

Strengthening What Works

A CASE STUDY

2011 PROMOTORA
COHORT DURING
GRADUATION



This case study examines recommendations and findings related to Enlace Comunitario's Domestic Violence Promotora Prevention Project. Enlace Comunitario is a social justice organization working to eliminate domestic violence and promote healthy families in the Latino immigrant community in Albuquerque, New Mexico. These recommendations and findings come out of a three year evaluation project funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation through the Strengthening What Works Grant Initiative.



Enlace Comunitario

Strengthening What Works **A CASE STUDY**

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION 1

STRENGTHENING WHAT WORKS AND THE EVALUATION PROCESS 4

THE DATA: LIMITATIONS, ALTERNATIVES, CHALLENGES AND FINDINGS 6

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIELD: WHAT WORKS 22

LOGISTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS 24

EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS 25

HOW OUR THINKING ABOUT OUR WORK HAS BEEN IMPACTED BY THE EVALUATION 26

NEXT PROGRAMMATIC STEPS 27

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED 28

APPENDIX 29

INTRODUCTION

With funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Strengthening What Works (SWW) initiative, Enlace Comunitario (EC) engaged in a three year capacity building project and evaluation of our domestic violence survivor adult women leadership (Promotora¹) and youth leader prevention projects.

1 Promotoras is a term used frequently in Latin America for para-professionals who are trained to educate community members, generally in health related areas.

This case study:

- 1) discusses EC's process of learning and implementing a program evaluation;
- 2) examines the impact that Enlace Comunitario's leadership training had on the individual Promotoras;
- 3) examines the outcomes that the Promotoras prevention work has on the larger Latino immigrant community in which the Promotoras focus their efforts; and
- 4) presents programmatic recommendations based on our evaluation findings for Enlace Comunitario and potentially other organizations wishing to implement similar IPV prevention projects.

We also include information about Enlace Comunitario's (EC) overall IPV/DV services and other prevention programs. As this case study demonstrates, the success of EC's Promotora Project is intricately linked to the overall domestic violence intervention services and programs that EC provides.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

Enlace Comunitario (EC) is a social justice organization led by Latina immigrants in Central New Mexico (NM). The mission of EC is to eliminate domestic violence (DV) and promote healthy families through domestic violence intervention services in Spanish, preventative community education, leadership development and policy advocacy. EC was created in 2000 to address the enormous unmet need for culturally and linguistically appropriate domestic violence services for Latino immigrants. Since that time, EC's staff has grown to 30 bilingual professionals, including case managers, therapists, attorneys, community educators, life skills facilitators, administrators, and more. EC has a very active board of Directors that includes non-profit professionals, attorneys, social workers, and former EC Promotoras (DV women survivors who become community leaders). Last year, EC provided life-saving domestic violence services, such as counseling, legal representation and case management, to 700 Spanish-speaking adult victims of domestic violence and their children. As part of our prevention work, we have provided community education and training to hundreds more.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AREA AND TARGET POPULATION

Our service area for this project is primarily Bernalillo County, located in Central New Mexico. Bernalillo County is the largest county of the 33 NM counties and it contains one third of the state's total population.² Growth has been fueled in recent years by a rapidly growing population of immigrants from northern Mexico. Bernalillo had the second highest rate of DV among all counties in New Mexico in 2008 and ranked first in NM for DV homicides.³ The DV rate in Bernalillo County is 21.4 per thousand, compared to the national incident rate of 15.3 per thousand. NM was ranked the second most dangerous state in which to live according to a 2007 report compiled from FBI records.⁴ EC is located in Bernalillo County and the majority of our clients currently come from that area. Our DV Prevention project targets the Spanish-speaking Latino immigrant community. Despite the fact that Latinos constitute the majority of victims seeking IPV/DV services in NM (52%) and that the requests for services in NM has increased over 25% since 2000⁵ EC is the only culturally specific Latino DV services provider in the state, and the only agency providing comprehensive community outreach and prevention education in Spanish.⁶

2 <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/35/35001.html>

3 Ibid

4 New Mexico STOP Violence Against Women Implementation Plan (2007).

5 Incidence and Nature of Domestic Violence in NM Report. NM Interpersonal Violence Data Central Repository. Dec 2011.

6 Burt, Martha. Malm, Karin. Scarcella, Cynthia. Findings and Opportunities: Family Violence in Central New Mexico. (Urban Institute, Washington, D.C), 2004. p. ii.

INVOLVEMENT WITH IPV PREVENTION

While EC has always had a small Promotora Project to engage female adult survivors in DV prevention activities, in 2008 we made a strategic decision to make a deeper commitment of resources to our prevention work. Domestic violence is so widespread that intervention services alone will never eliminate the problem. We engaged in a yearlong strategic planning process with our board and staff, and sought out and, in 2009, secured funding to expand our prevention efforts. In addition to the Promotora Project examined in this study, EC has a youth leadership prevention project, a project to engage Latino immigrant men as allies in preventing domestic violence, and EC offers trainings to service providers about best practices for working with Latino immigrant victims. EC staff members also provide primary prevention classes on healthy relating and parenting offered at Encuentro, a local Latino immigrant community center working towards increased civic engagement.



EC'S THEORY OF CHANGE

This diagram represents EC's overall theory of change. EC believes that intervention and prevention are and must be intricately connected. Adult victims and their children come to EC to manage their crisis and obtain immediate safety as individuals; they then work towards the broader goals in the top half of the diagram. A smaller number of adult and youth survivors develop their collective leadership capacity and work with EC staff to prevent domestic violence in the community through the various strategies listed in the top circle. It is important to note that our emphasis is on developing community leaders who work together with others to create change. To be effective, prevention must happen simultaneously on all of these levels (adapted from the Spectrum of Prevention). Moreover, prevention efforts must be led by those most impacted by domestic violence, though it is essential to also include the contributions of allies in the process. Our prevention efforts are informed by our intervention services and vice versa. The Promotora Project represents the heart and soul of our model, grounded in the experiences and insights of graduates from our intervention programs.

Enlace Comunitario works with Latina immigrant survivors of domestic violence to develop their leadership capacity. As women with firsthand knowledge of domestic violence, the newly trained leaders prevent domestic violence in the Latino immigrant community by facilitating educational workshops, representing EC in the community, and developing media campaigns that change social norms from ones that are tolerant of DV to ones that are intolerant of it.

THE PROJECT TO BE EVALUATED

While EC has various DV prevention projects; we decided to focus this SWW evaluation on our Promotora and Youth Leaders prevention projects.

These two projects have interconnected goals:

- 1) Develop the leadership capacity of adult DV survivors and youth who witness DV to become domestic violence prevention leaders; and
- 2) DV Prevention leaders engage with the Latino immigrant community in the greater Albuquerque area to prevent DV by increasing skills and knowledge about DV and healthier ways of relating.



2011 PROMOTORAS
COHORT DURING
INDUCTION CEREMONY

The projects are similar in that each year we recruit approximately 8-12 adult and youth leaders, respectively, who commit to one full year of prevention related activities. In turn, EC commits to provide ongoing leadership training and support to the leaders, and to secure venues where the leaders can train community members. For the purpose of this case study, we focus exclusively on the Promotora evaluation. We made this decision because we have generated so much data for each project evaluation, and we feel it is too much for one case study. Moreover, as many community based organizations do, we experienced staff turnover in the youth project shortly before doing our final round of data analysis and our first draft of the case study. While the new youth leadership staff is involved in analyzing the youth data, we wanted the benefit of staff who had been working on the project for a significant amount of time when writing the case study. We chose the Promotora Project over the youth project for these reasons, and also because it is more established at EC.

As stated before, each year Enlace Comunitario trains 8-12 Promotoras. Women must apply to become an EC Promotora. EC prioritizes intimate partner and domestic violence survivors for the program and at least 80% of the participants must have previously received domestic violence intervention services at EC. Since Promotoras play a public role as ambassadors of EC, applicants must have achieved emotional and physical safety for acceptance in the program. Enlace counselors, case managers, attorneys and life skills educators refer clients and former clients who they think are ready to be Promotoras. Additionally, recruitment for future cohorts of Promotoras is done by current Promotoras who speak with women in EC's counseling, parenting, and other groups. The Promotoras Coordinator, accompanied by current and former Promotoras as well as EC staff members, conducts individual interviews with prospective Promotoras. The interviews assess motivation for becoming a Promotora, perceived readiness and leadership potential, and ability to commit to the Promotora programmatic requirements. The Promotora Coordinator chooses the incoming Promotoras based on the above mentioned factors, as well as her, and the former Promotoras', sense of which individuals would work well together as a diverse group.

