ABSTRACT

MALE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROJECT: A GRANT PROPOSAL

By

Michael Jackson

December 2014

The purpose of this project was to identify potential funding sources, and write a grant to fund an existing violence prevention program designed to change cultural norms around masculinity that condone and glorify violence. The grant would fund the expansion of the program into targeted organizations that the host organization was previously unable to collaborate with for a variety of reasons. An extensive literature review increased knowledge about the problem of violence and its relationship to traditional or hegemonic definitions of masculinity and provided information about evidence-based violence prevention programs that the grant writer then used to design a best-practices approach to phase two of the existing program. A search for potential funding sources resulted in the selection of the Office on Violence Against Women, a division of the United States Department of Justice, as the best funding source for this project. Actual submission and funding of this grant were not a requirement for successful completion of this project.

MALE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROJECT: A GRANT PROPOSAL

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Social Work

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

Committee Members:

Brian Lam, Ph.D. (Chair)
Janaki Santhiveeran, Ph.D.
Philip Tan, Ph.D.

College Designee:

Nancy Meyer-Adams, Ph.D.

By Michael Jackson

B.A., 1998, Washington State University

December 2014

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, HAVE

APPROVED THIS THESIS

MALE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROJECT: A GRANT PROPOSAL

By

Michael Jackson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Brian Lam, Ph.D. (Chair)	Social Work
Janaki Santhiveeran, Ph.D.	Social Work
Philip Tan, Ph. D.	Social Work

ACCEPTED AND APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY

Nancy Meyer-Adams, Ph.D.
Director Chair, School of Social Work

California State University, Long Beach

December 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank God for letting me finish what I started. I am grateful to my parents Alfred and Martha for teaching me the value of hard work. I thank my sisters Natalie and Donna for being examples of exceptional ability in their careers and professionalism. I would like to thank Deandre and Kevin for being my "little brothers" who have put me on this path to serve others. I would also like to thank my friends Justin, Tiff, Lori, Veronica, Johnny, Liz, Shirley, Candace, Ian, and Angela, whose perseverance to finish their master's degree rubbed off on me.

I express my appreciation and gratitude to my classmates and faculty members. The Class of 2013 was a special class, and thanks to all of my group members who walked with me during our time of connectedness. I want to acknowledge Sojourn and Ms. Palotai for being the partnering agency, and for all of the exceptional work they do in Los Angeles County. I would like to thank my co-workers at the City of Santa Monica who gave me the opportunity to work on this committee which led me to this topic for my thesis. I thank you Julie, Patty, and Carla for being supportive of me and being supportive of this project.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Brian Lam, for his patience and encouragement to complete my thesis. I appreciate the valuable suggestions and input from Dr. Philip Tan and Dr. Janaki Santhiveeran. I also would like to thank Dr. Nancy Myers-Adam for her help, encouragement, and transparency.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Over the past decade, a trend of national headlines has identified "boys" as a social group in a current state of crisis by virtue of their gender and age (O'Neil & Lujan, 2009). Considering the following data offered by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the "crisis" claim seems to be more than well supported. Men and boys comprise the vast majority of homicide offenders (90%) and the vast majority of victims of homicide (77%). Further, among 10-24 year olds, boys (86%) were much more likely than girls (14%) to be victims of homicide (CDC, 2010). Additionally, the majority of youth victims of non-fatal violence are males. Males, ages 10-24, were arrested for violent crimes at a consistently higher rate than females over an 11-year period between 1995-2006 (CDC, 2011). Among high school students (grades 9-12), boys reported carrying a weapon (27%) or a gun (9.8%) during a period of 30-days at a much higher rate than girls (7.1%; 1.7%; CDC, 2010). There are further disparities among the genders (males 15.1%; females 6.7%) on reports of engaging in a physical fight on school property during a 1-year period (CDC, 2010). Thus, it is no secret that boys both perpetrate and are victims of violent crime more than girls. In fact, criminologists have consistently used gender, being male, as the strongest predictor of criminal involvement (Messerschmidt, 1993).

This data depicts a serious problem among men and boys, indicating a more

entrenched issue within the beliefs, cultural values, and social systems that shape notions of male gender and definitions of manhood and masculinity. Gender socialization, a ubiquitous social practice, is widely believed to be a critical part of human development. However, a large body of research exists that paints a different picture. The gender binary provides no information other than social cues around biological sex. Perhaps more importantly, it seems that the costs of this social training far outweigh the benefits to young boys and girls, and that the negative impact is particularly devastating to men and boys.

Men and boys who can be classified as "hyper masculine," or men and boys who experience high levels of gender role conflict–described as a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences on an individual (Amato, 2012)–have been shown to have worse outcomes in almost every area of life, including emotional and mental health, interpersonal and public safety, and interpersonal and social skills.

Studies show that men who more strongly sanction or who struggle more with masculinity expectations experience lower levels of well-being and exhibit increased problem behaviors, including abuse of alcohol and other substances, high risk sexual behavior, anxiety and depression, perpetration of violence in the community, use of controlling behaviors or violence with intimate partners, use of aggressive defenses during conflicts, aggressive driving, degradation of the environment, unemployment, and they are less likely to seek physical and mental health care. The undercurrent is the social norms, supported by systemic and institutional practices, that command men and boys to repudiate all things stereotypically feminine, and to take on traits–toughness and aggression, emotionless except for anger, competitive and hungry for power–that,

collectively, result in a culture that unintentionally breeds, condones and glorifies violent masculinity (Mankowski & Maton, 2010).

Goal of Project

The purpose of this project was to identify potential funding sources, and write a grant to fund an existing violence prevention program designed to change cultural norms around masculinity that condone and glorify violence. The grant would fund the expansion of the program into targeted organizations that the host organization was previously unable to collaborate with for various reasons.

The proposal would also incorporate a campaign through social media and the visual arts to mirror the messaging of the conducted discussion groups to permeate the communal culture of Santa Monica and West Los Angeles and evaluate the outcomes of the discussion groups as part of evaluation process.

The Male Violence Prevention Project (MVPP), the project for which this grant proposal was written, consists of educational activities that promote a non-aggressive/non-violent perspective of positive masculinity. Specifically, the project will create a format for conducting discussion groups with adults (men and women) that start to deconstruct traditional and hegemonic ideas about masculinity in our culture(s), and stimulate thinking about alternative ways to define manhood. Participants are asked to make their own contributions by having dialogues like the one they have participated in with their friends, families, coworkers and organizations. Discussion groups would be held within organizations and agencies in Santa Monica and selected parts of West Los Angeles.

Host Agency

Sojourn Services For Battered Women And Their Children (Sojourn), a project of OPCC (Ocean Park Community Center), has provided comprehensive services to domestic violence victims since 1977 with the opening of our crisis shelter, which is the second oldest in the state of California. Sojourn serves victims from all classes, cultures, and religions, regardless of economic circumstance, sexual orientation, immigration status, and addictions or mental health issues. The shelters welcome the often underserved populations such as lesbians, elderly women, women with HIV, trafficking victims, prostitutes, women recently released from prison, and Sojourn is known as a resource for deaf and disabled women. All staff and volunteers qualify as Domestic Violence Counselors pursuant to California Evidence Code §1037. There is no income eligibility for services, and Sojourn charges no fees (OPCC, 2013).

Programs of Sojourn are designed to address the emergency and long-term needs of battered women and their children and to provide community education and technical assistance to police, hospitals, social service agencies and the community at large. Services consist of shelters; clinical and horticultural therapy; support groups for women and for children; empowerment play groups for children; crisis intervention and peer counseling; attorney-staffed legal and social services clinics; court advocacy and accompaniment; outreach to the community, education on healthy relationships, dating violence, and non-violent conflict resolution for youth and children; and emergency response to law enforcement and medical facilities. Outreach efforts include a blog and a teen relationship expert who provides confidential dating advice via email or through social media. Prevention efforts include a school-based theatre program for youth, and a

citywide collaborative initiative aimed at changing social norms around masculinity. Sojourn is an official enrolling agency for the Secretary of State's confidential mail-forwarding program for victims of abuse and stalking. All services are accessed via a 24-hour hotline and are provided both in English and Spanish. Full-service, shelter-based domestic violence agencies like Sojourn remain the single most important lifeline for victims of domestic violence (OPCC, 2013).

Target Population

The target population would encompass the City of Santa Monica while using a "top down" approach–enlisting leaders and heads of community organizations to pioneer this effort within their own micro-communities. As the community-based organizations are the most prominent touch points for all community members, they can serve as "hotspots" of influence, reaching far wider than any individual person or single organization.

The targeted focus will be on the influence of adult men and women as role models for positive ways for men and boys to interact in all kinds of relationships. Other prevention initiatives typically employ youth-targeted education campaigns, which teach youth how not to become victims, or how not to become perpetrators. While these programs serve an important function on the spectrum of prevention programs, they might more appropriately be called risk reduction, rather than primary prevention. We believe that teaching risk reduction will never get to the root cause of why our youth become violent to begin with, which is, they grow up in a culture that we have created (and continue to sustain) that condones and celebrates violence, particularly male violence.

Cross-Cultural Relevance

Los Angeles County encompasses a wide net of male violence in many different forms. There are many different ethnicities and cultures that incorporate Los Angeles County. All of the different cultures have their own challenges in how violence affects their community. The male gender has its own inherent nature/nurture to counteract within the context of cross-cultural relevance. This program seeks to provide culturally competent discussions on the influence of culture on male violence. This will create a unique dialogue amongst the participants in what cultural and societal factors give life to the production of violence that perpetuates amongst all communities in Los Angeles County.

Social Work Relevance

According to the National Social Workers Association's (NASW, 1999) code of ethics, the core values of social work practice are service, social justice, dignity of the person, significance of community, integrity, and competence. This program seeks to assist in the changing of social norms. This is why the reframing of the media and cultural impact on the development of boys to men are critical when discussing some of the principles of social work. This program will enhance the importance of human relationships, especially without the fear or use of violence. This program will increase the knowledge of the dignity and worth of a person from different cultural backgrounds to the equity of gender. This program will approach men not as potential perpetrators, and women not as potential victims, but instead as allies who are empowered and can confront peers who are abusive and support those who may be experiencing abuse. From this model, a "bystander" is defined as anyone who is embedded in any type of

relationship–family, school, social, or professional–where one person may be abusive or be experiencing abuse. This program has created a format for conducting facilitated discussion groups intended to dismantle traditional ideas about masculinity, stimulate critical thinking and dialogue about the origins of social norms relating to masculinity, and elicit a commitment to action toward changing those norms in participants' respective lives.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Violence

A comprehensive analysis of the problem of violence should begin by defining the various forms of violence so as to facilitate their measurement. There are many ways to define violence, but perhaps the most thoughtful of those definitions is offered by the World Health Organization (WHO): "The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation" (WHO, 1996, p. 5).

It is important to note that the inclusion of the word "power" and the phrase "psychological harm" broadens the conventional definition of violence to include those acts that are not limited to causing physical injury, which should be understood to include neglect, or threats and intimidation. This definition is consistent with those used by helping professionals and researchers in the fields of domestic violence, child abuse, and bullying, which place some level of emphasis on the psychological and emotional injuries that can be inflicted without the use of physical force. This reflects a growing awareness among the researcher and practitioner community of the necessity to include violence that is not necessarily physical, but that still takes an otherwise significant toll on individuals, families, communities and health care systems. For example, many forms of gender-based violence, child abuse and elder abuse can produce physical, psychological and

social problems that do not necessarily lead to injury, disability or death. These consequences might be immediate or long-term, acute or chronic, and can have residual effects for many years after the initial abuse incident(s). Thus, defining outcomes of violence only in terms of physical injury or death is very limiting in terms of understanding the full scope of the problem and its impact on individuals, communities and society (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002).

