorize the observable racial breakup for this group (%)?

\_\_\_\_\_ White

\_\_\_\_\_ People of Color

Broadly categorize the observable gender breakup for this group (%)?

\_\_\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_\_\_ Female

Broadly categorize the observable age breakup for this group (%)?

High School: Ages 14 - 18

\_\_\_\_\_ 9th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 10th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 11th Grade

\_\_\_\_\_ 12th Grade

College: Ages 18 – 25

\_\_\_\_\_ Freshman

\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore

\_\_\_\_\_ Junior

\_\_\_\_\_ Senior

Other age groups:

- Teachers \_\_\_\_\_
- Parents \_\_\_\_\_
- School Administrators \_\_\_\_\_
- Non- Teaching Staff \_\_\_\_\_



Number of doses received by implementation site so far in this school year: \_\_\_\_\_

Any additional comments on why a specific core principle or specific curriculum requirement was not met.

---

---

---

---

---

**The following section is to be filled in by the strategy implementer and/or facilitator**

C5a. How was the skills training administered?

- All in one day/session \_\_\_\_\_
- Multiple Sessions \_\_\_\_\_

#of sessions for skills training: \_\_\_\_\_

# Section 4

**The following section is to be filled in by the strategy implementer and/or facilitator**

## **Additional Exposure Options Mentioned/Observed for This Site:**

Which of the following methods have been used to reinforce the violence prevention message: <i>Enter Data on Additional Exposures Worksheet</i>	Is the activity planned (y/n)	Is the activity completed (y/n)	Were POLS engaged in planning/implementing/attending the activity (Y/N)	Date of the activity if completed
• Posters				
• Brochures				
• Events/Contests/Programs				
• Bystander Pledge				
• Gear: buttons, t-shirts, water bottles, bracelets, etc.				
• Clothesline project				
• Denim Day				
• Electronic communication: email, listserv, websites, etc.				
• Social Networking: Facebook, Myspace, Twitter, etc.				
• Club Membership				
• Conversations with Peers				
• Volunteer Opportunities				
• Social Norm Campaign ( <i>as it pertains to bystander intervention</i> )				
• Other:				
○ Mentors in Violence Prevention				
○ SCREAM Theater				
○ Green Dot Persuasive Speech				
○ Green Dot Skills Training				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Media Literacy (<i>as it pertains to bystander intervention</i>)</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MOST Clubs</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ List others not mentioned above:</li> </ul> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>				

**For each additional exposure checked, how do/will you, the facilitator(s), tie this additional exposure to the primary strategy?**

---



---



---

**We are interested in refining this tool better. Please give us your feedback with regards to the following questions:**

- Please describe how easy was it to understand the questions and use this tool overall?

---



---

- Please give us specific examples of questions that you found especially unclear or difficult to answer.

---



---

- Are there any changes you would like to see with this tool?

---

## ***Checklist for Process Evaluation of Media Literacy Strategy***

### ***Goal: Gender Equity***

**Create and market social norms in New Jersey that promote gender equity and respect for women and girls by reducing rigid sexual stereotypes and increasing male accountability for the prevention of sexual violence**

Outcome:

- Recognition of the impact of sexualized mass media on gender inequality, healthy sexuality and gender roles will increase by 20% as measured by periodic community and school-based pre- and post-tests.

### **Recommended Strategies:**

- New Mexico Media Literacy adapted for gender equity outcomes

### ***Process Checklist***

The purpose of the Process Checklist is to accomplish the following:

1. Maintain fidelity of implemented strategies
2. Track adaptations of strategies
3. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)
4. Enhance tracking for potential funding opportunities
5. This checklist is being designed for use by an “impartial” observer - either a member of the County Coalition or other trained volunteer.

*To Be Completed By Facilitator Before Session:*

Name of Facilitator/Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender of Facilitator(s) : Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Observer: Coalition Member \_\_\_\_\_ Volunteer \_\_\_\_\_  
 AmeriCorpsMember \_\_\_\_\_ Staff Advocate \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Implementation Site:  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Session: \_\_\_\_\_ Duration of Session: \_\_\_\_\_ Session # \_\_\_\_\_

Sexual Violence Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you, the evaluator, been trained in any type of media literacy program?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

***To be completed by observer after session:***

**We are interested in refining this tool better. Please give us your feedback with regards to the following questions:**

- Please describe how easy was it to understand the questions and use this tool overall?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- Please give us specific examples of questions that you found especially unclear or difficult to answer.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- Are there any changes you would like to see with this tool?