The programmatic requirements include an eleven-month commitment to the program. The first four to six weeks of the program includes EC's intensive weekly leadership training, which takes place on consecutive Saturday mornings for approximately five hours per session. After the intensive training ends, Promotoras have a monthly group meeting where they receive further training on topics they request and plan for future prevention work. Some Promotora cohorts have opted to have additional monthly social gatherings. Promotoras are asked to prepare for and facilitate (or co-facilitate with another Promotora) at least three prevention presentations in the community. Prior to the actual presentation, they are asked to meet with the Promotoras Coordinator to prepare their activity. Promotoras are also requested to contribute approximately four hours of service each month to EC. That service can include, among other things, hosting information tables at community events, representing Enlace at a community meeting, disseminating Enlace newsletters and brochures to immigrant frequented businesses, and

assisting EC in creating a media campaign. While the service work is done on a volunteer basis, Promotoras do receive a very small stipend of \$30 per presentation if they present alone or \$20 per Promotora per presentation if they share facilitation with another Promotora. If Promotoras enter into a domestic violence situation again, they are encouraged to take a leave of absence from the program to resume intervention services at EC.

STRENGTHENING WHAT WORKS AND THE EVALUATION PROCESS

STRENGTHENING WHAT WORKS (SWW) GRANT AND THE EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

EC staff was surprised and ecstatic when we were invited to apply for the SWW grant. While we are well known and highly respected at the local level for providing outstanding services and programs, we did not think that a national organization like the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) was aware of our efforts. We were extremely excited at the prospect of engaging in a three-year evaluation, as we have wanted to develop our internal evaluation capacity for several years. Until SWW, we lacked the financial resources and time to make an investment in evaluation. When we received word that EC was a finalist and would be receiving an evaluability assessment site visit, we felt very positive about it.

Most people who visit EC in person tend to be surprised by our outstanding staff and large facility, the comprehensiveness of our programs, and the large number of clients we serve. The entire EC Team looked forward to the site visit itself as a very exciting opportunity for EC to receive productive feedback about our work from the LTG evaluators contracted as the National Program Office (NPO) by RWJF to conduct the assessment, as well as the member of the National Advisory Committee who represented RWJF during the visit.

LAUNCHING THE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

EC EVALUATION CAPACITY PRIOR TO SWW

Prior to SWW, EC had engaged in limited evaluation activities almost exclusively related to our intervention services. Other than implementing a simple satisfaction survey after our community trainings, we did no evaluation of our prevention programming. Those satisfaction surveys were reviewed immediately after trainings and stored in binders, but they were never compiled or analyzed in the aggregate.

While we had the capacity to implement the programs, rapid growth of the prevention program coupled by the fact that we were always responding to the immediate needs and requests of the community dissuaded us from spending time to create an evaluation process.

DEVELOPING AN EVALUATION LOGIC MODEL

Prior to SWW, EC had various flow charts that explained the individual service flow that most EC clients and our theory of change, but we had never developed a logic model. The SWW initiated process of developing the logic model was useful and led to many positive discussions about the goals of our work and the benchmarks that we believed would indicate whether we were succeeding. One challenging aspect of developing the logic model was that the logic model used by the NPO differed from logic models that our local Project Capacity Consultant (PCC) had previously utilized. It took a bit of time to all reach the same understanding of what the various logic model terms meant. Developing the logic model in year two was considerably easier, demonstrating the new skills and the common understanding of the logic model we had developed.

In the more recent version of the logic model, we identified two concurring goals:

- 1) engage Latino immigrant intimate partner violence (IPV)⁷ survivors to develop their leadership capacity as Promotoras; and
- 2) prevent IPV in the Latino immigrant community in greater Albuquerque area. To see a copy of the year two Promotora logic model, see Appendix A.

⁷ Intimate partner violence is used interchangeably with domestic violence throughout this document.

ALIGNING THE EVALUATION TO THE PREVENTION PROJECT

Our evaluation efforts were twofold. First, we set out to evaluate whether our leadership trainings in fact developed the leadership capacity of our Promotoras. Second, we evaluated whether the trainings conducted by the EC Promotora were in fact increasing knowledge within the Latino immigrant community about domestic violence and skills to prevent it among the workshop and presentation participants.

OUR EVALUATION APPROACH

Inherent in our evaluation was an assumption that an increase in knowledge about domestic violence and an increase in skills to deal with or avoid DV would prevent future domestic violence. It is important to note that we limited our evaluation to an examination of knowledge and self-reports of participants and their own perceptions of their skills, rather than conducting an evaluation of whether or not DV was actually prevented or reduced in the Latino immigrant community in Bernalillo County. This decision was determined by the relatively short timeframe of the evaluation and the limited funds (\$175,000 over three years) we could devote to the project. An evaluation of whether DV was actually prevented or reduced would need to be much longer term, would involve a lot more

resources, and would need to account for many other environmental factors, such as economic and policy impacts on victims, which can contribute to or mitigate DV.

It is also important to note that our evaluation also focused on the workshops and presentations facilitated by the Promotoras, excluding other prevention activities that the Promotoras engage in, such as developing media campaigns, speaking at press conferences, distributing EC's print materials, fundraising for EC, and representing EC at meetings and networks, among many other activities.

Our evaluation was participatory to the extent that we involved various Promotoras in the development of the evaluation tools, though time constraints on the part of staff and Promotoras prevented this from happening to the level that we would have liked. Most of the evaluation tools we developed were pre- and post- written surveys and stand alone post-test surveys that included quantifiable data plus qualitative open-ended ques-

tions. The surveys with EC Promotora leaders were not anonymous, while the surveys with community members at large were intentionally anonymous. We chose not to be anonymous with Promotoras because our relationship with them was ongoing and we wanted to be able to go back to a Promotora and ask for further information. As leaders we expected them to "own" their feedback and participate in data analysis as a group. Since our relationship with community members in presentations was limited to the actual presentation, we had no reason to ask their names and we felt they would give more honest feedback if they felt their comments were anonymous. Additionally, EC staff conducted in-person individual exit interviews with EC Promotoras, and several in-person group conversations with Promotoras to evaluate the program.

IPV/DV LITERATURE INFORMING THE EVALUATION

Prior to the evaluation, and even since, much of our approach to evaluation has been informed by staff observations and participant feedback about what seems to work. However, through the process of working with the NPO, we have become more systematic in our approaches (using standard forms, for example) and we have been much more vigilant about documenting our work, to be able to explain our sense of what works and triangulate data with participant feedback.

While IPV/DV literature plays a major role in EC program development and implementation, we are not aware of the evaluation literature related to IPV/DV prevention. Central to all programmatic development at EC



2013 PROMOTORA
COHORT DURING
TRAINING

are our collective experiences working with immigrant IPV survivors and the Promotoras' experiential knowledge that they bring to the table. Similarly, our approach to evaluation organically has many elements of participatory action research; in that EC engaged the domestic violence survivors (Promotoras and youth leaders) to create evaluation tools that address key questions and seem appropriate for the community.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The key staff involved in analyzing Enlace evaluation data has been Ana Lopez Salazar, EC Promotoras Coordinator; Virginia Perez Ortega, Violence Prevention Director; and Sandra Ortsman, Associate Director. For the most part, we conducted our analysis working together as a team since each of us brings a different perspective to our work, based in our different functions in the organization. Our varied insights made the process more fruitful and ensured that all of us were kept in the loop about any conclusions that we came to. Former employees of Enlace involved in collecting data and creating evaluation tools throughout the grant years have been Meg Wills, former Violence Prevention Coordinator and Blanca Pedigo, former Promotoras Coordinator. Additionally, Claudia Isaac, PCC and Michelle Wilson and Kristen Hudgins with the NPO have helped EC staff with the analysis and development of tools. All of our recommendations included in this case study were reviewed with a group of six Promotoras from 2010 and 2012 on September 7, 2012. Their insights and feedback are part of the overall data interpretation and recommendations. While Promotoras from 2011 were invited, none were available at that time.

NATURE OF THE COLLABORATION WITH THE PCC

EC staff had a very positive relationship with our PCC, Dr. Claudia Isaac. Dr. Isaac is a planning professor at the University of New Mexico and both EC Executive Director Claudia Medina and EC Associate Director Sandra Ortsman were previously her students. Dr. Isaac helped EC staff to construct our logic model and to develop our instruments. She was extremely helpful in keeping our team on track with the evaluation and for helping EC to organize our different tools. She was also instrumental at helping new staff hired in the middle of the evaluation to get caught up on the evaluation.

THE DATA: LIMITATIONS, ALTERNATIVES, CHALLENGES AND FINDINGS

This case study includes analysis of the following evaluation data:

- 1) three years of Promotora programmatic engagement data;
- 2) three years of Promotora pre/post leadership training tests;
- 3) three years of Promotora satisfaction surveys administered at the end of each session of the Promotoras intensive leadership training;
- 4) three years of facilitator notes written after each session of the Promotoras leadership training;
- 5) one year of community participant scenario-based evaluations;
- 6) two years of one-time community participant evaluation surveys;
- 7) two years of exit interviews with Promotoras at the end of their year of service; and
- 8) data on the extent to which Promotoras continue on in a leadership capacity inside or outside of EC after their year of service.

Year one corresponds to the 2010, year two to 2011 and year three to 2012. Each of these years engaged a different cohort of Promotoras.

PROMOTORA PROGRAMMATIC ENGAGEMENT

EC accepted and trained a total of 31 Promotoras during the three years of the evaluation. The 2010 class began with nine prospective Promotoras while 2011 and 2012 each began with 11 prospective Promotoras. Of the 31

that began the training, only two participants (one in 2011 and one in 2012) did not complete the initial leadership training (6%). Of the 29 who completed the initial training and were officially inducted as Promotoras, three Promotoras (10%) did not remain engaged for the remainder of their year of service (one in 2010 and two in 2012). Of the five participants who did not complete the program or did not remain engaged, the two main reasons we identified were that they secured work that was incompatible with the Promotora schedule (three people or 60%) or that they became involved in an abusive relationship and resumed services at EC (two people or 40%).