Types of Violence

There are three types of violence, divided based on the characteristics of the perpetrators of that violence: (1) self-directed (violence a person inflicts on him/herself), (2) interpersonal (violence committed by one individual or by a small group of individuals against another individual), and (3) collective (violence committed by larger groups–states, organized political or militia groups, and terrorist organizations).

Self-directed violence can be further divided into suicidal behaviors–suicidal thoughts, attempted and completed suicide–and self-abuse–self-injurious behavior, or self-mutilation.

Interpersonal violence can be subdivided into two sub-categories: (1) family/intimate partner violence (domestic violence)–violence between family members or intimate partners, mostly taking place within the home environment and (2) community violence–violence between unrelated individuals, and who may or may not know each other, generally occurring outside the home. The first sub-category includes child abuse, domestic violence, and elder abuse, while the second includes youth violence, random violent acts, rape or sexual assault by unknown assailants, and violence in settings like schools, workplaces, prisons and assisted living facilities.

Collective violence can be divided into social, political and economic violence. Social collective violence can be defined as violence used to advance a specific social agenda (e.g., hate crimes committed by organized groups, terrorist acts, or mob violence). Political violence includes war and related types of violent conflicts. Economic collective violence includes those attacks committed by larger groups which are motivated by economic gain, or those with the purpose of disrupting economic activity, or denying access to essential financial services.

Prevalence, Incidence and Victimization

It is important to note that there is no single cause of violence. Studies have shown that there are multiple factors that correlate to violent behavior or to the commission of violent crime, including biological factors, as well as socio-political and other cultural and environmental factors. Thus, it is similarly important to note that when looking at crime statistics, which have been used here to demonstrate the prevalence of violence among specific subsets of the population; it is of critical importance to examine them through the lens of these other, often nuanced, cultural factors. Issues of poverty, class, race and gender cannot be ignored in a critical evaluation of violence as a social problem. In addition, one must consider how crime statistics are collected–who does and who does not report crimes, which types of crimes get reported and which do not and why, discrepancies in law enforcement response to particular crimes in particular communities, differences in arrests, prosecution and sentencing within the criminal justice system, and so on.

Prevalence–the proportion of a population found to have a particular disease or condition, arrived at by dividing the total number of cases existing in a population by the

total population–of violence, cannot be considered on its own, because that one component does not offer us the whole picture. Instead, prevalence must be considered alongside incidence and victimization rates, so that we can have a full understanding of the scope of the problem before us.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, between 1980 and 2008, males represented 77% of homicide victims and nearly 90% of offenders. The victimization rate for males was 3 times higher than the rate for females, and the perpetration rate for males was almost 9 times higher than the rate for females. Blacks were disproportionately represented as both homicide victims and homicide offenders. The victimization rate for blacks was 6 times higher than the rate for whites. The offending rate was almost 8 times higher than the rate for whites. It is important to note here that while blacks were disproportionately represented among general homicide perpetrators and victims; other studies show that whites are disproportionately represented among serial and mass murderers. For example, over the past 30 years, in 93% of the mass shootings that occur on a school campus, the shooter(s) was a/were young white male(s). Approximately one third of murder victims and almost half of homicide offenders were under age 25. For both victims and offenders, rates peaked in the 18-24 year old age group.

Risk Factors for Violence Involvement

Research has increased the public's understanding of the factors that make some populations or individuals more vulnerable to violence victimization and perpetration. Risk factors increase the likelihood that someone will become violent or be victimized by violence. Protective factors buffer individuals from the risks of being victimized by or

perpetrating violence. It is important to note that risk factors have been studied far more extensively than protective factors, though both are critical to a comprehensive understanding of the problem of violence in communities. It is equally important to note that risk factors are not direct causes of violence, nor do protective factors promise insulation from violence. Rather, they both contribute to or reduce likelihood of violence (CDC, 2013b).

Risk Factors for Victimization

There is a significant amount of overlap between identified risk factors for violence perpetration and those for victimization. Further, much of the research being done around risk factors is being done specific to a particular type of violence among a particular subset of the population. For example, recent research efforts by the CDC have identified the following: among active duty army personnel, risk factors for suicide include problems in intimate relationships, mental health distress, substance use, and recent exposure to combat. Risk factors among youth around gang membership are alcohol and drug use. Among middle school students, strong correlations were found between bullying perpetration or homophobic teasing and subsequent sexual harassment perpetration. Youth who intentionally visit websites depicting, or who read or watch violent x-rated material are 6 times more likely to report engaging in sexually aggressive behavior (CDC, 2013a).

There are, however, common risk factors that can be identified across the research, and as applies to all forms of violence among all populations. Poor problem-solving skills and family conflict are among those common factors (CDC, 2013a). Additional research has been done relating to risk factors for boys, as a clear connection

has been drawn between gender, specifically men and boys, and violence victimization and perpetration rates. Studies have shown that adolescent boys are more likely than girls to be the victims of almost all types of serious violent crimes, including assault, robbery and homicide. Research also indicates that boys' risk of victimization increases as they get older (Health and Human Services [HHS], 2008).

For boys and young men, risk factors for violence victimization include: access to firearms in the home, exposure to family violence, low levels of parental education and income, lack of appropriate parental monitoring and supervision, and socially disorganized neighborhoods (HHS, 2008). Research also tells us that those boys and young men who have been exposed to family or community violence, or who spend time among peers who are aggressive are most likely to both perpetrate violence and to become victims of violence (HHS, 2008).

Risk Factors for Perpetration

Researchers have separated risk factors for perpetration into several categories: individual, family, peer/social, and community. Individual risk factors that correlate to the likelihood of violence perpetration include: prior violent victimization; attention deficits, hyperactivity or learning disorders; a history of early aggression; use of drugs, alcohol or tobacco; low IQ; poor behavioral control; problems with social cognitive or information-processing abilities; high levels of general emotional distress; a history of treatment for emotional issues; antisocial beliefs and attitudes; and exposure to family violence and conflict (CDC, 2013b).

Family risk factors that correlate to the likelihood of violence perpetration include: authoritarian attitudes regarding childrearing; overly harsh, overly lax, or

inconsistent disciplinary practices; low levels of parental involvement; low levels of emotional attachment to parents or caregivers; low levels of parental education and income; parental substance abuse or criminal history; poor family functioning; and lack of appropriate monitoring and supervision of children (CDC, 2013b).

Peer/social risk factors that correlate to the likelihood of violence perpetration include: associating with delinquent peers, gang involvement, experiencing social rejection by peers, lack of involvement in conventional activities, poor academic performance, and low levels of commitment to school and school failure (CDC, 2013b).

Finally, community risk factors that correlate to the likelihood of violence perpetration include: lack of economic opportunities in the community, high concentrations of residents living in poverty, high levels of transiency, high levels of family disruption, low levels of community engagement, and socially disorganized neighborhoods (CDC, 2013b).

Relationship between Masculinity and Violence

Men and boys comprise the vast majority of homicide offenders (90%) and the vast majority of victims of homicide (77%). Among 10-24 year olds, boys (86%) were much more likely than girls (14%) to be victims of homicide (CDC, 2010). Also, the majority of youth victims of non-fatal violence are males. Males, ages 10-24, were arrested for violent crimes at a consistently higher rate than females over an 11-year period during 1995-2006 (CDC, 2011). Among high school students (grades 9-12), boys reported carrying a weapon (27%) or a gun (9.8%) during a period of 30-days at a much higher rate than girls (7.1%; 1.7%; CDC, 2010). There are further disparities among the genders (males 15.1%; females 6.7%) on reports of engaging in a physical fight on school

property during a 1-year period (CDC, 2010). The data shows that men and boys both perpetrate and are victims of violent crime at far higher rates than women and girls. Criminologists have often used gender, being male, as the strongest predictor of criminal involvement (Messerschmidt, 1993).

While women and girls are subjected to the same types of trauma, live in the same communities, consume media, belong to peer/social groups, and they are, deplorably, victims of violence approximately 24% of the time (United States Department of Justice [USDOJ], 2011), they do not perpetrate violence at nearly the same rates as men and boys. This suggests that a much closer look needs to be taken at the beliefs, cultural values, and social systems that shape notions of male gender and definitions of manhood and masculinity. Though gender socialization practically begins in utero, the large body of research that has been done on the subject tells us that the gender binary is virtually useless to us, other than to provide information and social cues around biological sex. Furthermore, it appears that the costs of this social training that is imposed on young boys and girls far outweigh any possible benefits and are particularly harmful to men and boys.

Men and boys who define masculinity in its most extreme sense (hyper masculinity), or men and boys who experience high levels of gender role conflict–a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences on an individual or other around them (Amato, 2012)–have been shown to have worse outcomes in the areas of physical, emotional and mental health, interpersonal and public safety, academic achievement, and interpersonal and social skills. Perhaps even more deeply troubling is what appears to be at the root of why men and boys define masculinity in this radical way, or why they experience this psychological conflict–a deep sense of homophobia and

fear of femininity (O'Neil, 1981).

Studies show that men who more strongly affirm or who struggle more with masculinity expectations experience worse well-being outcomes and increased problem behaviors, including abuse of alcohol and other substances, high risk sexual behavior, anxiety and depression, perpetration of violence in the community, use of controlling behaviors and violence with intimate partners, use of aggressive psychological defenses during conflicts, aggressive driving, degradation of the environment, unemployment, and seek physical and mental health care at much lower rates. Each of these problems are supported by larger systems and institutional and societal practices, with an undercurrent of social and cultural expectations and norms, all of which dictate that boys and men reject anything viewed as stereotypically feminine; to be tough and aggressive; suppress all emotions other than anger; distance themselves emotionally and physically from other men; and always strive toward competition, success and power (Mankowski & Maton, 2010).

While overall quality of life for men is significantly negatively impacted by conformity or the expectation of conformity to traditional masculine norms, it should be noted that the extent of this negative impact can differ quite dramatically depending on a particular man's circumstances. Masculinity ideologies can vary from person to person, or from group to group, and they may also change over time. However, it is widely understood that some masculinity ideologies are more powerful than others in determining what members of a particular culture assign to be normative masculinity. Perhaps not surprisingly, as a result, outcomes in the areas previously discussed can be viewed on a spectrum, particularly when considering things like varying degrees of

privilege afforded to different men–White affluent men compared to men of color, of lower socioeconomic status, of non-heterosexual orientation, or of non-traditional gender expression. However, regardless of a particular man's or boy's status, it seems that there is undeniable evidence that all men and boys receive and, to varying degrees, internalize messages about masculinity that cause a range of social, health and emotional problems.

Theories to Address Violence Prevention

Violence is often seen as an intractable problem because of its multidimensional nature and the complexity of a long-term solution. Violence is, in fact, preventable, but its prevention requires a significant and sustained investment of resources. Violence in the United States is multi-layered and has many root causes, which means that no one program or approach would be able to address all causes nor all layers of the problem. The complicated nature of the problem indicates the need for a comprehensive solution, and requires the commitment and participation from multiple disciplines and community stakeholders. An effective approach to violence prevention incorporates a combination of community and systemic action and a focus on family and individual resiliency (Culross, Cohen, Wolfe, Ruby, 2006).

Theory 1: A Public Health Approach to Violence Prevention

Each year, more than a million people lose their lives, and many more suffer non-fatal injuries, as a result of all three types of violence–self-inflicted/directed, interpersonal or collective violence. Violence is among the leading causes of death worldwide for people aged 15–44 years (Mercy, 2003).

Although precise estimates are difficult to obtain, the cost of violence translates into billions of U.S. dollars in annual health care expenditures worldwide, and billions

more for national economies in terms of days lost from work, law enforcement and lost investment. The invisible costs of violence–grief, loss, trauma–are even more severe, but virtually impossible to quantify (Mercy, 2003).