\_\_\_\_\_

## Table of Contents by Sections

1. Activity Used – Each session should cover one or more activity
2. Media Literacy Concepts – May be covered in all sessions but most of the description will occur in early sessions
3. Clips Used in Session – Documentation of clips used in each session
4. Persuasion Techniques – Should be covered to some degree in all sessions
5. Deconstructing Media – Should be covered in all session except last one or two
6. Reconstructing Media – Should be covered in last one to two sessions
7. Linkage to Sexual Violence – May be covered in all sessions to some degree
8. Group Demographics & Comments – Facilitator completes after last session

### 1. Activity Used

<i>Circle the session # for those activities conducted in this session</i>	Session number
Agree/disagree – usually completed in first few sessions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
People Search – usually completed in first few sessions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Gender Boxes – usually completed early but referenced often	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Deconstructing Ads – done throughout	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Reconstructing/Making A Counter Ad – usually last few sessions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

## 2. Media Literacy Concepts

<i>Circle the session # if any of the following concepts were explained/discussed in this session</i>	L	Session number
Media shapes our culture	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media messages affect our thoughts, attitudes and actions	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media use “the language of persuasion”	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media literate youth and adults should be active, versus passive, consumers of media	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
No one tells the whole story	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media messages contain “texts & subtexts” whose effects can be subtle	B I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media messages reflect the values and viewpoints of media makers	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
The human brain processes images differently than words (emotional versus rational). Media uses a variety of strategies to enhance emotional impact.	I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
We all now create media (FB, Twitter, videos etc)	I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Our media system reflects the power dynamics and inequalities in our society	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Media literate youth and adults can be media activists	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Other		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Other		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

### 3. Media Clips Used

Please record the clip # for any clips used in this session or describe other clips used in this session that are not on the attached list.

Session #	Clip # or name	Type of Clip*	Product Sold/Main Message
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			

\*Type of clip:

1. TV Ad    2. Radio Ad    3. Music Lyrics    4. Online video    5. Print Ad



#### 4. Persuasion Techniques

<i>Circle the session # if any of the following concepts were explained/discussed in this session</i>	L	Session number
Association – linking product or message to cultural norms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beautiful people</li> <li>Symbols – links to words/images about lifestyle, family, gender</li> </ul>	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Bandwagon – message is that everyone is doing/using it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group dynamics – visual of groups that use/do this</li> <li>Majority belief – gives data on who uses/does this</li> </ul>	B A A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Testimonials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Celebrities – implicit or explicit endorsement</li> <li>Plain folk – use of “regular” people</li> </ul>	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Fear – offers product/message as solution to something you fear (i.e.- bad skin) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name Calling – use of undesirable personal or gender traits</li> </ul>	B I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Humor – connects laughter to the product to make it more memorable	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Repetition – words, sounds or images within an ad/message or the frequency of repeating the ad	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Rhetorical Questions – The “correct” answer is obvious	I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Simple solutions, instant gratification – Ignore the complexity, offer the easy solution	I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Cause vs correlation – associating product/message with unrelated outcomes	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Scapegoating – gender specific blame	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Timing – when the message is delivered matters, ie. Flowers for Valentines’ Day	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Scientific Evidence – use of charts, statistics and lab coats to “prove” something	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Other		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Other		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

## 5. Deconstructing Media

<i>Please check if any of the following concepts were discussed in this session</i>	L	Session number
Was clip # 39 used in this session?		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Discussion of source – Whose message is this? Who has control over the content?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Discussion of audience – Who is the target audience? How do you know?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Text – What story is being told?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Subtext – what are the possible different individual interpretations of the story?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What tools of persuasion are being used?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What part of the story is not being told?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What positive or negative messages are presented, especially as they pertain to gender norms/sexuality?	B	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What kind of lifestyle is being presented?	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What groups of people does this message empower?	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
What groups of people does the message disempower?	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
How does it serve the media maker's interest to empower or disempower certain groups	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
How and where can you get more information about the untold story?	A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

## 6. Reconstructing Media

<i>Circle the session # if any of the following concepts were explained/discussed in this session</i>	Session number
Was the ad being reconstructed also deconstructed in a previous session or just prior to reconstruction?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Did the facilitator show media clips #40 or #41?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Did the facilitator discuss what works in making ads?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Individuals can be proactive consumers of media – know, react, don't buy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Individuals can have conversations about media messages in their sphere of influence and encourage others to be proactive (or help others to deconstruct ads)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Individuals/groups can push back against the producers of media and make their feelings known about media messages that are objectionable or manipulative.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