Of the 26 who were engaged throughout the year of service, three Promotoras did not complete any presentations (12%), however they participated in other activities such as the creation of violence prevention billboards and radio ads. While scheduling challenges contributed to this, our current Promotora Project Coordinator sensed that these three Promotoras never felt confident enough in their abilities to facilitate a presentation, though this was not confirmed through exit interviews. One of those three Promotoras also returned to EC to receive DV services. An additional Promotora in 2010 and one in 2012 did some presentations but did not reach the minimum of three. Sixty-five percent of the Promotoras who remained engaged throughout their year of service completed far more than the required three presentations, including one Promotora who conducted 12 presentations. Many of the active Promotoras continue to do presentations for Enlace after their required year of service and assist with the training for newer Promotoras. Our overall completion rates in every area meet or exceed the completion goals that EC identified in the logic model regarding the first goal of Promotora leadership development.

PROMOTORA PROGRAMMATIC ENGAGEMENT: TRAINING AND PRESENTATION COMPLETION

Year	# Trainees recruited	# Successfully complete training	# Engaged throughout year/ service	# Completed at least 1 presentation	# Completed at least 3 presentations	# Promotoras who conducted 4 or more presentations
2010	9	9	8	7	6	5
2011	11	10	10	8	8	7
2012	11	10	8	8	7	5

Promotoras from all three cohorts have engaged in many activities beyond the presentations and development of media campaigns. EC Promotoras from all three cohorts have actively raised funds for EC; represented EC at community meetings of immigrant organizations, conferences and even national gatherings; have assisted EC on our DV advisory committee; have become part of our Board of Directors; etc.

It is also important to note that Promotoras received a very modest stipend for each presentation that they conducted. The stipend was initially \$20 per presentation and EC raised it to \$30 per presentation that was individually led, or \$20 per presenter for each presentation that was co-led. Despite the fact that all of our Promotoras have great economic need, some actually donated their stipends back to the organization. Everyone expressed gratitude for the stipend and expressed that they would do the work with or without the small token of payment. In this past year, EC decided to also give stipends for representing EC at informational tables at community events. We made this shift after recognizing the tremendous support to EC that Promotoras play at the informational tables, as well as the extensive time commitment the informational tables took. After dialoguing with Promotoras about this amount, we decided to give \$40 stipends and \$25 for shared presentations in the coming year. We would like to offer bigger stipends, but lack the funding to do so at this time.

Also important to mention is that Promotora engagement in the group builds social capital. Social capital as defined by the World Banks is “institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society’s social interactions,” including neighborhood cohesion and parental investment in children.⁸ The EC Promotoras work together as a team. They support one another. Some of the many examples of their support for one another are that Promotoras attend one another’s presentations if the presenter is nervous; they invite each other to social

8 Zoltor and Runyan (2006) “Social Capital, Family Violence, and Neglect”. *Pediatrics Journal*, American Academy of Pediatrics.

gatherings; they help one another to find work, such as cleaning houses; and they share with each other locations in the community where food and other resources are being given away for free. These relationship bonds also hold Promotoras accountable for completing the requirements of the Promotora program. This kind of social capital is a protective factor against domestic violence.⁹

PROMOTORA PRE/POST LEADERSHIP TRAINING TESTS

The objective of the Promotora pre/post leadership training tests was to gauge whether the Promotoras successfully learned the mission and services of EC; the role of the EC Promotoras, including appropriate professional boundaries; developed a thorough understanding of domestic violence; and whether or not Promotoras increased their leadership skills and personal identification as a community leader. As an agency we identified these topics as important for various reasons: Since the EC Promotoras are former clients of EC, they commonly identify



2013 PROMOTORA
COHORT

domestic violence and EC's services only through their personal experience of DV and the services that they personally received at EC. As they represent EC in the community, we want to ensure that they understand all of the different types of DV and the variety of services that we offer.

For reasons of victim safety and autonomy, we also want Promotoras to understand that providing domestic violence victims that they meet with a referral to EC and/or other available community resources is more appropriate than providing advice on what the victim should do. We have found that this is extremely important to clarify when working with Promotoras who are

survivors, as they may, with the best of intentions, feel eager to encourage a victim to take the same course of action that they themselves took, such as leaving their abusers, even if that victim has different goals than the Promotora did. Similarly, while Promotoras may have a variety of personal views on controversial topics such as abortion and homosexuality, when they are representing EC it is important that they understand EC supports reproductive justice, LGBTQ rights and human rights for all. While formally representing EC, they must be careful not to portray personal opinions that do not align with EC's mission as those of EC. To see a copy of the pre/post leadership test, see Appendix B.

We chose a pre/post-test with clear correct and incorrect answers, in an attempt to quantify the percentage of change in participants' knowledge in an objective manner. The pre-test scores were always relatively high (69% in year one, 69% in year two, and a 68% in year three). This did not leave a lot of room to demonstrate improvement in post-test scores (83% in year one, 79% in year two, and 84% in year three). The overall increase in scores was 13.4%. One possible reason that we identified for such high pre-test scores was that much of the information we tested on had already been reviewed while receiving EC intervention services and/or during the individual interview of applicants to the Promotora program.

Such high pre-test scores led us to wonder if the Promotoras training was beneficial to Promotoras or whether it was too easy for them, or if just the test itself was too easy. However, as we will discuss later, the Promotoras consistently shared through exit interviews and written session evaluation surveys that the training was extremely beneficial and motivational. Their consistent attendance at the training also indicated benefit to participants: 27 of the 31 total trainees had perfect attendance for all six sessions of the trainings and the overall attendance rate was 95% (only 10 session absences overall out of a potential 158 missed sessions).

⁹ Ibid.

Eventually, we came to see the pre/post leadership test as one of several markers of Promotora readiness that Promotoras may or may not have entered the program with. The other markers of Promotora readiness were more qualitative and individualized. For future training cohorts, EC has decided to administer the test only at the end of the training to assess whether or not Promotoras have the sufficient level of concrete information required to be an EC Promotora. EC also utilized narrative data from the exit interviews to assess the impact of the training regarding Promotora readiness to undertake leadership activities and the extent of Promotora identification with their leadership role. See Appendix for copy of pre/post leadership test.

Perhaps more significantly, the process of creating and analyzing the Promotora pre/post leadership test brought up a deeper conversation about the true goals of our training program. While all of the information we tested Promotoras on is important to know, the real change that we observed in Promotoras after the training was an increase in self-identification as a leader. As we will discuss later, many Promotoras reported during their exit interviews that their self-esteem had increased, and that they now saw themselves as leaders in the community, whereas they had not before the training. EC facilitators also observed this transformation for many of the leaders, which they noted in the facilitator notes for each training session. While this internal sense of oneself as a leader is important for all leaders, we believe it is particularly important for former victims of domestic violence.

PROMOTORA TRAINING SESSION SATISFACTION SURVEYS

At the end of the first five sessions of each round of the Promotoras leadership training, EC administered a session evaluation. Each evaluation included four to five scaled questions related to the specific topics of the particular session and overall satisfaction, as well as three open ended questions on what participants liked, what participants felt needed improvement and a request for additional comments. The scale for the questions was a five point Likert scale. Trainees selected number one to represent total disagreement and selected number five to represent total agreement. EC does not have the survey responses for three of the total 15 sessions (two in 2010 and one in 2011). We suspect that surveys were not distributed on those particular sessions due to running over the allotted time and/or forgetting to distribute them; however we cannot be certain because the individual who was responsible for collecting that data is no longer with EC. To see a sample session evaluation, see Appendix C.

ENLACE PROMOTORA OVERALL SESSION EVALUATION SURVEY DATA

SESSION	2010	2011	2012
Session 1	-	4.86	4.75
Session 2	4.75	4.82	4.86
Session 3	-	-	4.92
Session 4	4.72	4.54	4.92
Session 5	4.84	4.92	4.90
TOTAL	4.78	4.79	4.87

The overall average for the scaled questions was a 4.81 (4.78 in 2010, 4.79 in 2011, and 4.87 in 2012).