Violence can be prevented and its impact mitigated, in the same way that public health efforts have prevented and reduced other pandemic-level problems, such as pregnancy-related complications, workplace injuries, infectious diseases, and illness resulting from contaminated food and water in many parts of the world. The factors that contribute to violence–whether those related to attitude and behavior or related to larger social, economic, political and cultural conditions–can be changed (Mercy, 2003).

Over the past two decades, violence and violence prevention have increasingly been viewed as problems to be addressed in the public health arena. To demonstrate this point, 20 years ago, fewer than five people worked at the CDC on violence as a public health problem. Today, the CDC has more than 70 people working full-time on violence prevention in its Division of Violence Prevention within the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, making it the largest collection of experts in the world fully dedicated to preventing violence-related injuries and deaths. Furthermore, in that same time period, the division's annual budget has grown from less than $500,000 to more than $90 million (Mercy, 2003).

The public health approach combines several elements that are necessary to reducing and eventually eliminating the problem of violence: a commitment to prevention; the application of the relevant scientific tools to achieve this goal; and the unwavering belief that effective public health actions require collaboration and cooperation across disciplines–scientific, civic, societal, and political – and at all levels

(Mercy, 2003).

Theory 2: Social Ecology Model to Prevent Violence

One such framework for the public health approach to violence prevention, which is utilized by the project (MVPP) for which the grant highlighted in this paper was written, is the social ecology model. Primary prevention of violence necessitates an understanding of the myriad of factors that influence it. The CDC uses this model to better understand violence, its impact and the effect of different potential prevention strategies. This model takes into consideration the complexity of the interplay between individual, relationship, community, and societal factors (CDC, 2014a).

The first level (Individual) identifies factors of biology and personal history that increase the likelihood of becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence. These factors include: age, education, income, substance use, or history of abuse. Prevention strategies at this level, such as education and life skills training, are often designed to promote attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that ultimately prevent violence.

The second level (Relationship) examines close relationships in an individual's life that may increase the risk of perpetrating or being victimized by violence. A person's closest social circle–peers, partners and family members–heavily influences their behavior. Prevention strategies at this level may include mentoring and peer programs designed to build conflict resolution and problem solving skills, and promote healthy relationships.

The third level (Community) explores the settings within which social relationships are developed, such as schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods, and attempts to identify the specific characteristics of these settings that are associated with

risk factors for perpetration or victimization. Prevention strategies at this level, such as social norm and social marketing campaigns, are typically designed to impact the climate and policies within any one of these systems.

The fourth level (Societal) looks at broader societal factors, such as social and cultural norms, that help create a climate in which violence is either condoned or discouraged. Other broad societal factors include the health, economic, educational and social policies that maintain economic or social disparities between groups in a society.

Prevention strategies are not more important at one level or another. Rather, prevention strategies are necessary at all levels of the social-ecological model, happening simultaneously. Evidence indicates that a multi-level approach to violence prevention is the best strategy to reduce violence over time, rather than an approach that targets only one level of the model (CDC, 2014a).

Theory 3: Collective Impact Model to Prevent Violence

Another public health framework for the public health approach to violence prevention utilized by the MVPP is the collective impact model. As defined by Kania and Kramer in their Winter 2011 article in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, "Collective impact can be defined as the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem (p.36)." The authors later continue:

> Collaboration is nothing new. The social sector is filled with examples of partnerships, networks, and other types of joint efforts. But collective impact initiatives are distinctly different. Unlike most collaboration, collective impact initiatives involve a centralized infrastructure, a dedicated staff, and a structured

process that leads to a common agenda, shared measurement, continuous communication, and mutually reinforcing activities among all participants. (Kania and Kramer, 2011, pp.36-38)

Theory 4: Bystander Intervention to Prevent Violence

Research finds the problem of male violence to be consistent across communities, often finding its causes to be nested deep within community and cultural norms (e.g., Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, Stark, 2003), thus demonstrating the need for solutions that are community-centered and community-driven. If the causes are found in social norms, which communities help shape and perpetuate, it is critical that all community members take responsibility for the role they can play in creating different social norms, and in turn, ending male violence. Such a focus holds the promise of creating broader community change that is both meaningful and sustainable.

A piece of the conceptual model of the MVPP focuses on engaging community members in attitude and behavior change efforts in order to increase levels of receptivity to prevention messages. The model builds on the bystander work of Koss and Harvey (1991), but focuses on preventing all male-perpetrated violence, and targets all adult community members as influencers who can shape and model healthier norms around masculinity that do not glorify violence or devalue women. Briefly, the objective of most traditional bystander intervention is to involve both men and women to change the underlying culture or environment within which violence against women occurs and is often supported. All bystander prevention programs share in the common philosophy that, if social norms are at the root of the problem of violence, then everyone in the community has a role to play in shifting those norms in order to prevent violence.

Furthermore, the bystander model explores specific roles and action steps that community members may adapt and then adopt in order to have tangible methods for how to do this.

Within the research, the specific application of the bystander approach varies from program to program and site to site. Many of the bystander intervention programs and much of the corresponding research targets students and campuses, but there are some general differences can be noted among bystander programs. These differences include the length of training for potential bystanders, the training delivery format, and how participants are selected and grouped (single versus mixed-gender groups). Whereas some programs have trained mixed gender groups (Banyard et al., 2007), others have focused on single gender groups, specifically groups of men to explore violence prevention (Berkowitz, 2002; DeKeseredy et al., 2000; Foubert, 2000). Other programs have targeted even more specific groups within student populations, such as student athletes (Katz, 1994), fraternity and sorority members (Moynihan & Banyard, 2008), and students identified as peer leaders (Edwards, 2009).

Although bystander prevention and intervention programs are still largely considered new strategies, some promising outcomes have been indicated in the research so far. For instance, the Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) program (Katz, 1994)– the program created by Jackson Katz, one of the inspirational voices behind the work of the MVPP, and one of the project's consultants–has been operating for many years now in many settings around the country training peer mentors among high school-aged boys and girls to address violence through bystander intervention. Evaluations of this program show participants demonstrating increased knowledge about violence and higher levels of feelings of self-efficacy at taking action to prevent violence as a result of participating in

the program. More recent research shows promising outcomes in bystander interventions used to address violence against women among college students. Barone, Wolgemuth, and Linder (2007) examined men's attitudes and behaviors before and after participation in a study called, "Men's Project." The program recruited single gender participant groups from athletic teams, fraternities and in residence halls, and administered 2-hour weekly training sessions for 10 weeks on the prevention of violence against women. Four qualitative focus groups were conducted with 19 participants. As a result of these focus groups, Barone et al. (2007) found that men having a support group was essential to their ability to challenge their sexist environment and effectively implement the prosocial bystander behavior techniques they learned. Banyard et al. (2007) provided some of the first empirical evidence that a bystander intervention specific to sexual violence prevention resulted in significant and sustained changes in knowledge, attitudes, and bystander behaviors in both college men and women. Moynihan and Banyard (2008) and later Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz (2011) conducted separate studies on bystander interventions for sexual violence prevention among different subsets of college students, and results from both studies indicated that these interventions were successful in changing knowledge and attitudes around sexual violence, or in reducing self-reported sexual aggression or less associating with sexually aggressive peers. An exploratory pilot study of a bystander intervention program for sexual violence prevention among college athletes and fraternity members evaluated groups considered to be at high risk of sexual violence perpetration. Results indicated that, in general, the intervention was effective in changing their knowledge, attitudes, and bystander efficacy.

By presenting material about male violence in the context of group discussions,

prevention programs are more likely to be successful in creating social change around these issues as participants have identified needing this type of social support (e.g., Berkowitz, 2003). This approach must be adapted for primary prevention, moving the focus away from just those most at risk for becoming victims or perpetrators, and broadening the scope to all community members who have important roles to play and who have a large stake in preventing violence in their families and neighborhoods. Thus, the impact of the program may readily extend to changing the broader social context and culture from one that normalizes violence and encourages people to mind their own business to one that discourages violence and supports community members to identify as prosocial bystanders who not only have a role to play but who have a responsibility to act in situations that could become violent.

Current Approaches to Violence Prevention

The public health field defines three distinct levels of prevention–primary, secondary and tertiary. Primary prevention strategies attempt to stop violence before it starts, and aim to reduce factors that put people at risk for, or increase factors that protect people from experiencing violence. Secondary prevention strategies focus on the immediate response to violent incidents, and aim to address violence in its aftermath (e.g. medical services for victims). Tertiary prevention strategies are long-term approaches to address the lasting effects of violence, such as rehabilitation for perpetrators of violence or counseling services for victims of violence that address the emotional trauma (CDC, 2014a).

In 2006, the Prevention Institute created a report outlining promising violence prevention initiatives across the country, with a focus on primary prevention of youth

violence and adult intimate partner violence. Several specific programs were identified, but much attention was paid to the large-scale initiatives that experts felt would be most effective in responding to the breadth and scope of the problem of violence. Particular emphasis was placed on programs that recognized the importance of collaboration, based on the theory that violence is a learned behavior, and thus efforts must be geared not just toward developing skills in individuals that are needed to avoid and prevent violence, but also to the larger framework within which these individuals exist, live and learn from (Culross, et al, 2006).

STRYVE—Striving To Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere—is a national initiative to prevent youth violence among youth aged 10 to 24. The initiative is led by the CDC. STRYVE's vision is one of safe and healthy youth achieving their full potential as connected and contributing members of thriving, violence-free families, schools, and communities. STRYVE's goals are to: increase awareness and create attitudes in communities that support the notion that youth violence can and should be prevented, promote the use of evidence based youth violence prevention approaches, and provide guidance to and in communities on practical strategies to prevent youth violence (CDC, 2014b).

One of the STRYVE programs–the Youth Violence Prevention Partnership of the Multnomah County Health Department in Portland, Oregon–wanted to generate authentic dialogue about the issue of youth violence, but first needed to address the growing distrust and fear that exists between the police and the community. In Portland, Oregon, attitudes toward police had been impacted by long standing beliefs, especially among young people, about excessive use of force and racial profiling. In 2006, organizers from

the Community Capacitation Center (CCC) of the Multnomah County Health Department (MCHD) initiated the Youth Violence Prevention Partnership (YVPP), a community-driven collaboration between law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations, and youth that aims to build positive relationships between law enforcement officials and young people with the goal of preventing violence affecting youth.

In the YVPP model, community youth and law enforcement representatives meet regularly and engage in collaborative activities that educate and empower participants, and stimulate critical thinking. The YVPP approach treats youth and law enforcement as equal partners and as having an equal stake in properly identifying the problems, examining root causes, and exploring and implementing solutions in their communities. YVPP reaches over 200 youth a month at 8 community-based sites in Multnomah County that serve low-income youth and youth of color.

YVPP is evaluated using surveys and individual interviews. In 2010-2011, survey results showed that youth's participation in YVPP was associated with changes in their attitudes toward the police. Youth participants reported increased willingness to engage with law enforcement to report wrongdoing in their communities and reported being less likely to believe that all law enforcement officers abuse their authority. Interviews with law enforcement officials demonstrated that their participation in YVPP also yielded an overall positive impact on their police work. Being part of the project helped police to identify and address some of the underlying causes of youth violence and thus approach their work with you and with communities with generally more positive attitudes. Interviews with community partners indicated that project activities were effective in establishing better relationships and building trust between law enforcement

officers and young people. Community partners also described an overall change in attitudes among the youth in their organizations toward law enforcement personnel.