## 8. Linkage to Sexual Violence

<i>Circle the session # if any of the following concepts were explained/discussed in this session</i>	Session number
Gender roles/gender equity - use of gender boxes, discussion of rigid gender stereotypes etc.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Age appropriate healthy sexuality or healthy relationships across genders	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
The linkage between media and sexual violence	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

**Facilitator Only: After Last Session**

**Observable Demographics of Participants:**

Average # of attendees in audience: \_\_\_\_\_ # of facilitators/presenters: \_\_\_\_\_

**Broadly categorize the observable racial breakup for this group (%)?**

\_\_\_\_\_ White

\_\_\_\_\_ People of Color

**Broadly categorize the observable gender breakup for this group (%)?**

\_\_\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_\_\_ Female

**Broadly categorize the observable age breakup for this group (%)?**

**Students:**

Elementary school (K-5<sup>th</sup> grade, about 5-11 years old) \_\_\_\_\_

Middle school (6-8<sup>th</sup> grade, about 12-14 years old) \_\_\_\_\_

High school (9-12<sup>th</sup> grade, about 15-18 years old) \_\_\_\_\_

College \_\_\_\_\_

**Adults age range:**

18-25 \_\_\_\_\_

26-40 \_\_\_\_\_

41-64 \_\_\_\_\_

65+ \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Group:**

School\_\_\_\_\_

Church/Faith based\_\_\_\_\_

Civic Organization

Other

**Any specific comments on why a specific core principle or specific curriculum requirement was not met.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Did the site provide any follow up between sessions using the curriculum? Please describe.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix C: Outcome Evaluation Tools

### *Bystander Pre-Post Test*

THIS IS CONFIDENTIAL.  
YOUR PARTICIPATION IS VOLUNTARY.  
PLEASE FILL OUT YOUR RESPONSES TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY.

#### SECTION I

**You're hanging out with friends at a party and you notice a guy leading a very drunk girl upstairs to a bedroom. He's been getting her drinks all night.**

1. Does this situation bother you?       Yes       No       I don't know

2. Would you do something in this situation?

Yes, I would do something

No, I wouldn't know what to say or do so I would not do anything

No, I don't see a need to do anything

I don't know

3. Mark your willingness to do any of the following actions in this situation:

	Very willing	Somewhat willing	Not at all willing	Don't know
3A. Approach the guy and/or girl to share your concerns				
3B. Get some of your friends to help you do something.				
3C. Find some friends of the guy or girl to help.				
3D. Distract the girl or guy				

4. How confident are you that you have the skills to do the actions you checked above

	Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Unsure	Not Very Confident	Not At All Confident	Did not choose
4A. Approach the guy and/or girl to share your concerns						
4B. Get some of your						

friends to help you do something						
4C. Find some friends of the guy or girl to help.						
4D. Distract the girl or guy						

5. To what degree do the following make a difference in your willingness to intervene in this situation?

	More likely	Less likely	Doesn't matter
5A. You know the girl fairly well			
5B. You know the guy fairly well			
5C. You don't know either of them at all			

6. Mark all of the reasons why you would not do something in this situation:

- 6A. Someone else will take care of it.
- 6B. Nobody else thinks it's a big deal.
- 6C. It's not my business.
- 6D. I don't want to get anyone in trouble.
- 6E. Some people need to learn the hard way how to take care of themselves.

**A friend of yours texted you an inappropriate picture of her ex boyfriend. She's already sent it to all of her friends and posted it on Facebook. Now she wants you to forward it to as many people as you can.**

7. Does this situation bother you?     Yes     No     I don't know

8. Would you do something in this situation?

- Yes, I would do something
- No, I wouldn't know what to say or do so I would not do anything
- No, I don't see a need to do anything
- I don't know

9. Mark your willingness to do any of the following actions in this situation:

	Very willing	Somewhat willing	Not at all willing	Don't know
9A. Approach the guy and/or girl				

to share your concerns about the situation				
9B. Tell others not to forward the message.				
9C. Ask some friends of the ex boyfriend or girl to do something.				
9D. Tell a teacher, another faculty person, or parents about the situation.				
9E. Refuse to forward the message myself				

10. How confident are you that you have the skills to do the actions you checked above?

	Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Unsure	Not Very Confident	Not At All Confident	Did not choose
10A. Approach the guy and/or girl to share your concerns about the situation						
10B. Tell others not to forward the message.						
10C. Ask some friends of the ex boyfriend or girl to do something.						
10D. Tell a teacher, another faculty person, or parents about the situation.						
10E. Refuse to forward the message myself						