On every evaluation participants were asked if they were satisfied with the session. This question consistently had the highest score; the overall response for all three years was 4.96 out of five. The lowest score was 3.83 out of five in the fourth session of 2011 year when participants were asked if they received useful information and tools to develop and prepare workshops, followed by a 4.33 in that same session in response to whether participants felt more comfortable with their presentation and facilitation skills than they felt prior to that session. The same session received lower than average scores in 2011 as well (4.72). In that particular session, participants prepared for 5-15 minute individual presentations that they would each make to the entire group of Promotoras during the next session. For years 2010 and 2011, these presentations were on any topic that Promotoras chose. While EC wanted to encourage Promotoras to gain presentation skills on a topic of personal interest, this openness for first

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

In 2012, EC modified the leadership training to require that the presentation be related to domestic violence and/or healthier ways of relating. It is noteworthy to mention that the Promotora satisfaction scores for that session were significantly higher in 2012 (4.9/5). In each of the program years, several questions received a five out of five (15 questions out of 55 total or 27%). While we were pleased with the high scores, the scaled question responses did not offer a lot of insight about how we could improve each session. For question-by-question scores for all three years, see Appendix D.

time presentations may have led to a feeling of unpreparedness and/or feelings of being overwhelmed. On a related note, one of the 2011 Promotoras recommended in her exit interview that the presentations done during the leadership training focus on domestic violence and healthy relating to match the presentations the Promotoras would make throughout their year of service. She noted:

“It would be better that instead of giving us the liberty of presenting about any theme we wanted during the training, that we presented about the same topics that we are going to present to the community, so that our first time presenting to the community is not the first time we ever present on domestic violence. This would also be very helpful because the other Promotoras could also tell us what we did well or badly.”¹⁰

The open-ended questions asked on each of the surveys provided more detail and a lot of very helpful suggestions, which were later incorporated into the training. Specifically, the three years of surveys included 113 distinct open-ended comments made by 31 Promotora participants, each of whom filled out a total of five surveys over the course of their training. These comments could be broken into five distinct but sometimes overlapping categories that we identified as: gratitude, personal development, curriculum improvement, group dynamics/development, and overall high quality of training. The chart below shows the categories under which the comments from each year were grouped.

PROMOTORA TRAINING OPEN-ENDED COMMENT GROUPINGS

YEAR	Gratitude	Personal Development	Curriculum Improvement	Group Development	Overall High Quality	TOTAL COMMENTS
2010	3	7	10	2	5	27
2011	6	9	8	8	14	45
2012	10	7	-	5	19	41
TOTAL COMMENTS	19	23	18	15	38	

In 2010, 37% of the open-ended comments made were suggested improvements for training. The main suggestions were to increase the amount of time (15% or 4 comments). One participant said, “It would be good to add a bit of time, like one hour more, because we need more information.”¹¹ Another participant stated that the facilitators needed to ensure participants’ comments were more concise and related to the theme: “Comments should be more related to the theme. It is important to simplify comments.”¹² Additional recommendations were to add more visual information and to coordinate the logistical aspects of the training better (e.g. provide extension cords when needed). Twenty-six percent of 2010 open ended comments were related to the personal development Promotoras were experiencing. One participant pointed out, “I felt very good and very confident. I learned a lot about leadership and communication and I enjoyed the presentation a lot. I think I am going to be more prepared.”¹³

In 2011, 31% of the open-ended comments promotora training participants made mentioned on the overall quality of the training. One promotora reflected, “I liked the way in which we started the group. The presentation

10 “Sería también mejor que en vez de darnos la libertad de presentar sobre cualquier tema en el entrenamiento, que presentemos sobre temas que le vamos a dar a la comunidad para que la primera vez que presentemos sobre la violencia domestica no sea la primera vez. Esto ayudaría bastante porque nuestras compañeras en el entrenamiento nos pueden decir lo que hicimos bien o mal.” –2011 Promotora

11 “Que se pueda agregar un poco más de tiempo como una hora más porque necesitamos más información.” –2010 Promotora

12 “Comentarios respecto al tema más enfocados al tema. Se requiere simplificar los comentarios.” –2010 Promotora

13 “Me sentí muy bien con mucha confianza. Muy bien aprendí más sobre liderazgo y la comunicación y la presentación me gusto mucho. Creo que voy a estar más preparada.” –2010 Promotora

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

In response to Promotora comments, in 2012, EC began and ended training sessions on time and made this a group rule. It is noteworthy that 2012 promotoras never identified time management as an issue in their open-ended comments. The main area that 2012 promotoras noted was overall high quality (46% of open ended comments). One promotora stated, “Everything seemed very good to me. The information, the treatment, and the learning were very good. Thank you for helping us to grow.”¹⁷ Another promotora noted, “I really like how they make us work together and how they permit us to express and give our own opinions about issues.”¹⁸ Specifically, one promotora noted that she benefitted tremendously from hearing the Enlace youth leaders present on how domestic violence impacts children. Twenty four percent of 2012 comments were related to gratitude for Enlace and the facilitators of the program. One promotora said “Thank you for your dedication to this project and for your patience.”¹⁹ Another promotora remarked, “Thank you for the good communication, your time and your patience. Thank you for the food and for being leaders.”²⁰

with the other participants, and the way they shared the training in a fun, comprehensive, and clearly explained way.”¹⁴ Another promotora pointed out, “Everything was excellent—the attention and everything. I hope the training continues this way. I am satisfied and content.”¹⁵ Twenty percent of 2011 promotora training comments were related to personal development experienced. One promotora said, “I learned more about myself through the activities. I also learned more about the mission of Enlace. I liked everything a lot.”¹⁶ Nine percent of promotora comments (4) in 2011 were suggestions regarding improved time management. One promotora made a concrete recommendation to start more punctually. There were no comments that expressed overall dissatisfaction with the training.

While comments regarding the overall group development were never the most common open-ended comments, about half of the total promotora training participants commented on their experience developing as a group, in addition to their personal development. Their comments noted the richness of learning from the diversity of the group, the warmth of the companionship, and also the challenges of being in a group. We consider the development of the group identity to be an important aspect of a successful Promotora Program, because we believe that a good community leader does not work in a vacuum, rather they work alongside other leaders. We have also observed that the Promotoras ideas become more powerful when they refine them in conversation with the other Promotoras. Moreover, we have noted that the Promotoras have increased their social capital through their connections with other Promotoras. They frequently rely on one another for help and support. As we will discuss later, this social capital also extends into the Latino immigrant community in Central New Mexico, expanding the reach of our DV prevention efforts.

THREE YEARS OF FACILITATOR NOTES

After each session of the leadership training, the EC facilitators wrote a progress note where they identified whether or not participants seemed engaged, how the

curriculum worked and if they made any changes and/or recommended any changes for next year, and any other details they thought noteworthy. To see a copy of the facilitator note outline that we used to capture comments, see Appendix E. To analyze this narrative data, the EC evaluation team conducted an interactive reading of the notes, looking for patterns, and triangulation of those patterns. In all three years of the training, the facilitator noted that participants were very engaged, appeared proud to have been selected for the program, and seemed eager to learn and increase their leadership skills. In all three years of the training, the facilitator also noted distinct group dynamics. While dynamics were mostly positive, the facilitator noted some competitiveness among participants, particularly in cohorts of mostly younger Promotoras. She also noted that there could be frustration among those Promotoras who seemed to have moved beyond their personal domestic violence trauma when other Promotoras with more

14 “Me gusto la manera en que comenzamos el grupo. La presentación con nuestras compañeras, y...como compartieron el entrenamiento de una manera divertida y muy comprensiva, y muy clara de explicar.” –2011 participant

15 “Todo estuvo excelente. Las atenciones y todo. Espero [que] siga igual. Estoy satisfecha y contenta.” –2011 participant

16 “Conocí más acerca de mi misma por medio de las actividades. También conocí más de la misión que tiene Enlace. Todo me gusto mucho.” –2011 participant

17 “Solo que todo me pareció muy bien. La información, el trato y la enseñanza estuvo muy bien. Gracias por ayudarnos a crecer.” –2012 participant

18 “Me gusta mucho como hacen que trabajemos juntas y como permiten que nos expresamos y dar nuestras propias opiniones sobre los temas.” –2012 participant

19 “Gracias por [su] dedicación a este proyecto y por su paciencia.” –2012 participant

20 Gracias por la buena comunicación, por su tiempo y su paciencia. Gracias por los alimentos y por ser líderes.” –2012 participant

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

The 2010 facilitator recommended some changes to the curriculum that were later made permanent, including a tour of the EC facilities and the omission of a domestic violence root causes analysis exercise that seems more appropriate to use with service providers. The facilitators also noted that the curriculum was culturally relevant, and that during the exercises participants used examples of Latino leaders when talking about the leadership concepts discussed in the curriculum. The facilitator also noted that they had lost some control of the conversations, and that it was important to remind Promotoras to keep moving forward when the discussion went off topic. The loss of control seemed augmented when the facilitators started the class late, resulting in the session going past the scheduled end time. While the group seemed to get along, the facilitator noted competitiveness among the 2010 Promotora trainees.

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

In 2012, the facilitator pointed out the inclusion of the group rules, which included concrete conventions such as starting and ending on time and interpersonal rules such as respect for participants' comments. These rules were followed in every session. This corresponds to participant data for the three years, where 2010 and 2011 Promotora participants noted that they would improve on the management of time. The 2012 Promotora participants never gave this feedback. In addition to having former Promotoras participate in the training, the 2012 facilitators felt that it was very positive to have different members of EC staff visit during the training. For 2013, EC will encourage all staff to come by and introduce themselves and what they do at EC during some point of the training.

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

For 2013, the facilitator will eliminate some of the repetitive components of the curriculum such as the types of leaders that exist, including visual diagrams of leadership. While the content is positive, there is no need to repeat it.

recent DV took up a lot of group time to process their own trauma. Group dynamics were affected by a variety of factors, including the recentness of the trauma experienced by DV participants, the general age range of the cohort, the level of religiosity of participants, and more. It is important to have a facilitator who is comfortable acknowledging the group dynamics and ensuring that time is well shared. The unique interpersonal dynamics of each individual group of Promotoras should not be an impediment to successful implementation.