Each partner organization has philosophically agreed to commit and invest whatever resources they are able. That said funding for the YVPP has mostly been sustained with a shared, in-kind budget. The Multnomah County Health Department remains committed to its role as the backbone and lead of the project. This project provides evidence that negative attitudes and beliefs can be changed with the right approach, the right partners, and committed resources. In particular, this project highlights the success of having a public health agency coordinate such an effort (CDC, 2014c).

Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth through violence prevention (UNITY) is a project developed by the CDC's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control to address violence affecting youth in large urban areas around the United States. Through a cooperative agreement with the Prevention Institute, the Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center/UCLA School of Public Health, and the Harvard School of Public Health, the goals of the project are to: bolster existing youth violence prevention efforts in larger cities, build national support for local urban programs by developing appropriate national resources and policies, and develop practical tools and a framework to ensure sustainability of existing and developing youth violence prevention efforts in large urban settings (Weiss, 2008).

One of the UNITY programs–the San Diego Commission on Gang Prevention and Intervention – was created in response to years of unsuccessful attempts by city and community-based organizations to intervene in rising gang violence in the City of San

Diego. The 2003 New Year's Eve murder of two young women seemed to be the tipping point, and is largely viewed as the precipitating event that caused the San Diego City Council to set up the San Diego Commission on Gang Prevention & Intervention. The Council passed an ordinance that sanctioned the Commission to make recommendations around gang prevention and intervention and gang diversion and suppression strategies, to identify potential funding sources for such efforts, and to address any other gang-related policy issues. After soliciting community feedback, the City joined the California Cities Gang Prevention Network, a group of 13 California cities, to learn how they had incorporated prevention into overall city planning activities. San Diego then also became a part of UNITY, allowing the city access to the resources of the Prevention Institute, a national organization focused on promoting primary prevention practice.

In 2006, the Commission developed a strategic plan aimed primarily at building collaborative relationships between the public, schools, and law enforcement to decrease gang violence. Local agencies partnered with school districts to bring the Safe Passages program into the local middle and high schools. Safe Passages is a coordinated, multi-disciplinary effort to get students to and from school safely and to reduce the likelihood of youth gang involvement. A secondary work area and area where the Commission has seen success is around truancy and curfews. Over 50 neighborhood volunteers have helped police with curfew sweeps. In 2007, at the peak of the violence, there were 29 gang-related homicides. By 2009, that number had declined to 9 (CDC, 2014d).

In 2008, the UNITY project commissioned a report to assess the current youth violence prevention efforts in major cities across the United States. In their own report, they found that the majority of cities' responses to youth violence are not perceived to be

highly effective, appropriate or adequate in regards to the level of organized response or committed funding. Cities also cited a lack of a comprehensive prevention strategy or collaboration between city government entities. Of particular concern was the trend that law enforcement still appeared to be driving much of the effort while public health departments, despite the overwhelming evidence that a public health approach to violence prevention is the most promising practice, are not perceived as an ally. Because of the narrow focus of law enforcement by its very nature, these findings indicate that the vast majority of the efforts around the country (or at least highlighted in this fairly comprehensive report) are still most likely classified as secondary rather than primary prevention approaches (Weiss, 2008).

Relevance of Violence Prevention Programs

Violence and its prevention are important to discuss because of the toll it takes on communities, families and individual human lives. Violence of all types impacts men and boys disproportionately, both from a perpetration and victimization perspective. While youth violence is on the rise, and is an issue that cannot be neglected, it is not an issue that can be looked at in a vacuum. Young people are members of families, of communities, and of other social and peer groups from which they learn cultural and social norms. Those norms are heavily shaped and influenced by the adults who surround them. Those programs identified as best or promising practices in the country deal with a specific type of youth violence. Furthermore, as is discussed previously, many violence prevention programs utilize law enforcement or criminal justice approaches, which are more secondary than primary prevention approaches. Finally, virtually none of the programs that work to prevent violence of all types among youth

target the adult influencers who create the norms that shape the beliefs and attitudes of young people. Social norms interventions have been used throughout history to change attitudes and behavior. Public awareness campaigns have successfully encouraged individuals to reduce health-risk behaviors and change cultural and social attitudes to reduce rates of cigarette smoking, drinking, drunk driving, and driving without seat belts. Research has shown that this approach can be adapted to bystander intervention program models, to encourage individuals to adapt more prosocial bystander behaviors in order to prevent violence, and, if looking at violence on a continuum, to prevent the daily micro-aggressions that can easily escalate to violence (Berkowitz, 2007). The MVPP is the only effort of its kind–a multi-disciplinary/collaborative primary prevention program, targeting adult influencers, aimed at changing the underlying social and cultural norms that condone or glorify violence.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND DATA COLLECTION

Identification of Potential Funding Sources

Several methods were used to identify potential funding sources. The MVPP is a community collaborative initiative with a variety of city-sponsored or city-funded partner organizations. These partner organizations participate at one of two levels–by sanctioning the participation of a staff member in regular meetings and work of the Skills Committee, or by having an administrative level representative participate in regular meetings and work of the Executive Committee. The Skills Committee functioned as the "boots on the ground" committee, having been responsible for the development and implementation of the 4-hour discussion, and other project activities. The Executive Committee began as an administrative decision-making body, but after OPCC (the founding partner) took over as the fiscal lead for the project, this Committee evolved into a resource development and policy-level body. Each of the organizations participating on the Executive Committee–the City of Santa Monica's Community and Cultural Services Department's Human Services Division, the Santa Monica Police Department, the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District, the Santa Monica Commission on the Status of Women, the Westside Domestic Violence Network, and Sojourn Services For Battered Women And Their Children, a project of OPCC–has its own method of resource and fund

development, and each organization committed to researching and sharing potential funding sources for the project.

MVPP is a program of Sojourn, one of the ten projects of the Ocean Park Community Center (OPCC). OPCC's Development Department is responsible for researching, writing, negotiating, executing and administering all of OPCC's government and foundation grants. OPCC's staff grant writer is responsible for researching, writing and submitting for foundation grants, and keeps a pulse on all of the needs of each project with regard to programs needing additional funding. The MVPP is currently unfunded and is a program for which resources are constantly being gathered and fielded. While being a domestic violence organization housed within a larger homeless services organization certainly has its benefits, it has sometimes been challenging to capitalize on all possible funding opportunities as several of the projects within OPCC often compete for the same resources. For example, Sojourn is a shelter that primarily serves women who are trying to rebuild their lives. Daybreak Shelter, another of OPCC's projects, also shelters women who are trying to rebuild their lives, though the reasons behind the need for each shelter are quite different. Sojourn assists victims of domestic violence and Daybreak serves women with mental health issues. Nonetheless, many grants would likely be a near fit for either program, and at OPCC, the Development Department is forced to choose one before writing for any grant (A. Palotai, personal communication, July 14, 2014).

That being said, the OPCC Development Department utilizes every resource at its discretion, and on a daily basis researches possible government and foundation resources, along with soliciting private donations from individual community members.

Criteria for Selection of Actual Grant

Because of the uniqueness of the nature of the work of the MVPP, criteria for the selection of the grant are very specific. The mission of the project was to create long-term community and culture change, thus, the timeframe for the project's short-term goals were 3-5 years and 7-10 years for the project's long-term goals. This timeframe issue alone eliminated many, if not most, of any Foundation grants which may have matched other criteria. Most Foundation grants provide only one-time or feeder funding to help with start up costs.

Other limitations for selecting an appropriate grant included grants with a specific geographic focus, e.g. directed at the entire nation, a county, the entire state, a rural or tribal region, etc. Even those grants that did not preclude our project based on its city-wide focus, our project is based in Santa Monica, which does not possess the traits necessary for the now common "place-based" grants. Santa Monica is often overlooked as having many of the same social problems as any other city because it is home to so many wealthy individuals, and one of the major tourist attractions in Los Angeles County. However, those of us who live and work here, or who have studied the statistics, know that this is a fallacy.

Finally, the type of support that is being offered by many grants did not fit the scope of work of the MVPP. Many grants offer support for leadership/management development, research, construction, and so on. MVPP was in an interesting position because it was not a brand new project, and much of the program development had already taken place. Further, it was a collaborative coalition-based project, housed within

a larger organization, and so did not need a dedicated building or office space, nor did it need any type of leadership development or capacity building in the traditional sense.

Thus, project leadership came to a consensus based on the criteria above, that a government grant would likely be the best fit for the needs of the project. At this point, project partners, along with staff of OPCC's Development Department began doing this research to this end.

The CDC, having researched and published much on approaching violence as a public health problem, came up in conversation as a potential research-based funding source. Because OPCC is an established 501c3 organization managing multiple government grants, OPCC already possessed an account on www.grants.gov, which is where all CDC funding opportunity announcements are published. There are three types of CDC funding opportunities: new research, new non-research, and continuations. Continuation opportunities are only available to current CDC grantees and not new applicants. OPCC has never received a CDC grant before, so the two types of grants it could consider were for new research and new non-research. Upon doing a search for available FOAs, several were discovered, and upon reviewing the specific criteria within each, it was determined that the MVPP might be a fit for what is called an "R01" new research grant. Based on the criteria in the FOA, the grant application would require a research organization to apply as the fiscal lead, with the MVPP as the research "subject" and grant partner. Thus, through contacts at OPCC and UCLA, several researchers in the public health arena, including one at the CDC, were approached about the feasibility of this grant for the project. This project is the only one of its kind, focusing on primary prevention of violence and community change, thus, project leadership felt that the

project was in an excellent position for this type of cutting edge research. While the CDC contacts indicated an interest in the project, they informed project leadership that the project was still too young and underdeveloped to participate in the types of research grants that were currently available.

A community member who had participated in MVPP activities, and who was also a professional grant-writer who had assisted OPCC with writing government grants in the past, informed project leadership about a potential funding opportunity through the Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

Description of Selected Grant/Foundation

In 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was passed by Congress, emerging from the efforts of a broad-reaching grassroots coalition of advocates and survivors. In the twenty years preceding the enactment of this important legislation, the women's movement and the battered women's movement was gaining momentum and more attention was being paid and pressure being applied to government officials around the increasing severity of crimes committed against women. Many rape crisis centers and women's shelters had been established in local jurisdictions, and state and local laws had and were continuing to change. VAWA was borne out of the need for a national solution, that could help to standardize the application of some of those laws and the availability of resources for victims, and it enhanced the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes against women and created additional resources for victims of those crimes (USDOJ, n.d.).

In 1995, the Department of Justice created OVW, which administers financial and technical assistance to communities nationwide that are developing programs, policies,

and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking – crimes that disproportionately impact women and girls (USDOJ, n.d.).

OVW currently administers three formula-based and 18 discretionary grant programs, established under VAWA and subsequent related legislation. The three formula-based programs include STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors), SASP (Sexual Assault Services Program), and State Coalitions. The 18 discretionary programs promote coordinated community response, victim support and perpetrator accountability. OVW provides funding to local and state and tribal governments, courts, non-profit organizations, community-based organizations, secondary schools, institutions of higher education, and state and tribal coalitions. Additionally as funding allows, OVW may fund some special initiatives in order to dedicate resources to issues or communities needing special/additional attention. This special initiative funding allows OVW to occasionally explore innovations in the gender based violence field and sometimes share those innovations on a national scale. Since its inception, OVW has awarded over $4.7 billion in grants and cooperative agreements (USDOJ, n.d.).

OVW's Engaging Men grant is one of the 18 discretionary grant programs which funds new or existing efforts to engage men in preventing crimes perpetrated against women, usually by men–domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking (USDOJ, n.d.).

The Request for Proposals for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 combined the Engaging Men grant program with three other grant programs–Grants to Assist Children and Youth Exposed to Violence Program (CEV); Services to Advocate for and Respond to Youth Program (Youth Services); Services, Training, Education and Policies to Reduce Sexual

Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking in Secondary Schools Grant Program (STEP); and the Engaging Men and Boys in Preventing Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking Program (Engaging Men) – due to an unanticipated shortage of funds, becoming the "Consolidated Grant and Technical Assistance Program to Address Children and Youth Experiencing Domestic and Sexual Violence and Engage Men and Boys as Allies," or Consolidated Grant Program (USDOJ, n.d.).