11. To what degree do the following make a difference in your willingness to intervene in this situation?

	More likely	Less likely	Doesn't matter
11A. You know the ex-boyfriend fairly well			
11B. You don't know the ex-boyfriend at all			



12. Mark all of the reasons why you would not do something in this situation:

- 12A. Someone else will take care of it.
- 12B. Nobody else thinks it's a big deal.
- 12C. I'm afraid for my own safety.
- 12D. I don't want to get anyone in trouble.
- 12E. Some people need to learn the hard way how to take care of themselves.

DRAFT

**SECTION II**

In the following section, read each behavior and circle whether you think it is harmful, could be harmful or is no big deal.

#	BEHAVIOR	BELIEF		
		Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
13	<b>Saying a guy is acting like a girl</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
14	<b>Using a phrase like “Your team just got raped”</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
15	<b>Laughing at rape jokes</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
16	<b>Punching someone in the stomach</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
17	<b>Kissing in public</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
18	<b>Talking someone into having sex</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
19	<b>Using sexual slurs to address your friends</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
20	<b>Viewing pornography</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
21	<b>Getting someone drunk or high so you can have sex with them</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
22	<b>Continuing to have sex even if a partner says no</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
23	<b>Unwanted Facebook stalking</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
24	<b>Telling your dating partner not to hang out with other people</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
25	<b>Saying that a lot of people lie about being raped</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
26	<b>Assuming someone wants to have sex because they started hooking up with you</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
27	<b>Continuing to text someone who has asked you not to</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
28	<b>Logging on to someone’s Facebook account without their permission</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
29	<b>Hurting someone physically in a relationship</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
30	<b>Assuming someone wants to have sex because of the way they dress</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
31	<b>Believing men cannot be raped</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal
32	<b>Hitting on someone who doesn’t want to be hit on</b>	Is harmful	Could be harmful	Is no big deal

**SECTION III**

33. *In general, how likely are you to do something if you know ALL of the people involved in a potentially harmful situation?*

Very Likely                  Likely                  Unlikely                  Very Unlikely

34. *In general, how likely are you to do something if you DO NOT know ANY of the people involved in a potentially harmful situation?*

Very Likely                  Likely                  Unlikely                  Very Unlikely

35. *In general, how likely are you to do something if you know only ONE of the people involved in a potentially harmful situation?*

Very Likely                  Likely                  Unlikely                  Very Unlikely

**SECTION IV**

36. *In the past 3 months, have you: (check all that apply)*

- 36A. Noticed an event that could have become harmful?
- 36B. Thought of helping in a situation that could have become harmful?
- 36C. Helped in a situation that could have become harmful?

SECTION V

37. *What is your age?*

\_\_\_ years old (#)

\_\_\_ I choose not to say (Code as 0)

38. *Which Race/ Ethnic group do you identify with?*

\_\_\_ White

\_\_\_ Black

\_\_\_ Hispanic

\_\_\_ Asian

\_\_\_ American Indian/Alaskan

\_\_\_ Hawaiian Native / other Pacific Islander

\_\_\_ Other (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I choose to not identify myself

39. *What is your gender?*

\_\_\_ Female

\_\_\_ Male

\_\_\_ I choose to not identify myself

40. *Date when survey was administered:* \_\_\_\_\_

41. Have you been trained in any type of bystander intervention program?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what strategy have you been trained in?

- 41A. Green Dot
- 41B. SCREAM Theater
- 42C. Mentors in Violence Prevention
- 42D. Other (please specify):  
\_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT

## ***Media Literacy Strategy Outcome Evaluation***

### ***Goal: Gender Equity***

**Create and market social norms in New Jersey that promote gender equity and respect for women and girls by reducing rigid sexual stereotypes and increasing male accountability for the prevention of sexual violence**

#### ***Core Outcomes:***

- Promote gender equity and respect for women and girls
- Reduce rigid sexual stereotypes
- Increase Male accountability for the prevention of sexual violence
- Recognition of the impact of sexualized mass media on gender inequality, healthy sexuality and gender roles will increase by 20%

**This outcome evaluation is designed for use with clicker technology and is built into the structure of the Media Literacy curriculum. If clicker technology is not available the following can be adapted into a paper based form to be distributed to participants and/or completed by an observer.**

*To Be Completed By Facilitator:*

Name of Facilitator/Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Sexual Violence Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Implementation Site: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Participants: \_\_\_\_\_

Observable Age of Participants (Total #) *Can also be offered as a clicker question:*

## Adaptation of People Search Exercise\*

\*If clicker technology is available questions should be asked in a Y/N poll format for each question. If clickers are not available these questions can be adapted to a checklist and collected. The purpose of these questions are to gather data about the types of media being consumed by the participants and will only be conducted during the pre-test.