In 2011, one of the EC facilitators noted that she found facilitation of the curriculum easier, as she and the co-facilitator were more familiar with the training. The facilitator also noted that it was positive to have former Promotoras attend the training and facilitate parts of it. Participants seemed to feel motivated when they saw the accomplishments of the previous cohorts of Promotoras, especially since they too were domestic violence survivors. Noting that, EC recruited a former Promotora who is now an employee of EC to co-facilitate the entire 2012 training. In 2011, halfway through the training, the facilitator noted how the participants were making notable progress in their public speaking abilities. Excitement to begin the work as EC Promotoras seemed to grow in 2011 when the facilitators set up a demonstration of what an Enlace informational table looked like. Informational tables are tables that EC sets up at community events; they usually contain brochures about Enlace, newsletters, and information about domestic violence, as well as candy to entice community members to the table. In 2012, we added instruction in the purpose and process of informational tabling into the training as permanent part of the session focused on conducting presentations and representing EC at events.

While the 2011 group dynamics seemed positive overall, the facilitator noted that one participant did not seem to get along with the rest of the group as well as most of the others. This participant never conducted any presentations, which may be related to a sense of isolation from the group. The 2011 facilitator also made a note that time management remained an issue and recommended that the group create "group rules" in 2012.

In 2012, without creating an activity with this intent, the Promotoras organically shared their personal domestic violence story with each of the Promotora trainees. This had never happened before, and in fact had been something that we previously discouraged, in fear that the group could become too much like an EC support group. However, this sharing was very powerful for all of the Promotoras and the group became very excited to begin their work against domestic violence as EC Promotoras. Another training event in 2012 was a presentation by the EC youth leaders to the participants on their experience as children who have witnessed domestic violence as well as their work as youth leaders against domestic violence. While many Promotora participants suggested that the overall Promotoras leadership training be made longer, in 2012 the EC facilitator noted that the curriculum contained a lot of repetition.



2012 PROMOTORA
COHORT

THE EC PROMOTORAS' PRESENTATIONS

The EC Promotoras generally present on one of five topics. Our target audience is Spanish speaking low-income immigrants. While the presentations are generally open to men and women, the audiences are almost always predominantly female. On some occasions the Promotoras do recruitment for these classes, but generally, the presentations are co-hosted with other community-based organizations that work with Latino immigrants or Spanish-speaking parent organizations through the public schools. Those organizations have existing members and/or participants, so when EC co-hosts a presentation, we expect that the community partner will recruit their members for the presentations.

In total, since January 2010, EC Promotoras conducted 83 presentations in the community to 859 community members.²¹ The number of participants per presentation ranged from 3 people to 31 people. The average presentation had just over 10 people in attendance, while nine participants was the median number of attendees per presentation. In 2010, 31% of presentations for that year had five or fewer participants. We identified five or fewer people as too few people in the audience, given the amount of time and financial resources we were expending. In 2011, none of the presentations had five or fewer people and in 2012 only 5% of presentations have had five or fewer people. We have also noticed a greater demand for our presentations in 2012. In the previous years, EC would struggle to secure venues and co-hosts for presentations. This past year, many different community organizations, health projects, and schools have sought out Enlace Promotora presentations. While we do not have conclusive data to explain this, we believe the greater demand is in response to a variety of factors: Our Promotora Coordinator has reached out to more community groups and they have been very responsive; more community groups are aware of the presentations that EC Promotoras conduct; and the content of the presentations has been more dynamic.

Initially we created a pre/post-test for participants taking the four-session presentation series. The goal of this test was to measure actual knowledge gained from presentations through scenario-based questions that had correct and incorrect answers. Due to various factors, including high rates of attrition between the presentations, new participants entering the presentations mid-series, and many instances of staff providing participants with the wrong evaluation, we were unable to obtain sufficient pre/post-test data.²² We decided to make each presentation a standalone presentation, eliminated pre-tests and used only a post-session scenario-based evaluation instrument.

In 2010 and 2011, the topics included domestic violence 101, the impact of domestic violence on children, self-esteem and stress, the media and violence, and an overall Enlace presentation. In 2012, EC changed the media and violence presentation to a presentation on healthy communication and conflict resolution. We made this change because we determined that the content of the media and violence presentation did not clearly relate to

²¹ After each presentation, the number of participants was entered into the EC database. We did not have any mechanism to account for community members who have attended more than one EC presentation. They are inevitably counted more than once. The count of 859 includes duplication.

²² Based on conversations with participants and some co-hosts, we have identified various factors for the attrition including barriers participants faced, such as lack of transportation and changing work schedules that interfered with scheduled presentations. We also wondered if attrition was due to the fact that presentation content wasn't important enough or facilitated well enough to inspire people to return; however, our overwhelmingly positive evaluations did not indicate that this was an issue.

domestic violence and/or healthier relating. We had initially created this presentation in response to comments made by participants at EC Promotora presentations. In these 2010 and 2011 presentations participants had a lot of questions about the media and their children's use of the computers. In response to their desire for information, EC created a presentation on media. However, after several staff members attended the presentation, we discussed the presentation and determined the link to domestic violence and/or healthier relating was not strong enough and that EC presentations needed to be more clearly related to our mission of eliminating DV and promoting healthy families. That decision is documented in this case study. We also recognized that there are other groups working in the immigrant community in Albuquerque with a lot more expertise on computers and technology who we feel are better qualified to cover this subject area. In the future when we are asked to present on topics outside of our expertise and removed from our mission, we will seek out and refer to other more qualified community groups.

In 2012, we also changed the presentation on self-esteem and stress to focus only on self-esteem. Our presentation on self-esteem helps participants recognize their own self-worth, and the ways in which they may be diminishing themselves. It is an uplifting presentation. One of the 2011 Promotoras suggested to the facilitator that the section on stress be removed. While self-esteem and stress interact with one another, the Promotora felt that it was confusing to participants and even to the Promotoras presenting. She stated that participants would appear uplifted by their revelations about self-esteem, but that the focus on stress would bring them down. When we asked other Promotoras who had facilitated the same presentation, they affirmed this analysis. Taking the lead from EC Promotoras, we modified the presentation to focus solely on self-esteem.

PROMOTORA EXIT INTERVIEWS ON LEADERSHIP TRAINING

At the end of the 2010 and 2011 Promotoras' year of service, EC staff members administered an in-person exit interview to 13 of the 18 Promotoras who completed their year of service. We were unable to coordinate exit interviews with the other five Promotoras. We have not conducted 2012 Promotora exit interviews because the year is not yet completed. We will collect that data at the end of this year to inform our ongoing evaluation activities.

The exit interviews were designed to

- 1) determine if Promotoras perceived themselves as leaders, including why or why not;
- 2) learn Promotoras' retrospective opinions on the best and worst part of the leadership training and how they would improve it;
- 3) understand how Promotoras perceived the impact of their presentations, media campaigns and materials distribution on the prevention of domestic violence;
- 4) understand how Enlace could have more impact on DV prevention;
- 5) know the Promotoras' future plans for themselves; and
- 6) collect any additional information that the Promotoras wanted to share.

To see a sample of the exit interview questions, see Appendix H. To see Promotoras responses on the impact of their presentations on domestic violence prevention, see page 19.

One hundred percent of interview respondents identified themselves as a leader. When asked why they identified themselves as leaders, respondents repeatedly identified tangible skills that they gained as Promotoras as the reason. They frequently mentioned that their public speaking ability made them leaders, as well as their ability to inform the community in a formal and informal setting, their ability to help people, and their knowledge and skills about domestic violence and victim rights. One Promotora shared, "I consider myself a leader because I like to learn and help my community. I also like to inform people about resources in the community that exist to create a better environment."²³ While there are many ways to be a leader, the EC Promotoras spoke to tangible leadership skills and community values embodied in being an EC Promotora.

²³ "Sí, porque me gusta aprender y ayudar a la comunidad. También me gusta informar a gente sobre todos los recursos que hay para tener un mejor ambiente."—2010 Promotora

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

In 2011, EC expanded the DV component of the leadership training. This change proved positive as many of the 2011 Promotoras identified that their ability to recognize domestic violence and the cause of it made them a leader. Several more 2011 Promotoras identified the information on domestic violence as one of the strengths of the training. This feedback was interesting to EC staff in that we did not initially feel DV information needed to be an emphasis of the training, given that the EC Promotoras had previously received services at EC. It reminded us that learning about domestic violence is an ongoing process, and an individual currently experiencing domestic violence will understand it in ways that are different than a survivor who has largely overcome the DV. Moreover, learning to teach about domestic violence is different than learning to personally overcome it.