The Consolidated Grant Program has two primary purpose areas and supports projects that implement one or both of these areas. One of those areas was centered around multi-faceted prevention strategies involving community organizing, outreach and public education campaigns that focused on engaging men as influencers of other men and as allies with women and girls in preventing gender based violence. Based on the criteria enumerated by the grantor, the mission of the MVPP was more in alignment with, and therefore intended to apply for the "Engaging Men and Boys Projects" portion of the Consolidated Grant Program.

Target Population

The target population for the OVW Engaging Men and Boys Projects grant is adults who have influence in the lives of youth attending Santa Monica High School (SAMOHI). This includes 7 school administrators, 144 teachers, and the 57 coaches of 21 sports teams. This also includes administrators of off-campus youth services and parents whose influence is key to the on-campus effort. Special attention will be paid to engaging leaders and parents in the Pico Neighborhood who have been most affected by community violence and whose children are considered to be most at-risk.

CHAPTER 4

GRANT PROPOSAL

Proposal Narrative: Purpose of Application

This application is on behalf of Sojourn Services for Battered Women and Their Children (Sojourn), established in 1977, a project of Ocean Park Community Center (OPCC, lead agency). Sojourn is a nonprofit, nongovernmental entity with a primary goal of serving adult victims of domestic violence and a demonstrated history of providing comprehensive services to children and youth victims. OPCC, established in 1963, is the largest human services non-profit agency on the Westside of Los Angeles County. Since 2009, Sojourn, with community partners, has operated Phase One of the Male Violence Prevention Project (MVPP), with the goal of stopping the intergenerational cycle of violence in the City of Santa Monica by changing social norms regarding masculinity. The target population is adults who influence children and youth. Sojourn seeks OVW funding to launch Phase Two (Planning and Implementation), the goal of which is to stop the cycle of violence specifically in the lives of the students at Santa Monica High School (SAMOHI), a microcosm of the City. This will be accomplished by engaging the students' adult role models in forums and activities designed to decrease their levels of agreement with hyper masculine ideology and increase their levels of prosocial bystander behavior. This proposal addresses Purpose Areas 5 and 3 and satisfies requirements of a Priority Area by addressing the intersection

of domestic violence and dating violence with other youth issues such as gang involvement, bullying, truancy, suicidality, and teen pregnancy.

MVPP Phase One was initiated in June of 2009 after community members heard Dr. Jackson Katz present on male violence and masculinity. Subsequently, the Chief of Police and other city officials, along with other interested agencies, met with Sojourn staff to discuss how Santa Monica could reduce or eliminate violence in the community through understanding the root causes of violence, why it persists so stubbornly, and devising methods to address the male-perpetrated violence that society has long tolerated, if not actually fostered. At a February 2010 Leadership Forum, the official launching of MVPP, community leaders developed a mission and vision for the project, actively recruited men leaders whose buy-in was critical, and identified skills necessary to implement MVPP. Phase One began with all partners donating their time and serving on committees: Executive and Skills. In May 2011, the City awarded lead agency OPCC two technical assistance grants ($23,120) to fund part-time personnel and supplies. In May, 2012, OPCC began funding a full-time Coordinator out of its general funds. Skills Committee members (Skills) did research on other similar initiatives in the country (domestic/dating/gang/ gun violence prevention, anti-discrimination education, diversity promotion efforts, effectiveness of different approaches to community change work) and drew on the work of Jackson Katz (Mentors in Violence Prevention), Futures Without Violence ("Coaching Boys Into Men"), Courage Campaign, Positive Coaching Alliance, and others. In the next year, Skills developed a 4-hour consciousness-raising workshop– the "Intervention"–used with small groups of adults to begin the process of redefining masculinity. The Intervention creates a safe space, free of power dynamics, where

participants explore existing social norms around masculinity, examine how these are problematic, and discover how to re-envision masculinity in the context of how adults influence children and youth. The Interventions do not attack or belittle men, rather clarify that, as everyone has been socialized to value traditional models of manliness, everyone can work together in freeing men from this rigid stereotype. To demonstrate this point, the Intervention includes a personal story of the facilitators' own transformation (Koerth-Baker, 2012). Interventions with various community groups began in July 2011 with a research assistant helping to evaluate their effectiveness. Over the next year, the Intervention and the evaluation tools were refined using participant and facilitator feedback. Facilitators reported hearing fear of "feminizing boys" and the common use of phrases like, "Man up!" and "You play like a girl." Seeing a need to change this culture, the MVPP–with the support of the SAMOHI Principal and the Superintendent of the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District–defined a target population: the teachers and coaches, parents or guardians, and administrators of youth service agencies who serve as role models for SAMOHI students. While the Intervention was proving effective, it would not be enough to yield a permanent shift in the culture, so focus was shifted to sustainability. At that point, Skills realized that they themselves had experienced a change they were seeking in others. They had begun as a group of individuals (60% men) from different disciplines, backgrounds, and worldviews, where everyone had an opinion about what it means to "be a man," and some were threatened by challenges to their traditional thinking or their parenting style or their coaching style. It took a year of meeting regularly for these individuals to work through their issues, learn to trust one another, drop defenses, and truly hear one another (Tuckman, 1965).

Ultimately, they came together in agreement that the MVPP seeks not to take power from, but to enrich the lives of men and boys by adopting a definition of their gender as physically, mentally, and emotionally whole. Having had their own first-hand experience with the transformative process, however, Skills anticipated strong resistance in the target population, not only because many would embody traditional social norms, but because some also would perceive this Intervention as neglecting intersecting oppressions (racism, classism, homophobia) and the complexities of gender identity issues. Further, Skills needed to show they had no intention of coming in as experts, pretending to know more about the target population's culture than the population itself. Believing that their strongest allies would come from inside the target population–administrators, faculty/coaches, and parents–Skills began to recruit "Insider Teams" who were supportive of MVPP and likely to assist with breaking down resistance within their organizations by delivering the MVPP message peer-to-peer. See Appendix B for a list of MVPP Phase One activities.

Service Area

Santa Monica, incorporated in 1887, is an 8.3 square mile beachfront city on the west side of Los Angeles County with a population of 89,736, of whom 70% are White, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 13% Hispanic/Latino, 4% African American/Black, 3% mixed race, 1% other (United States Census Bureau, 2010). Ethnic diversity in this service area is significant (as it is throughout Los Angeles County), not only because of the number of cultures represented, but because each takes pride to maintain its distinct identity through attitudes, customs, and language. The City's residents are diverse, as well, with regard to educational attainment and income. Because of its agreeable climate and beautiful beach,

Santa Monica is a tourist attraction and appeals as much to its wealthy home-owners as it does to a population struggling with homelessness, mental illness, and/or substance dependence. One of the most diverse areas in the Los Angeles region is Santa Monica's Pico Neighborhood, population of 24,741 (47% White, 23% Latino, 14% African American, 10% Asian, 3% Biracial, 1% American Indian, 1% Pacific Islander, 1% other; average income $40,000). The neighborhood was created in the 1960's with the building of the Santa Monica Freeway through the heart of the area (deemed by many to be an act of deliberate disenfranchisement) and has been shaped by political, social, racial, and economic tension ever since. The Pico Neighborhood Association is the area's de facto political body, as the residents have been underserved and never have had a representative on the Santa Monica City Council. Crime in this neighborhood is an ongoing issue and includes gang activity. Since 1989, there have been 40 homicides in Santa Monica, 90% of which occurred in an 8-block radius of the Pico Neighborhood. Santa Monica High School (SAMOHI): Students either reside in the city or are children of people who work in the city; 30% are from the Pico Neighborhood. In 2011-12, the school had an enrollment of 3,069 (1,484 girls, 1,585 boys, 39% White, 36% Hispanic/ Latino, 9% African-American/Black, 8% Asian 1% Filipino, 6% mixed race, 1% Pacific Islander and American Indian). Parent support organizations include PTSA (predominantly White), AAPSSSG (African American Parent Student Staff Support Group), and ELAC (English Learner Advisory Committee, predominantly Latino). In 2010-11, SAMOHI reported 217 suspensions and 3 expulsions (California Department of Education, 2013). Incidents of bullying, cyberbullying, and dating violence are reported anecdotally. In 2011, a student was wounded in an off-campus shooting; SMPD officers

responded to five fights, including a student being threatened with a gun; and there was a racial incident in the wrestling team locker room.

Target Population

The target population for MVPP Phase Two is adults who have influence in the lives of youth attending SAMOHI. This includes 7 school administrators, 144 teachers, and the 57 coaches of 21 sports teams. This also includes administrators of off-campus youth services and parents whose influence is key to the on-campus effort. Special attention will be paid to engaging leaders and parents in the Pico Neighborhood who have been most affected by community violence and whose children are considered to be most at-risk.

Problem of Engaging Men and Boys

Obstacles to engaging men and boys in this work are: (1) MVPP seeks to change the traditional definition of masculinity from one that tolerates and promotes violence to one that promotes strength, power, respect, and trust. Many men (as well as many women), when contemplating a revised definition of masculinity, become threatened at what they perceive to be an attempt to emasculate men, and they disengage from the process. (2) Violence against women is largely seen only as a "women's issue." From the beginning of the battered women's movement, women have provided leadership in establishing and obtaining funding for a system of support for victims of domestic and sexual violence, in transforming the criminal justice system to hold perpetrators accountable, and in bringing more attention to issue. But men and boys are equally if not more affected by this issue. While the majority of crime is committed by men and boys, the vast majority of crime *victims* also are men and boys (BJS, 2011). Women, therefore,

must engage as allies the men and boys who comprise the majority of perpetrators, the majority of victims, and those most invested in maintaining the status quo. (3) Whenever there is youth violence, remedies almost always are youth-targeted, focusing either on perpetrators (gang intervention programs, "Columbine prevention" programs, anti-bullying campaigns, etc.) or on victims (KidPower, Learning for Life, etc.). These interventions are more "risk reduction" than prevention programs since they do not have as their primary emphasis one of the most important pedagogical agents in the history of education: Modeling. Research shows that children only learn to understand and regulate their emotions, practice self-discipline, and learn appropriate impulse control, and adaptive coping mechanisms by watching the adults around them. Only through adult modeling can children better learn to deal with aggressive or violent experiences ("Ventura County CAREs," December 2007).

Current Services Provided in the Community

MVPP is the only initiative in the community specifically designed to hold adults accountable for their influence on children. The City of Santa Monica, in addition to fully supporting MVPP, is engaged in an initiative, Cradle to Career, being implemented by the Youth Resource Team, many of whose members also are involved with MVPP. Cradle to Career is youth-focused and does not specifically address violence. Other youth-focused programming and services include Virginia Avenue Park, Crest Youth Sports, and Police Activities League (all departments of the City), Pico Youth & Family Center, Boys and Girls Club, YMCA, and YWCA. Administrators of these organizations are allies of MVPP and are in the target population. In 1995, Sojourn founded the Westside Domestic Violence Network (WDVN) which streamlines and strengthens

services to victims of domestic violence by networking providers, supporting their collaboration, conducting training and case-conferencing, upholding a best practices standard of service provision, and tracking trends to ensure development of collaborative solutions.