1. I have a smart phone (Y/N)
2. I read a newspaper 1x or more per week (Y/N)
3. I have bought a magazine in the last month (Y/N)
4. I access the internet from (select all that apply):
  - Home Computer(Y/N)
  - School Computer (Y/N)
  - Library(Y/N)
  - Smart Phone(Y/N)
  - Other (discuss) (Y/N)
5. I use **Facebook** (select one only):
  - Many times per day
  - Daily
  - Few times per week
  - Time to time
  - Never
6. I use **Twitter** (select one only):
  - Many times per day
  - Daily
  - Few times per week
  - Time to time
  - Never
7. I use **Twitter** to (select all that apply):
  - "tweet" (Y/N)
  - Follow others (Y/N)
  - "re-tweet" (Y/N)
  - I don't use twitter (Y/N)
8. I have watched a music video in the last 24 hours (Y/N)
9. I have posted a video on "YouTube"(Y/N)
10. I play M-rated video/computer games (select one only):
  - Daily
  - Few times per week

- Time to time
- Never

**11. Most days I watch TV for (select one only):**

- 0-2 hours per day
- 2-5 hours per day
- 5+ hours per day

**12. I watch movies (select one only):**

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Never

### **Adaptation of Agree or Disagree Exercise\***

\* If clicker technology is available, questions should be asked using a five-point response scale. If no clickers are available the activity can be conducted as outlined in the original Media Literacy curriculum as a taking sides exercise. The purpose of these questions is to gather baseline data about the participants' views on gender equity/male accountability and link to media. This activity will be used in both the pre and post test to measure a change in attitude among participants.

**1. I find myself wanting things I see advertised, even though I didn't know I wanted those things before I saw the ad.**

*Strongly Agree    Somewhat Agree    Neither Agree/Disagree    Somewhat Disagree    Strongly Disagree*

**2. I trust most of what I see on TV.**

**3. I get more information from people I know, rather than from the media.**

**4. Gender stereotypes can lead to sexual violence.**

**5. Boys and girls learn how they should look and act by watching TV, movies, listening to music, from the internet and/or video games.**

**6. I learn how I should act by watching TV, movies, listening to music, from the internet and/or video games.**

**7. I am bothered by how men and women are portrayed on TV, movies, video games.**

**8. I am bothered by violence against women as portrayed on TV, movies, video games.**

**9. If a woman is insulted by another man, her boyfriend or partner should fight on her behalf. (Pilot Question)**



10. If a man is insulted by another woman, his girlfriend or partner should fight on his behalf. *(Pilot Question)*
11. A woman should never disagree with her boyfriend or partner in public when other people can hear. *(Pilot Question)*
12. A man should never disagree with his girlfriend or partner in public when other people can hear. *(Pilot Question)*
13. Women should be protected by men.
14. It bothers me when a man does something that I consider feminine.
15. A male whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet would probably seem odd to me.
16. It is okay with me if boys play with dolls.
17. It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.
18. Unless he was really desperate, I would probably tell a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary. *(Test “secretary” for relevance to group else substitute “babysitter” in future)*
19. If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and loved to cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.
20. If a man saw a sweater in a store and liked it, and then found out that it was being sold as a women’s sweater, I think he should just buy it and wear it anyway.
21. I think that it is extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house, and take care of younger children.
22. If I noticed a man used nail polish on his fingernails, I might think he was a little too feminine.
23. A real guy enjoys a little danger now and then.

### **Deconstruction Skills**

In this section, students should be asked to view the attached print Ads from the “Got Milk?” campaign featuring Rihanna/Usher and consider the questions below. This piece should ONLY be offered in the post-test to assess whether the students have the skills and working knowledge to deconstruct media messages.

Whose message is this? Who created or paid for it?

- *The milk company created and paid for it.*
- *The “Got Milk?” campaign was created by the Goodby Silberstein & Partners advertising agency for the California Milk Processor Board. It has been licensed for use by milk processors and dairy farmers.*
- *The Milk campaign is also funded by the USDA (influenced by the Agri-business Dairy lobby)*

Who is the target audience?