Additionally, many of the Promotoras from 2010 and 2011 identified increased self-esteem as a result of being a Promotora. In response to being asked what the best part of the training was, one Promotora from 2010 said, “My self-esteem increased since the training. I feel better about myself and I feel I have a lot of virtues.”²⁴ Another Promotora from 2011 responded, “I benefitted from everything. Even after having counseling [at Enlace], I still felt like a damaged woman and my self-esteem was low. I felt rejected. After going through the Promotora program I feel different. I feel sure of myself and happy to be able to do what I am doing. It is really beautiful—to be able to give something in return for all that was given to me. Everything was good!”²⁵

The 2010 cohort of Promotoras identified a need for more information on domestic violence in the training as a means to improving the intensive leadership training. “I would like the training to include DV prevention, knowledge of resources, having an action plan in case of DV. EC should give us a book of resources that exist with more information about DV. I wouldn’t eliminate anything from the training.”²⁶

Many of the 2010 Promotoras noted that despite the fact that they finished the leadership training with a significant amount of energy and enthusiasm to begin working in the community, EC did not have any presentations set up for them to conduct immediately after the training ended. They said that the lapse of time between the leadership training and their community presentations contributed to increased nervousness about actually doing the presentations and decreased enthusiasm for their work as Promotoras. Taking this feedback

into account, in 2011 EC made sure to have presentations already scheduled before the leadership training ended.

Many of the 2011 cohort said that they would lengthen the leadership training if they could. Some 2011 Promotoras said that they would add more practice doing presentations into the training, while others said that they would add more information on community resources and/or they would lengthen the DV training. Various Promotoras identified that they wanted the training to delve deeper into the various topics it covered. With respect to the DV training, one Promotora stated that she wanted to understand better why men abuse, while another Promotora wanted to understand how to help people who batter.

One Promotora from 2011 said, “I think it’s important to continue covering what domestic violence is- how it starts, essentially to continue teaching about the cycle of domestic violence- and how far it can span. I also think that the topics covered lack some profoundness. It’s also important to talk about how we will avoid, stop, and eradicate domestic violence. The most important thing to cover is how we heal after being victims. I also think it’s important to talk about stress, and how to increase self-esteem. We have to learn about how we will relax and how we will manage our pain.”²⁷

The fact that the EC Promotoras want to examine so many facets of domestic violence demonstrates their nuanced understanding of domestic violence.

24 “Subió mi autoestima, desde que este entrenamiento, siento mejor de mí misma y siento que tengo muchas virtudes.”—2010 Promotora

25 “Beneficé de todo. Aun después de tomar consejería, yo todavía como mujer me sentía dañada y mi autoestima estaba muy baja. Me sentía rechazada. Después de pasar por el programa de Promotora me siento diferente. Me siento segura de mí misma y contenta de poder hacer lo que estoy haciendo. Esto es algo muy bonito, de poder dar algo de lo mucho que me dieron a mí. ¡Todo fue bueno!”—2011 Promotora

26 “Me gustaría tocar prevención de VD, conocimientos de recursos, tener un plan de acción en caso de VD. Deberían de habernos dado unos libros de recursos que hay y más información sobre VD. No quitaría nada.”—2010 Promotora

27 “Creo que es importante de seguir cubriendo todo lo que es la violencia doméstica. Como se inicia, esencialmente es continuar enseñando el ciclo de la violencia doméstica. También hasta donde puede abarcar. Creo que también les falta más profundidad en los temas que cubren. Es también importante hablar de cómo vamos a evitar, detener, erradicar la violencia doméstica. Lo más importante es hablar de cómo vamos a sanar después de ser víctimas. También creo que es importante hablar del estrés, y como levantar el autoestima. Tenemos que aprender a como relajarnos y hablar en cómo vamos a manejar nuestro dolor.”—2011 Promotora

One potential bias in the exit interviews was that they were conducted by EC staff members, though not by staff implementing the program. For the 2012 exit interviews, EC will have an outside person conduct the interviews. So, though the exit interviews uncovered a number of production suggestions for improving the program, we think an outside interviewer may elicit more critical data.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPANT SCENARIO-BASED EVALUATIONS

In 2010, EC developed scenario-based instruments for all of the topical sessions in conjunction with EC staff members, the PCC, and one of EC's very active Promotoras from the 2009 cohort. The NPO also provided feedback on the evaluation questions. We decided to ask scenario-based questions to be able to provide nuanced and detailed narrative data in a manner that we felt would not give away the correct answers in the question wording. In total we distributed the evaluations to 56 participants at eight different presentations, with an average of seven people per presentation. Each survey had three to four questions- some multiple-choice and some open-ended. Staff observed that participants seemed uncomfortable filling out these surveys. EC Promotoras began to read the questions aloud but participants still seemed uncomfortable. On one occasion a staff member attended a presentation and asked a participant sitting next to her who was leaving the evaluation blank if she needed any assistance with the evaluation. While this assistance might impact how the participant responded, the staff member was concerned that the participant could not read. Even when she reread the question aloud to the participant and offered to write the answers down, the participant did not seem to grasp the meaning of the question. See Appendix F for sample community participant scenario-based evaluations.

Our analysis of the 56 evaluations seemed to confirm staff suspicions. Without even analyzing whether participants answered the questions correctly, we noticed that many questions were either left blank or had multiple answers circled for questions where only one answer should have been circled. We also noticed that some of the answers participants wrote had no relevance to the question asked. We believed that the questions were written at a literacy level too high for our target population and decided to classify answers in the following three categories: did not understand test, partially understood test, and understood test. Responses with two or more questions either left blank or contained multiple answers were circled (questions asked people to mark one answer) were deemed as "did not understand test." Responses with some questions answered but some answers were blank or irrelevant to the question asked received a "partially understood".

We categorized answers where respondents answered questions, with one answer that was relevant to the question asked as "understood" regardless of if the answer was correct or incorrect. In total, 30 respondents (54%) did not understand; 11 respondents (19%) partially understood and 15 respondents (27%) understood. Not only did the evaluations fail to provide the information we wanted, we feared that administering a test above one's literacy and comfort level was isolating and insensitive to participants. Because of the high number of people who we determined partially or fully did not understand the evaluation, we decided to cease to implement it. We are currently discussing what an appropriate lower-literacy level test that assesses knowledge gained would look like. We are most inspired by a red light/green light knowledge based test that the Migrant Clinician's Network created to use with Latino immigrant men with lower literacy levels.

Community Participant Survey Evaluations: When we eliminated the scenario based evaluations, EC returned to using a survey that asked three scaled questions and three open ended questions. The scaled questions asked participants to rate how useful the information presented was to them, how well the facilitator did, and how useful the materials that EC used were. The open ended questions asked participants about the most important thing they learned in the presentation, what they thought the community needs to know about domestic violence, and for any other comments that they had. The evaluations also asked participants if they or someone they knew had experienced domestic violence. We asked the last question to understand if the issue of domestic violence was something that participants felt was impacting their lives. It is also a discrete way of assessing participants' acknowledgement of how widespread domestic violence actually is. In this way, we believe we are beginning to break the

taboo of talking about domestic violence. To see a sample of the community participant surveys, see Appendix G.

Prior to the SWW evaluation initiative, EC administered this same survey to presentation participants. The data had never, however, been aggregated. Evaluations were simply reviewed by the presenter after each event. It took us until 2011 to create the evaluation form in our database, and we had far too many evaluations to retroactively enter data. For this reason, we only have 2011 and 2012 data. Moreover, we were not classifying the presentation topic into the database and we only made this addition to the evaluation form in the database in April of 2012. Moving forward we will be able to aggregate comments and scores by the topic of the presentation but at this time, we are unable to do so.

The numerical scores were high for both years, but as the chart below demonstrates, our scores in 2012 did go up in all three categories. Beyond the changes in presentation topics, we switched the format of the presentations from using PowerPoint to be more interactive. EC Promotoras shared that they themselves felt more comfortable with the information that they were presenting on. This increase in scores may be related to the more dynamic nature of the presentations, but our evaluation surveys do not provide enough insights to conclude this. The other increase that we saw is that more participants identified as a DV survivor or as knowing a DV survivor. This increase may indicate that the taboo around domestic violence is decreasing.

ONE TIME COMMUNITY PARTICIPANT EVALUATION SCORES

YEAR	Avg. Score Info Presented	Avg. Score Person Presenting	Avg. Score Usefulness of Materials	% who is or who knows a DV victim
2011	4.23	4.29	4.26	52%
2012	4.53	4.45	4.35	65%
TOTAL	4.38	4.37	4.31	58.5%

To analyze the open ended comments, EC staff reviewed the comments and created a code list based on emerging patterns and themes. We then went through all comments and coded them. We classified these comments by year (2011 or 2012). For both years, we noticed that comments frequently referred to prevention and intervention as linked activities. These comments highlighted how intervention and prevention of domestic violence are part of a continuum, and also how EC Promotoras and our presentations frequently oscillate between the two. While we believe this continuum to be true at EC, the comments have inspired us to more intentionally shift the focus of our presentations away from intervention and Enlace’s services, focusing more heavily on pure prevention. We believe that this is the only way to place the work of preventing domestic violence more in the hands of community members. Enlace will incorporate more training on this distinction in the next Promotora training.