Gaps in Existing Services

In the Prevention Institute's 2006 paper highlighting violence prevention strategies, of the 39 promising programs around the country that they highlighted, none focus solely and primarily on the social norms around masculinity that glorify and condone violence. Further, of those programs highlighted, much of the focus is on youth, approaches community members as potential victims or perpetrators, emphasize physical and "serious" violence, and promote risk reduction rather than primary prevention (Culross, Cohen, Wolfe, Ruby, 2006). The MVPP is unique in its focus on the root cause of violence in the community, namely the social norms that perpetuate a definition of masculinity that embraces violence and a hyper masculine, "power over" dynamic. It is the first program of its kind in Santa Monica, and on the Westside of Los Angeles County, engaging men and boys in a solution to the issue of male-perpetrated violence of all kinds. Finally, MVPP is unique in its approach of ALL adult community members to prevent youth violence (and all other violence as well), as role models who help youth define norms around gender, and not as potential victims or perpetrators, but rather as allies who have a role to play in modeling healthy norms around masculinity and in intervening when violence on a less severe scale, or micro-aggressions, occur.

Impact of Current or Prior Efforts

MVPP Phase One: Beginning in June of 2011, Interventions were administered to 119 adults (63% of them male). These participants were evaluated immediately before and after and again at 3- and 6-month intervals. The evaluation tool consisted of measures from a Bystander Attitudes Scale and a Hypergender Ideology Scale. At both 3- and 6-month follow-up intervals, participants reported a greater willingness to engage in prosocial bystander behaviors and reported decreased agreement with extreme masculine and feminine roles, both at statistically significant levels. Lead Agency, Sojourn, has operated intervention and prevention programs aimed at domestic violence and dating violence since 1977 via a comprehensive and constantly evolving roster of services to thousands of adult and child victims and through community education. Sojourn's Children's Program uses a non-coercive, non-controlling empowerment model designed for parenting for independence rather than compliance. Outreach to children and youth includes "Hands Are Not For Hitting," healthy relationships and anti-bullying workshops, and teen-focused programs. To ensure positive role models in the Children's Program, Sojourn actively recruits men to join our volunteer corps. Participant evaluations of Sojourn's services consistently reflect high marks of satisfaction, demonstrating the need for these programs and their consistent effectiveness.

Previous Public Education Efforts by Lead Agency

In addition to the MVPP (2009-present), Sojourn has operated two programs utilizing men as influencers to prevent domestic violence and dating violence: (1) The Olympic Video Project, 2002-2005, funded by the State of California, Health Department, Maternal and Child Health Branch, targeted students deemed at-risk due to

one or more factors which included: demonstrated problems with forming and maintaining healthy relationships, grew up in a violent home, were abused and/or neglected by a parent, were involved in gangs, and/or abused drugs and alcohol. The students told their personal stories through "videographies," a creative and healthy outlet for their emotions. Education and leadership was provided by Jeff Rohwer, Program Coordinator, an expert in Sojourn's Empowerment Model and video production/editing, who received JAYCEES Distinguished Service Award for his work in the program. Evaluation of the program through quantitative and qualitative measurements was done by Children's Hospital Los Angeles. The school's principal noted the following outcomes: increased attendance, increased interest in continuing education beyond high school, and personal transformations that allowed students to succeed in school and life. (2) TELA (Teen Education in Liberation Arts), 2008-present, currently operating with no funding and in association with USC, is a teen theater program based on "Theatre of the Oppressed" (TO) works of Paulo Friere and Augusto Boal. The program's mentor, USC Professor Brent Blair, is a former Fulbright Scholar who founded the Applied Theatre Arts focus at the School of Dramatic Arts and is founding director of the Center for Theatre of the Oppressed and Applied Theatre Arts in Los Angeles. His male and female interns and Sojourn's male and female staff work with 20-30 students each year. Impact of the program is evaluated in-house via pre- and post-workshop surveys completed by the students. Students consistently self-report the following outcomes: decreased violence; decreased anger; increased trust in adults; increased enjoyment in school; decreased levels of depression, suicidality, and anxiety; increased awareness of socio-political issues; and increased sense of connectedness to their peers and community.

What Will Be Done

Sojourn/OPCC seeks OVW funding to expand MVPP into Phase Two. Surveys of target adults, surveys of students, and parent focus groups will set a baseline for determining the culture on campus at SAMOHI and adults' internalization of gender norms. Interventions with target adults with pre-post evaluations will be administered concurrently with a Public Education Campaign. Subsequent surveys will determine overall project effectiveness. For this prevention effort, Sojourn is utilizing several models: Public Health, Collective Impact, Social Ecological, and Empowerment. The public health approach seeks to educate the general public about the harmful effects of domestic violence on society as a whole, as study after study make clear that the effects of domestic violence are felt, not only within the relationships in which it occurs, but by everyone. Just in one regard, all of us are put at risk in various ways because of the enormous impact that domestic violence has on children who are exposed to it in their homes, both while they still are children and when they grow up. Since the early 1980's, efforts from the field of public health have shown that violence can be prevented or its impact mitigated in the same way that public health efforts have affected other social and pandemic-level problems such as cigarette smoking, pregnancy-related complications, workplace injuries, and infectious diseases. MVPP is in alignment with a city-wide effort (Collective Impact Model) to address violence in the community and promote the social, educational, and healthy development of youth in Santa Monica. MVPP was identified as a key component of the "Action Plan To Address Youth Violence" adopted by the City Council in 2010. To reach the adults who influence the students

of SAMOHI in as many spheres as possible (Social Ecological Model), MVPP personnel will work within the school, at off-campus agencies, and with parents/guardians. MVPP also will encourage use of an empowerment model to replace the power-over model, which has been the dominant paradigm as most adults tend to parent, coach and teach the way they were parented, coached, and taught. So long as youth are denied power and those with power misuse it, we will be neglecting to teach an entire generation about how power and privilege intersect with social norms.

Goals/Objectives/Activities/Outcomes

Goal 1: To stop the intergenerational cycle of violence in the lives of the students at Santa Monica High School.

Goal 2: To decrease levels of agreement with hyper masculine ideology in the adult role models of SAMOHI students.

Goal 3: To increase levels of prosocial bystander behavior in the adult role models of SAMOHI students.

Objective 1: (Planning) 85% of targeted adult influencers and 85% of current student body will participate in baseline surveys to determine adults' level of agreement with hyper masculine ideology and levels of prosocial bystander behavior and perception of SAMOHI culture. (Implementation) 65% of the same adults and 85% of current student body will participate in follow-up surveys subsequent to Interventions and training to determine measurable outcomes.

Activities: (Planning) Hire personnel and consultants; conduct organizational and community strengths and needs assessment; partners develop 30-month strategic plan;

participate in new grantee orientation; develop technical assistance plan; develop survey tools; begin administering surveys; begin conducting parent interviews and focus groups; Skills Committee meets. (Implementation) Administer surveys; collect and analyze data; adjust Project methodology; Skills Committee meets; WDVN supports MVPP activities.

Objective 2: By April 2016, 200-300 adults (on- and off-campus program administrators, teachers, coaches, and parents) will have participated in Interventions designed to redefine masculinity by exploring social norms that perpetuate violence.

Activities: (Planning & Implementation) Engage (1) curriculum developer to ensure the highest level of professionalism, (2) personnel from the Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Center to ensure sensitivity to gender norms in the LGBTQ community, and (3) a consultant to help incorporate tenets of Critical Race Theory; conduct Interventions; maintain attendance records; administer pre- and post- evaluations; interpret facilitator feedback; collect and analyze data; adjust Project methodology; Skills Committee meets; WDVN supports MVPP activities.

Objective 3: 75%-100% of Insider Teams will be trained in an empowerment model and non-violent conflict resolution skills by April 2016.

Activities: (Planning) Skills meets with ECHO Center and Center for Civic Mediation to develop empowerment model and nonviolent conflict resolution training curricula. (Implementation) Conduct training; maintain attendance records; adjust Project methodology. WDVN supports MVPP activities.

Objective 4: Insider teams will develop and implement 2 Public Education Campaigns, one at SAMOHI and one at an off-campus youth serving agency.

Activities: (Planning) Partners develop Public Education Campaign materials with assistance from the curriculum developer, personnel from the Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Center, and the Critical Race Theory consultant. (Implementation) Roll-out of campaigns; Insider Teams report anecdotal response. WDVN supports MVPP activities. (See Appendix C for the Objectives and Activities Flowchart)

Goal 1 Outcome: By conclusion of the Implementation Phase, analysis of data gathered from students who participated in follow-up surveys–whether or not they helped set the baseline – will reflect that positive change is occurring in the adult population and the culture of the school.

Goal 2 Outcome: By conclusion of the Implementation Phase, of the 65% of target adults who participated in follow-up surveys, 75%-80% will self-report decreased levels of hyper masculine ideology and positive change in the culture of the school.

Goal 3 Outcome: By conclusion of the Implementation Phase, of the 65% of target adults who participated in follow-up surveys, 75%-80% will self-report increased levels of prosocial bystander behavior and positive change in the culture of the school.

Outcome Improvement Indicators

Increase in respectful communication between adults and youth; decrease in using put-downs (particularly sexist put-downs) and shaming to motivate students; increase in strengths-based approaches to motivation; reduction or entire elimination of violent acts, verbal conflicts, racial comments/incidents, bullying behaviors, vandalism; reduction or entire elimination of dating violence; overall increase of actual and perceived safety on campus; more enthusiasm regarding attending school; less tardy/truancy.

Team and Key Partner Agencies

MVPP is a collaboration involving Sojourn (services to adult victims of domestic violence and their children with outreach to children and youth); WDVN, the community's domestic violence coalition; various factions of the City of Santa Monica (Human Services, Police Department, youth services programs); Santa Monica High School, its PTSA, and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District; Pico Neighborhood Association and Pico Youth and Family Center, organizations that represent and work with underserved populations; Another Way, a program focused primarily on men; the Santa Monica Commission on the Status of Women; and The Center for Civic Mediation. These key collaborators work as a team to plan and implement the Project.

Safety and Confidentiality

Employees and volunteers of Sojourn operate under the laws of client confidentiality as delineated in California Evidence Code §1037.1, are required to submit their fingerprints via LiveScan to the DOJ, and are mandated child abuse reporters.

Tangible Products

In Phase One, MVPP partners created a brochure for use as an outreach tool to potential partners. Funds will be used to revisions and printing. MVPP partners and Insider Teams will explore development of posters for use in Public Education Campaigns and instructional videos for use in Interventions, continuing education, and outreach. Materials will be culturally and linguistically specific to the underserved target population.

Men Leading Boys/Youth

Project partners are wholly committed to the MVPP as a movement led by men who serve as positive role models for boys and youth. Currently, 38 men are involved in the core initiative, either through committee work or as facilitators of the Interventions, and 63% of Intervention recipients were men. It should be noted, however, that women and girls must not be left out of the equation. The definition of masculinity that connects so intrinsically to violence is embraced and supported by many women and girls, as well. During Phase One, when men were challenged on their defense of this definition, they often pointed out that women are equally invested in the stereotype.