- *Rihanna’s ad is targeted at English-speaking teenagers, especially females.*
- *Usher’s ad is targeted at English-speaking young men.*

What persuasive techniques are being used in this ad?

- *Celebrity*
- *Beautiful people*
- *Association*
- *Testimonials*
- *Repetition*
- *Charisma (Usher’s paragraph)*
- *Cause vs. correlation (Rihanna’s paragraph)*
- *Simple solution (drink milk for better health –Rihanna’s paragraph)*

What is the text of this ad?

- *The short paragraph: “Drink it in. Pop star? Not exactly. Milk is more my move. Some studies suggest that teens who choose milk instead of sugary drinks tend to be leaner and the protein helps build muscle. So, shut up and drink.”*
- *The short paragraph: “I pour my heart into my music. How do I stay in tune? With milk. The protein and nutrients in lowfat milk help me build muscle and stay fit. So eat right, exercise, and grab a glass of ice cold milk. Now that’s chill.”*
- *The logo “got milk?”*
- *The words “Let it flow.”*
- *Another logo that reads “body by milk.”*

- *The image of a singer, Rihanna, posed, sitting on top of a couch, wearing a black dress, looking forward, etc.*
- *The image of an entertainer, Usher, in a room (that looks to be a recording studio), standing, wearing a suit, with his one hand in his pocket, etc.*

What is the subtext?

- *Rihanna drinks milk.*
- *Milk helps Rihanna be attractive.*
- *Usher drinks milk.*
- *Milk helps Usher create music.*
- *Usher drinks milk when he is recording music.*
- *Usher knows what's "chill" and what it means to be "cool."*
- *If you drink milk, you'll be healthier and it will help you be more physically fit.*
- *Milk helps Rihanna be lean and build muscle as a female versus Milk helps Usher build muscle and be fit (varied implications)*
- *Rihanna is looking at the audience seductively, being feminine=sexy vs. Usher is not there to engage with the viewer he is there for himself, being masculine= confidence, chill/cool*
- *Rihanna is on a sofa and the lighting is more subdued to add the effect of being seductive- this adds to the minimization of her role as a singer/artist. In the Usher Ad, the background setting looks to be a music studio- directly connecting to his talent/role as a singer/artist.*

Who is being hurt by this ad?

- *People of a lower economic status, as healthier eating is more expensive. Milk is more expensive than some sugary drinks.*
- *Milk is not healthy for the 80% +/- of the world's population that are lactose intolerant a condition that is more common in Black, Asian, and Native American ethnicities.*
- *It also excludes vegans who have health, religious, ethical and environmental reasons for not drinking milk.*
- *Teenagers who do not do their grocery shopping and do not have access to resources like Rihanna or Usher.*
- *Young men who are not fit and do not have muscle.*
- *Young women who are not lean and/or "attractive."*
- *Men and Women who do not fit into the gender box (ensure students are able to clearly connect the dots between how these images/stereotypes relate to sexual violence)*

What part of the story is not being told?

- *Health involves much more than drinking milk.*
- *Students that choose milk instead of sugary drinks may be leaner because they have healthier habits overall.*
- *These entertainers do much more than drink milk to achieve their physical appearance.*
- *These entertainers do much more than drink milk to achieve their goals.*
- *Although the USDA urges that milk is good for everyone, research that shows it is NOT the best source of calcium and is high in fat and cholesterol.*

## Reconstruction Skills

*These questions will be asked during the post-test to assess how likely the students were and now are to push back against the media as active consumers.*

### In the last three months have you:

1. Posted a comment a YouTube video that you found offensive or did not agree with (Y/N)
2. Made a comment to a friend or parent about a commercial that you found offensive (Y/N)
3. Refused to buy a product because you did not agree with their advertising (Y/N)
4. Talked to your friends about an advertisement that you did not agree with (Y/N)
5. Posted or shared an article on Facebook about violence in the media or gender (Y/N)

### In the next three months how likely are you to:

1. Post a comment a YouTube video that you find offensive or do not agree with

*Very Likely      Somewhat Likely      Somewhat Unlikely      Very Unlikely*

2. Make a comment to a friend or parent about a commercial that you find offensive
3. Refuse to buy a product because you do not agree with their advertising
4. Talk to your friends about an advertisement that you do not agree with
5. Post or share an article on Facebook about violence in the media or gender
6. Talk to your friends about what you have learned in this program
7. Talk to your parents about what you have learned in this program