In 2011, 25% of participants identified prevention strategies as the most important things they learned, followed by 23% of participants who identified that they learned new skills to alleviate stress, increase self-esteem and increase self-reflection. Fourteen percent of participants identified “recognizing and intervening when domestic violence occurs” as the most important thing that they learned. Other comments indicated that participants were learning new social norms about men and women, and about healthy and unhealthy relationships. In their own words participants said they learned:

- “What violence and self-esteem are, and how much we are worth—as men and women—and that communication is primordial in marriage.”²⁸
- “To speak with my partner and come to an agreement.”²⁹
- “Children learn what they see and they almost always imitate it.”³⁰

28 “Que es la violencia, y el autoestima de uno, y que valemos mucho tanto como hombres y mujeres y que la comunicación es lo primero en el matrimonio.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

29 “Hablar con la pareja y llegar a un acuerdo.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

30 “Que los niños aprenden todo lo que ven y casi siempre lo imitan.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

In 2011, participants identified the community's need to learn how to identify and stop domestic violence as well as where to go if they are experiencing domestic violence. In addition they indicated that the community needed to learn new skills, new healthier norms, and prevention strategies. Several participants also noted that they believe men should be attending the EC workshops.³⁹ It is important to note that the 2010 EC Promotoras also made this same recommendation in their exit interviews, and that EC followed these recommendations and began a men's program in late 2011.

- “To not use violence.”³¹
- “Where to go and what to do in case of a [domestic violence] situation.”³²
- “To not abuse, and to not allow myself to be abused.”³³
- “How to have a better life without violence.”³⁴
- “To know what DV is and how it starts.”³⁵
- “That you always have to love yourself first, and not allow anyone else to abuse you.”³⁶
- “That no one deserves to be abused- for any reason.”³⁷
- “How a person can overcome [DV] when they are experiencing domestic violence.”³⁸

In 2012, 31% of participants identified that learning how to “identify and intervene when domestic violence was occurring” was the most important thing that they learned, followed by 24% of participants who identified that they learned new skills to alleviate stress, increase self-esteem and increase self-reflection. Thirteen percent of participants responded that they learned about healthy communication. In their own words, participants said they learned:

- “How we can learn to love ourselves in a healthy way.”⁴⁰
- “To value myself, my children, and my partner.”⁴¹
- “The problems that it [domestic violence] causes to children and the reactions of the society.”⁴²
- “To stay calm and not react aggressively.”⁴³
- “How to realize the signs of domestic violence in time and how to leave a relationship that isn't good.”⁴⁴
- “That I am very valuable for myself, my family, and society.”⁴⁵
- “More about the dynamics of domestic violence, power, and control.”⁴⁶

Based on participant comments, we saw that many participants learned about the complex relationship between low self-esteem and domestic violence pointing out, that violence and low self-esteem “go hand in hand.”⁴⁷ Some participants noted that lower self-esteem can make one more susceptible to DV; while others recognized that lower self-esteem can also be a factor in why one abuses. Participants also recognized that one's self-esteem is impacted by being victimized by domestic violence. These comments inspired us as the evaluators and implementers of the program to have many conversations about whether or not this was the message we wanted to spread. While we agree that low self-esteem can be a factor in causing domestic violence and can also be a result, we wondered if the current message blames victims without holding abusers accountable or sent a message that domestic violence is caused by low self-esteem.

31 “No usar la violencia.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

32 “Lugares donde ir y que hacer en caso de...cosas como estas.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

33 “No abusar, ni dejarse ser abusado.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

34 “Como poder tener una vida mejor sin violencia.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

35 “Sobre como es y [como] empieza la VD.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

36 “Que siempre hay que amarse uno primer y no dejarse ser abusada por otra persona.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

37 “Que nadie merece ser abusado por ningún motivo.”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

38 “Como una persona puede sobrevivirlo cuando están en una situación de violencia domestica”—2011 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

39 Less than two percent of participants at the Promotoras' presentations are men.

40 “Es como podemos aprender a querernos de una forma saludable.”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

41 “A valorarme, valorar mis hijos y mi pareja.”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

42 “Los problemas que ocasionan a los niños y las reacciones que tiene en el ámbito social”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

43 “De mantener la calma y no reaccionar agresivamente.”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

44 “Como darme cuenta a tiempo de violencia y como salir de una relación que no es buena” — 2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

45 “Que soy muy valiosa para mi, mi familia, y la sociedad.”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

46 “Más sobre las dinámicas de VD, Poder y control.”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

47 “Que las dos cosas van de la mano”—2012 participant in response to question on the most important thing they learned.

We spoke with EC Promotoras about this concern. The Promotoras who had recently left their domestic violence relationships considered self-esteem to be the utmost important lesson to teach women in the community, given that they attributed their own ability to leave a their abusive relationship as a result of increasing their self-esteem. The Promotoras who have been free from their abusive relationships for a longer time expressed a clear position that while self-esteem was one factor correlated to domestic violence; it was not the root cause of DV. For the 2013 program year, we will continue training on self-esteem, but will clarify in greater detail that it this one of many related aspects to domestic violence and healthier relationships. Moreover, for future years, EC intends to recruit prospective Promotoras who have been free from violence for a longer amount of time because we believe they will be more able to recognize that low-self esteem is often a consequence of domestic violence but not the cause of it.

In 2012, participants identified a community need to learn more about available resources and how to identify and intervene when domestic violence is happening. Similar to 2011, however, participants identified a community need to increase their skills to raise self-reflection and self-esteem. Sixteen percent of respondents in 2012 stated that the community needed more of Enlace's presentations in general, without stating what specific areas were needed. Since the surveys are anonymous, we do not have a way of following up to clarify what specific areas people want presentations in, however as community members give us ideas at the presentations, we will write down those suggestions on each sign in sheet and review them quarterly.

Additionally, in 2011 and in 2012, an overwhelming number of participants commented on the overall high quality of the presentations. Participants also stated how impactful it was to have DV survivors sharing the information with them. Some participants also commented that the information was extremely useful to them as they are currently experiencing domestic violence and not receiving any help. Some comments were:

- “Congratulations. Thank you for being concerned and for taking the time to give this very important talk to the community.”⁴⁸
- “Excellent, good presentation and comfortable environment.”⁴⁹
- “The presenter was 100% certain of herself, very calm, excellent work.”⁵⁰
- “I am so glad I stayed to listen because I am currently experiencing a bad moment. Thank you for helping me and listening to me.”⁵¹
- “For me, everything they spoke about today was important and I have learned a lot of things that I did not know. Thanks for your support and may God help all of the staff that makes Enlace possible. Thank you.”⁵²
- “Thank you so much for giving this talk. I liked it a lot and I understood a lot of things that I didn't previously understand. Thank you.”⁵³
- “We would like you to continue presenting more of your workshops.”⁵⁴
- “That it [the presentation] is very, very good and they help people to change and understand and be able to live a healthy and happy life. Thank you.”⁵⁵

48 “Felicitaciones, gracias por preocuparse y tomarse el tiempo de dar esta plática muy importante para la comunidad.” – 2011 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

49 “Excelente, buena presentación y ambiente confortable.” – 2011 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

50 “La presentadora estaba 100% segura de sí, muy tranquila, excelente trabajo.” – 2011 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

51 “Me alegra haberme quedado a escuchar porque estoy pasando por un mal momento. Gracias por ayudarme y escucharme.” - 2011 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

52 “Para mí fue importante de todo lo que se hablo aquí y he aprendido muchas cosas que no sabía. Gracias por su apoyo y que dios les ayude a todo el personal que hace posible Enlace. Gracias.” – 2012 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

53 “Muchas gracias por habernos dado esta plática, me gusto mucho y entendí muchas cosas que yo no sabía. Gracias.”- 2012 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

54 “Queremos que si pueden seguir presentándonos más de su talleres.” – 2012 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

55 “Que está muy bien y ayuda a las personas que cambien y se entiendan y llevan una vida sana y feliz. Gracias.” – 2012 participant in response to ‘other comments’ section of evaluation survey.