Who Will Implement the Project

Lead Agency (Domestic Violence Service Provider): Sojourn Services For Battered Women And Their Children (Sojourn), a project of Ocean Park Community Center (OPCC), opened the second oldest domestic violence shelter in Southern California in 1977. Originally staffed by volunteers, Sojourn has evolved into a comprehensive provider with an annual budget of $1.2 million, serving as many as 3,000 victims of domestic violence annually. Sojourn has a staff of 16 (11 of whom are fluent in Spanish) and maintains a volunteer corps of 50-100 who donate approximately 4,000 hours annually. Programs of Sojourn are designed to address the immediate safety concerns of victims and their children as well as strategies for long-term safety and survival. Sojourn is funded by federal, state, county, and city grants as well as foundations, corporations, and faith-based organizations. Private fund-raising is managed by OPCC's Development Department and Sojourn's volunteer Resource Board. Sojourn maintains a reputation as one of the leaders in Los Angeles County, providing services

without prejudice to underserved victims, including those who identify as LGBTQ; persons with disabilities, their caregivers and service animals; male children up to age 18; clients with mental health and substance dependence issues; and women in any stage of pregnancy. All services are free of charge to the client and accessed through the 24/7 hotline which provides peer counseling, lethality assessment, resource referral, and advocacy. Services include shelter, transportation, food, clothing, housing advocacy and household establishment assistance; clinical and horticultural therapy; Children's Program; support groups; "DV 101 Knowledge=Power," an educational group; legal and social services advocacy; attorney-staffed legal and social services clinics; court advocacy and accompaniment; community education and outreach; education of children and youth on healthy relationships, dating violence, and non-violent conflict resolution skills; and emergency response to law enforcement and medical facilities. In 2001, Sojourn completed an ADA Compliance Evaluation and Plan (program, physical, communications, and employment) and conducts annual updates. In 1989, Sojourn was instrumental in establishing a restraining order clinic in the Santa Monica courthouse, currently administered by Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. In 1992, Sojourn placed an advocate in the office of the Santa Monica City Attorney as a resource to victims of domestic violence. This resulted in an increase in misdemeanor filings. In 1995, Sojourn founded the Westside Domestic Violence Network (WDVN) and continues to administer WDVN networking/trainings, annual conference, and the work of various subcommittees. Sojourn staff sits on the WDVN Executive Board, Steering Committee, and Coordinating Council. Sojourn is a member of the California Partnership To End Domestic Violence (statewide coalition), Los Angeles County DV

Council, Los Angeles City DV Task Force, Los Angeles County Superior Court Planning Group, Los Angeles County Death Review Team, and GERDA, a county-wide protocol development team for dealing with children in families with domestic violence issues.

OPCC established in 1963 and now the largest human services non-profit agency on the Westside of Los Angeles County, operates a network of shelters and services. OPCC has an annual budget of $9.7 million, a full-time staff of 189, and is governed by a 16-member Board of Directors. OPCC serves over 7,500 individuals annually who include domestic violence victims, youth, and persons dealing with severe mental illness and/or substance dependence, and the chronically homeless. OPCC uses generally accepted accounting procedures (GAAP). The annual audit, conducted by the accounting firm of Singer, Lewak, Greenbaum and Goldstein LLP, has consistently had an unqualified audit, receiving the highest possible rating.

Key Staff

MVPP is administered by Sojourn's Prevention Programs Coordinator (full-time funded position), a bilingual, Latino, community native who serves as liaison among partners to ensure seamless collaboration and communication. Coordinator helps develop and maintain program materials and assists with documentation, tracking and reporting of all project activities. The Coordinator oversees the strengths and needs assessment, strategic plan, and technical assistance plan, and conducts outreach on behalf of the project. A Data Specialist (part-time funded position) assists with developing and administering evaluations, surveys and parent interviews and focus groups. Specialist enters and analyzes data to generate reports of project impact, and assists with other office and clerical duties. Both staff are supervised by Sojourn's Assistant Director, a

non-OVW-funded position who will attend OVW new grantee orientation and all technical assistance trainings.

Key Partners

Westside Domestic Violence Network (WDVN): The WDVN provides ongoing networking and support for providers and MVPP partners. Through its Director and leadership committee, the WDVN establishes best practices and tracks trends to galvanize community response. The Director serves on the MVPP Executive Committee and will further assist MVPP with community events, public education campaigns, communication, promotion, and advertising.

City of Santa Monica: The Assistant Director of Community & Cultural Services sits on the Executive Committee and will be involved throughout the planning and implementation phases, administering all support coming from the City of Santa Monica, specifically from Human Services Division, CREST program, and Virginia Avenue Park. Several Human Services staff has been involved in one or more of the active committees since the Project's inception and will continue through the planning and implementation phases.

Santa Monica Police Department (SMPD): SMPD Command Staff, with the support of the Chief of Police, serve on both MVPP committees, provide office space for meetings, and will be involved in the planning and implementation phases.

Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (SMMUSD) / Santa Monica High School: The MVPP is supported by the district Superintendent and the high school Principal. The Director of Student Services serves as liaison for MVPP to the high school and the district.

SAMOHI PTSA (Parent-Teacher-Student Association): The President has facilitated MVPP presentations at PTSA meetings, will continue to assist with outreach to parents, and will meet periodically with school officials and other community leaders to secure buy-in and ensure success of Project implementation.

Santa Monica Commission on the Status of Women (COSW): The COSW advises the City Council on issues of concern to women and girls. The MVPP Community Liaison for COSW sits on the Executive Committee and will be involved in planning and implementation phases.

Another Way (program focused primarily on men): A division of Open Paths Counseling Center, conducts 52-week domestic violence perpetrator intervention groups for men under the auspices of the Los Angeles County Department of Probation. The Program Manager, a group facilitator, has served on the Skills Committee since its inception, and will continue to provide expertise regarding engaging men who use violence. Another Way and Sojourn have collaborated on issues of victim safety and perpetrator accountability since the 1980's and collaborates on providing training through the WDVN.

The Pico Neighborhood Association (PNA; organization working with underserved population): The PNA serves as the de-facto political representation for this underserved community. PNA leaders will assist with addressing culturally specific needs of this population as well as connecting MVPP partners to Pico Neighborhood parents, helping to coordinate Interventions and focus groups. Leaders will meet periodically with school officials and other community leaders to secure buy-in and ensure success of Project implementation.

The Center for Civic Mediation: The Community Mediation Program Coordinator, involved on the Skills Committee since its inception, will provide consultation and training on nonviolent conflict resolution to MVPP partners and Insider Teams as well as at community events.

Program Consultants

Barrie Levy, LCSW: Formerly Director of the WDVN, Barrie Levy is a faculty member in the Department of Social Welfare, School of Public Policy, and the Women's Studies Department at UCLA. A nationally recognized expert on teen dating violence, Levy authored *In Love and In Danger: A Teen's Guide to Breaking Free of Abusive Relationships*, and *What Parents Need To Know About Dating Violence: Advice and Support for Helping Our Teens*. Levy served as interim project Coordinator and will continue participation throughout Planning and Implementation Phases.

Billie Weiss, MPH, Fielding School of Public Health, UCLA; Founder, Violence Prevention Coalition of Greater Los Angeles; co-chair, UNITY (Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth): Billie Weiss is a nationally recognized researcher, with a primary emphasis in Violence as a Public Health Issue, including intimate partner violence, teen relationship violence, and parenting for violence prevention. Ms. Weiss will consult regarding evaluation and survey materials development and analysis.

Jackson Katz, Ph.D.: Jackson Katz is one of America's leading anti-sexist male activists, internationally recognized for groundbreaking work in the field of gender violence prevention education with men and boys, serves as mentor and consultant to the MVPP and will be a featured speaker at key conferences and trainings during the implementation phase.

Budget and Budget Justification / Narrative

Also see appendix A.

Personnel

Sojourn Assistant Director: Direct supervision of the Prevention Programs Coordinator and Data Specialist; OVW liaison, attends New Grantee Orientation Meeting and technical assistance trainings. Annual salary: $53,300 (not funded by OVW).

Prevention Programs Coordinator: A bilingual (English/Spanish) individual serves as liaison among partners to ensure seamless collaboration and communication; responsible for oversight of organizational and community strengths and needs assessment, the strategic plan, development of technical assistance plan; ensures documentation, tracking and reporting of all Project activities; oversees development and maintenance of materials; responsible for all administrative tasks; conducts outreach on behalf of the Project. Annual salary of $30,000 per year for 3 year funding cycle totaling $90,000 (requesting 100% funding from OVW).

Data Specialist: Assists with administering of organizational and community strengths and needs assessment, technical assistance plan; creation and administering Intervention tool, pre-post Intervention evaluation tool, surveys; analyze data, report Project impact and effectiveness of evaluation measures; assist with other office and clerical duties. Annual salary of $40,000 per year, funded at 50% for 3 year funding cycle totaling $60,000 (requesting 50% funding from OVW).

Fringe Benefits: Tabulated at the following rates based on annual salary: Workers Compensation at 6.13%; SUI at 0.79%; Health Insurance at 12.62%; and FICA at 7.65% totaling $40,789 for the 3 year grant cycle.

Consultants: There will be 5 program content consultants and 2 technical consultants. Program content consultants will include Jackson Katz, Ph.D. and Ruth Beaglehole, as well as experts in Critical Race Theory and Curriculum Development, and an expert from the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center. Program content consultants will be paid at a rate of $100.00 per hour of service, for a total of 12 hours of service each, totaling $6,000. Technical consultants will include a graphic designer and a strategic planning expert, for which up to $50,000 is set aside by the grantor to be used in year one of the funding cycle. The graphic designer will be hired for 20 hours of service at a rate of $100.00 per hour, totaling $2,000. The Oertel Group will be hired as the strategic planning expert and will consult for a total of 282.5 hours over the course of 6 months at a rate of $175.00 per hour, totaling $49,438.

Project Partner Stipends: Key project partners, specifically those 5 that are community-based non-governmental organizations, will be paid a stipend for their ongoing participation in project activities. These partners include the Westside Domestic Violence Network (WDVN), the Pico Youth and Family Center (PYFC), the Pico Neighborhood Association (PNA), the Santa Monica High School Parent Teacher Student Association (SAMOHI PTSA), and the Center for Civic Mediation (CCM). Each partner will be paid for 60 hours of participation per year at a rate of $100.00 per hour totaling $90,000 for the 3 year funding cycle.

Operations and Expenses

Travel: Each year of the grant cycle, $1,790 will be spent for two staff members to attend mandatory annual training and technical assistance meetings provided by the

grantor. This includes airfare, airport transfer, lodging and per diem meals, totaling $5,370 for the 3 year funding cycle.

Equipment: The program will spend $4,350 in one-time costs for purchasing equipment for program activities, the creation of program promotional materials, and program evaluation. This includes one power-point projector, one software package for data collection and analysis (including 3 annual updates), one laptop for remote data analysis, and one software package for graphic design.

Printing and Supplies: Approximately $361.00 per month will be spent on printing brochures and educational materials, for general project branding and advertising, and on purchasing office supplies to document project activities, disseminate project materials, and facilitate meetings. This will total $2,000 for the 3 year funding cycle.

CHAPTER 5

LESSONS LEARNED

Grant Writing Process

This writer began processing ideas based on an experience relating to the grant-writing topic. The ideas were based on the writer's own interest in addressing some of the issues that male violence perpetrates throughout all levels of society. The writer soon realized that these ideas would have to take form in many different ways to convey that this is a problem on an epidemic level in the way boys are raised by family, community, and society. There is a problem that is invisible through the eye of a male powered dominant lens that takes away their appropriate place in being part of the solution. As the writer began to sift and follow the research it became apparent that the level of research needed needs to be farther, wider, and deeper. The writer would be able to touch key points that were gender specific and culturally relevant.

This process provided an overall increase of knowledge and awareness of the many intricate parts that take place in developing a grant proposal. The writer worked to gather and research practicable and concrete data to support the grant idea. Developing and implementing the program required planning and utilizing current ideas and simplistic approaches that would effectively target all proposed solutions. This included the expansive literature review, which garnered some examples and models of being able to systematically approach these concerns of male violence prevention.

Identifying Funding Sources

Finding a funding source for this grant required the researching of several internet databases. Identifying a source was challenging and the writer requested the assistance of the helpful staff of Sojourn to provide leads that may have not been available in the databases. Identifying as potential funding sources was decided based on the funding parameters of the CDC and other funding for violence against women foundations. The funding that was available in very small increments was connected by existing relationships with local agencies and the City of Santa Monica grants program.

Strategies Used to Increase Likelihood of Funding

In an effort to increase the likelihood of funding sources, the writer was able to provide information gathered through the initial literature review. The grant is designed to benefit community institutions, community stakeholders and overreach into the community itself. This population of institutions, community stakeholders, and community members has many touch points that encompass many strains of public and private life. Additionally, the impactful ways of this message of male violence prevention can incorporate itself well within the parameters of public safety. By bringing in law enforcement to be part of the trainings, and hopefully part of the budgets can increase the likelihood of funding by strategic collaboration in communities that have forward and practical thinking Police Departments.

Relevance of Grant Writing to Social Work Policy and Practice

The need to magnify all available resources and cultural differences is key in social work policy and practice. Community outreach, collaboration and promotion of resources are vital roles that Social Workers play in ensuring that all members have equal

access to resources within a community. In practice, this grant will provide ample opportunities for the social worker to provide direct information and resources in order to empower bystanders, organizations, and individual participants of this grant program. Through empowering and creating awareness, the social worker will focus on the strengths and abilities, and readiness of the communities, individual, and themselves as well as those that are indirectly collaborating with them.

In addressing the need for culturally diverse programs, it is important to remember the impact this will have within the individual's environment. Thus, the need to create other social space in which the participants can experience a reinforcement of the quality of life issues. That can arise when counteracting current cultural and societal forces that impact on personal decision-making. Expanding the resources can provide other ways of providing prevention and intervention into the critical discussion of male violence. Improving the condition and interaction with young men and men of influence can only lead to better ways of discussing the issue of male perpetrated violence and the effect that it has on all men throughout of society. The social worker will have direct practice with the participant, that requires micro and macro social work skills be utilized in working with individuals, institutions, and providers and in developing and implementing the program.

Integrating instruction in program development and grant writing into social work education would create well-rounded students that would hold valuable information and skills to students. Grant writing and program development instruction should be part of social work curriculum to enhance all parts of the dynamic areas of social work influence. Social work students can, should, and will be called on to find solutions to

societal issues, therefore the need to understand the principles of resource finding and goal attainment are crucial in required research, policy, administration, or other social work courses. In addition, the need for social workers to create, mobilize, and utilize their current influence with policy makers, and resource providers should be moved into the area of lobbyists to sustain and impact social work on a international level.

APPENDIX A

LINE ITEM BUDGET

APPENDIX A

LINE ITEM BUDGET

MVPP Line-Item Budget (Expenses Only)

Salaries and Wages	
Prevention Programs Coordinator	$ 90,000
Data Specialist (at 50%)	$ 60,000
Fringe Benefits	$ 40,789
Content Consultants	$ 6,000
Technical Consultants	$ 51,438
Project Partner Stipends	$ 90,000
Total Salaries and Wages	$ 338,227
Other Operating	
Travel	$ 5,370
Equipment	$ 4,350
Printing and Supplies	$ 2,000
Total Other Operating	$ 11,720
Total Budget	$ 349,947

APPENDIX B

MVPP PHASE ONE ACTIVITIES

APPENDIX B

MVPP PHASE ONE ACTIVITIES

Phase One Date	Activity Type	Location	Number of Participants	Participant Type
2/19/10	Leadership Forum	N/A	~50	Community Leaders
8/4/10	Leadership Forum	N/A	22	Community Leaders
10/15/10	Conference	N/A	141	Community Leaders
2/24/11	Leadership Forum	N/A	32	Community Leaders
4/4/11	6-Hour Facilitator Training	N/A	8	Community Leaders
5/9/11	6-Hour Facilitator Training	N/A	5	Community Leaders
6/6/11	Intervention	Olympic High School	11	All Faculty
6/23/11	Intervention	Santa Monica Police Department	11	Interdepartmental
7/12/11	Intervention	OPCC	7	Interdepartmental
8/31/11	Leadership Forum	N/A	40	Community Leaders
10/10/11	6-Hour Facilitator Training	N/A	6	Community Leaders
10/28/11	6-Hour Facilitator Training	N/A	13	Community Leaders
11/15/11	Jackson Katz presentation	Santa Monica High School	~100	Faculty and Staff
11/30/11	Intervention	OPCC	11	Interdepartmental
2/21/12	1-Hour Presentation	SMMUSD PTA Council Meeting	29	All SMMUSD PTA Presidents/Parents
3/6/12	Intervention	UCLA Men's Caucus	15	Social Wk Grad Students
3/26/12	Intervention	Santa Monica High School	15	Coaches and Faculty
3/28/12 – 3/30/12	6-Hour Facilitator Training	N/A	10	Community Leaders
4/26/12	Intervention	Santa Monica Police Department	20	Command Staff
4/28/12	Intervention	Santa Monica High School	7	Coaches and Faculty
5/2/12	1-Hour Presentation	Grant Elementary School PTA	19	Parents
5/22/12	Intervention	Santa Monica High	17	Coaches and Faculty
5/23/12	6-Hour Training	N/A	17	Facilitators
8/16/12 – 8/17/12	MVPP-related activities (media literacy, sports culture)	City of Santa Monica Human Services Division Annual Training	99	HSD Staff
8/22/12	Intervention	Pico Youth and Family Center	5	Staff
Total number of Facilitators Trained			**67**	
Total number receiving Intervention			**119**	
Participants Identifying as Male			**63%**	
Participants Identifying as Female			**37%**	
Total number of people reached with project message			**810**	

APPENDIX C

OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES FLOWCHART

APPENDIX C

OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES FLOWCHART

MVPP PHASE TWO ACTIVITY	Planning May-Oct 2013	Implementation Nov 2013-Apr 2014	Implementation May 2014-Apr 2015	Implementation May 2015-Apr 2016
Hire Personnel and Consultants				
Skills Committee Meetings				
WDVN Activities/Events				
Strengths/Needs Assessment				
Partners create Strategic Plan				
Create Technical Assistance Plan				
New Grantee Orientation				
OVW Technical Assistance Trainings				
Interventions				
Parent Interviews/Focus Groups				
Identify and Recruit Insider Teams				
Develop Survey Tools				
Develop training curricula				
Develop Public Education Campaigns				
Administer Surveys				
Empowerment Model Training				
LGBTQ Sensitivity Groups				
Critical Race Theory Discussion Groups				
Interpret Survey Data				
Implement Public Education Campaigns				
Community-Wide Event/Training (Jackson Katz, Conflict Resolution, etc.)				
Re-administer Surveys				
Final Data Analysis				

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Amato, F.J. (2012) The relationship of violence to gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms in a forensic sample. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 20*(3), 187-208.

Berkowitz, Alan D. (2007). Fostering Healthy Norms to Prevent Violence and Abuse: The Social Norms Approach In Preventing sexual violence and exploitation: A sourcebook (p.2). Wood and Barnes.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *35*, 463-481.

Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 585-594.

Berkowitz, A.D. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. In P.A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the lifespan* (pp. 163– 196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Berkowitz, A.D. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians* (pp. 259–279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

California Department of Education (2013). *Expulsion, suspension and truancy detail report*. Retrieved April 14, 2013, from http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Expulsion/ExpReports/ SchoolExpRe.aspx?cYear=2010-11&cChoice=SchExpla&c County=19&cDistrict=19 64980—Santa%2BMonica%252DMa&cNumber =1938000&cName=Santa%2BMonica%2BHigh

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010). *Youth violence: Facts at a glance*. Retrieved August 3, 2014, from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2011). *Youth violence: National statistics: Violent crime arrests*. Retrieved August 4, 2014, from http://www.cdc.gov/ violenceprevention/ youthviolence/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013a). *Understanding and preventing violence: Summary of research activities*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/ pdf/dvp-research-summary-a.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013b). *Youth violence: Risk and protective factors*. Retrieved August 22, 2014, from http://www.cdc.gov/Violence Prevention/youthviolence /riskprotectivefactors.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014a). *Primary prevention: Preventing violence begins with understanding the basics*. Retrieved August 16, 2014, from http://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/basics-primary-prevention.html.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014b). *Veto Violence: Violence Education Tools Online*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from http://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/ STRYVE/ about_stryve.html.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014c). *Veto Violence: Violence Education Tools Online*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from http://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/ successstories/showdoc.aspx?s=3068&dt=0

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014d). *Veto Violence: Violence Education Tools Online*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from http://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/ successstories/showdoc.aspx?s=3072&dt=0

Culross, P., Cohen, L., Wolfe, A., & Ruby, J. (2006) *Creating safe environments: Violence prevention strategies and programs*. Oakland, CA: Prevention Institute.

Dahlberg, L.L., & Krug, E.G. (2002). *World report on violence and health: Violence – a global public health problem*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

DeKeseredy, W.S., Schwartz, M.D., & Alvi, S. (2000). The role of profeminist men in dealing with women on the Canadian college campus. *Violence Against Women, 6*, 918–935.

Edwards, D. (2009). *Green Dot curriculum manual*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Fabiano, P.M., Perkins, H.W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health*, *52*(3), 105-112.

Foege, W.H., Rosenberg, M.L., & Mercy, J.A. (1995). Public health and violence prevention. *Current Issues in Public Health, 1*, 2–9.

Foubert, J.D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape-prevention program on fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American College Health*, *48*, 158 –163.

Gidycz, C.A., Orchowski, L.M., & Berkowitz, A.D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, *17*(6), 720-742.

Kalish, R., & Kimmel, M. (2010). Suicide by mass murder: Masculinity, aggrieved entitlement, and rampage school shootings. *Health Sociology Review 19*(4), 451-464.

Kania, J. & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. *Winter*,36-41.

Katz, J. (1994). Mentors in violence prevention (MVP) Trainer's guide. Boston, MA: Northeastern University's Center for the Study of Sport in Society.

Koerth-Baker, M. (2012, August 19). Eureka: How to move a mind. *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res= 9505E5DF1F38F93AA2575BC0A9649D8

Koss, M.P., & Harvey, M.R. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community interventions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mankowski, E.S., & Maton, K.I. (2010). A community psychology of men and masculinity: Historical and conceptual review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45*, 73-86.

Mercy, J.A., Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L. & Zwi, A.B. (2003). Violence and Health: The United States in a Global Perspective. *American Journal of Public Health, 93,*(12), pp.256-261.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L. (2008). Community responsibility for preventing sexual violence: A pilot with campus Greeks and intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, *36*, 23-38.

National Association of Social Workers. (n.d.). *Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from, https://www.socialworkers.org/ pubs/code/code.asp

Ocean Park Community Center. (n.d.). *Our Projects: Sojourn*. Retrieved April 5, 2014, from, http://www.opcc.net/?nd=sojourn.

O'Neil, J.M. (1981) Patterns of Gender Role Conflict and Strain: Sexism and Fear of Femininity in Men's Lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal,60 (4)*. 203.

O'Neil, J. M., & Lujan, M. L. (2009). Preventing boys' problems in school through psychoeducational programming: A call to action. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(3), 257-266.

Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 63* (6), 384-399.

United States Census Bureau. (2013). *State and county quick facts*. Retrieved April 11, 2013, from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/0670000.html.

United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2008). *What challenges are boys facing, and what opportunities exist to address those challenges? Fact sheet: Victimization and mortality*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/08/boys/FactSheets/vm/report.pdf

United States Department of Justice. (n.d.). *About the Office on Violence Against Women*. Retrieved April 11, 2014, from, http://www.justice.gov/ovw/about-office.

United States Department of Justice. (2011, November). *Homicide trends in the United States, 1980-2008*. (BJS Publication No. NCJ 236018). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Weiss, B. (2008). *An assessment of youth violence prevention activities in USA cities*. Los Angeles: UCLA School of Public Health, Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center.

WHO Global Consultation on Violence and Health. (1996). *Violence: A public health priority*. (Document WHO/EHA/ SPI.POA.2). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.