PROMOTORA EXIT INTERVIEW RESPONSES ON OUTREACH

When asked during their exit interviews if the presentations had an impact on the prevention of domestic violence, the Promotoras from 2010 and 2011 all said that they had an impact. Various Promotoras commented on their belief that their identity as Latinas, DV survivors and Spanish-speakers made community members feel comfortable asking questions and speaking about their personal situations. One Promotora from 2011 said, “Just knowing that

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

While all of these comments are very powerful, they speak more to the intervention impact. In hindsight, we would have liked to ask more follow up questions about the Promotoras’ perception on how the presentations did or did not contribute to prevention of domestic violence before it ever happened. The fact that we did not probe deeper at the time of the interviews reflects the insights that we have gained about the need to clearly distinguish prevention and intervention through this evaluation process. However, even if we had probed deeper, one of the reasons that we believe that the Promotoras identified so many clear examples of intervention to demonstrate the impact that their presentations are having is that these examples are easier to identify and to measure than to actually know and measure when violence has been prevented. In the exit interviews to be conducted with the 2012 Promotoras, we will ensure that our interviewer distinguishes between primary prevention and intervention impact when she conducts the interviews.

the presenter is a person who survived domestic violence, makes all the difference. It is important to share our experiences to be an example in the community.”⁵⁶ Another Promotora from 2010 said “In my experience with the presentations, we are having an excellent impact. People always ask for Enlace’s telephone number, they dare to speak about their situation, and they trust us because we speak the same language, share the same culture, etc.”⁵⁷

While the Promotoras enthusiastically said presentations were having an impact on prevention, they largely shared examples of participants who spoke out about their personal domestic violence situations for the first time and who learned for the first time that they had rights and that there was somewhere [Enlace] that they could go. For example, one Promotora from 2010 excitedly shared “The truth is, the presentations are having an impact, because the community needs information. The community is very impacted and EC has grown and victims are finally saying ‘Enough!’ Now they know that DV includes psychological violence. Women are now saying ‘Enough Already.’”⁵⁸ Another Promotora from 2011 shared “I think that the presentations to the community make a difference because people are living domestic violence, without even knowing what it is. They don’t know.”⁵⁹ Another 2011 Promotora said, “I think the presentations are very important! Because people that think there is no exit to their situation, see a presentation and get motivated to leave an abusive relationship, and they begin to have hope that they can have a life without domestic violence. They begin to see they can exist without violence.”⁶⁰

Some Promotoras did speak about how the presentations changed the way people thought, though these responses were not the most frequent responses. One 2010 Promotora responded, “I think the presentations have a lot of impact. People see that their values have a lot to do with the ways we are raised. I presented on self-esteem, which is very connected to domestic violence. Everyone was very interested in self-esteem and they made the connection between self-esteem and domestic violence.”⁶¹ Another 2011 Promotora said “I think the presentations are making a true and very positive impact. Many people are extremely satisfied and

are left wanting us to present on more issues. I say this because the women have commented this to me after the presentations.”⁶² Two of the 2011 Promotoras interviewed recommended that EC stop using PowerPoint to do presentations and one of the Promotoras commented on how she felt the new presentation format, which was just being piloted, was far more effective. As noted previously, EC followed this recommendation.

56 “Es más, el simple decir que la presentadora es una persona que sobrevivió la violencia domestica, hace todo la diferencia. Es importante compartir nuestras experiencias para ser un ejemplo en la comunidad.”—2011 Promotora

57 “En mis experiencias con las presentaciones, estamos teniendo un excelente impacto. La gente siempre pedía teléfono de EC, se atrevían hablar de sus situaciones, y tenían confianza con nosotros porque hablamos el mismo idioma, compartimos la misma cultura, etc.”—2010 Promotora

58 “La verdad- está teniendo un impacto, porque la comunidad necesita información. La comunidad está más impactada y EC ha crecido y las victimas ya están diciendo, ‘¡Ya!’ Ahora sepan que VD también incluye violencia psicologica. La mujer ya está diciendo, ‘Ya Basta.’” —2010 Promotora

59 “Yo pienso que las presentaciones a la comunidad hacen la diferencia porque la gente aunque esté viviendo violencia domestica, no sabe lo que es. No conocen.”—2011 Promotora

61 “Yo pienso que tiene mucho impacto. La gente vió que los valores tiene que ver mucho con como crecimos. A mí me toco la presentación de autoestima y este tiene mucho que ver con VD. Todos estaban muy interesados en el tema de autoestima y hicieron la conexión entre autoestima y VD.”—2010 Promotora

62 Creo que las presentaciones están haciendo un verdadero impacto y muy positivo. Muchos quedan satisfechos y a un con necesidad que se le lleven más temas. Lo digo porque ellas lo han comentado después de que hacemos las presentaciones,”—2011 Promotora

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED

With regards to the materials distribution, Promotoras felt that the impact was not as significant as it could be. They identified that EC needed to expand those efforts. Several Promotoras recommended placing materials in public bathrooms, more schools and even clinics. Two Promotoras recommended that EC make the print materials shorter. EC has been heeding this advice in our newsletter, where we have been using more images and shorter stories overall. It is important to note that three of the Promotoras cautioned that the material alone, without the direct contact of the Promotora, would be less useful in general. EC will take the recommendations of bathrooms, schools and clinics into account for our next materials outreach campaign, but we want to first create a new social norms prevention campaign before we do that.

During the exit interviews, we asked Promotoras about their perception of the impact of their media campaigns and materials distribution. In 2010, the EC Promotoras created a Spanish-language commercial, several radio spots and a billboard campaign. They felt that the outreach was very powerful, and that it changed people in the community's understanding of domestic violence as much more than just physical abuse. Unfortunately in 2011, EC lost significant funding and we were unable to do as widespread of a media campaign. The media outreach efforts included guest spots on public television and some radio programs. Not surprisingly, the 2011 EC Promotoras shared that they felt EC needed to conduct more media campaigns.

We asked the Promotoras how they thought EC could have an even bigger impact and the suggestions varied. Three Promotoras recommended that EC work with men. In this last year, with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, through the Peaceful Pathways grant program, EC began a project to work with men as allies in ending domestic violence. Other Promotoras recommended that we expand the Promotora Program to have more women involved. Given that we are committed to training a new cohort of Promotoras each year, we feel confident that we will increase the number of Promotoras working to prevent domestic violence in the community. Another Promotora recommended that EC expand our services to serve more victims. Given the growth for intervention services that we have experienced in the twelve years since we've opened (40 clients in 2000 to over 700 in 2012); we believe that a strategy of purely expanding intervention services strategy, without a focus on prevention, will not impact prevention. As stated throughout this case study, EC will focus more on prevention strategies.

PROMOTORAS CONTINUED LEADERSHIP POST PROMOTORA PROGRAM

One of the things evaluation activities brought to light was that participation in the Promotora program appears to be a personal and professional growth opportunity for many of the Promotoras. Almost all of the Promotoras continue providing referrals in the community, not just to Enlace, but to other service providers that they learned about through their year of service in Enlace. Additionally, from the 2010, 2011 and 2012 cohorts of Promotora, one Promotora went on to become part of the board of Enlace and then to work at EC; two serve on the board of Enlace and also found new jobs (unrelated to DV); two work in El CENTRO, an immigrant rights organization; another works at a community-based health clinic; two more participate on the board of Encuentro, an immigrant community center; and four began their own business, including one who got a childcare certification and started her own in-house daycare. Outside of gaining new employment opportunities, Promotoras also experienced changes in other areas. For instance, one Promotora learned to drive a car and got her daughter engaged as an EC youth leader; at least two are finishing their GED; at least three are taking finance and English classes; one graduated with her Associate Degree in Social Work and is now working at a community organization; and at least four others are taking self-development classes like healthy relating that EC offers at the Encuentro immigrant center. Another Promotora is actively working as a leader in her church. When we asked a group of EC Promotoras if they felt that the experience of being a Promotora had helped them professionally, they unanimously agreed, noting that it was a push for them to continue advancing.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIELD: WHAT WORKS

For this section, EC organized our recommendations into three sub-categories. While interrelated, the first category of recommendations consists of broader recommendations that align with our philosophical program vision. The second category of recommendations consists of more logistical recommendations geared towards increasing the effectiveness of the trainings and presentations. The third category of recommendations is related to developing an evaluation that works for community based organizations.

PROGRAM VISION RECOMMENDATIONS

FOCUS ON IPV/DV AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM TO INCREASE PREVENTION IMPACT

Although the EC training is effective at creating leaders, increasing knowledge of resources in the community, and changing individual social norms, it is not yet training people about domestic violence as a social problem to the extent that we would like. To accomplish this, it is important to train Promotoras on domestic violence as a societal problem, and to clarify the difference between DV intervention and prevention. For programs wishing to implement a Promotoras program, it is important to identify program goals. If the goal is to increase the number of clients at your agency, then it makes sense to focus on outreach regarding intervention. If the goal is to prevent domestic violence before it happens, then presentations must focus on domestic violence as a public health epidemic and prevention strategies that change social norms. Doing just outreach work will never eliminate domestic violence.

WORK WITH DV SURVIVORS

We believe that it is very powerful and extremely important to train Promotoras who are survivors of domestic violence. The experiential knowledge they have gained from surviving domestic violence is invaluable; they are also very committed to the issue as a result of their experience. Moreover, as immigrant survivors who have received services at Enlace, these Promotoras can increase the confidence that the immigrant community feels to ask questions about Enlace, regardless of their immigration status. When we asked the group of Promotoras if they agreed with this assertion, many shared that they felt their personal DV experience inspired other people in the audience, including those who were experiencing domestic violence and those who knew someone experiencing domestic violence. Others shared that they did not think a Promotora needed to be a survivor, but that they definitely needed to have a close connection to the cause (e.g. a sister who was a survivor) to be effective.

SHARE PERSONAL DV STORIES

Working with survivors requires that facilitators be very conscientious of the Promotoras' emotional safety and well being. It can be a traumatic experience for a domestic violence survivor to share her personal domestic violence story in public. Conversely, telling one's personal story can be very healing, but may be a barrier for survivors to get beyond their personal story. This could make participants uncomfortable in embracing their own role in spreading the DV prevention messages if they themselves are not also survivors. It is important that the Promotoras Coordinator at the agency work with Promotoras to recognize their personal limits, learn to recognize at which moments their story may be useful, and to develop techniques for sharing parts of their story that not only do not harm them, but also can move the presentation beyond their personal experience. The Promotoras agreed with this recommendation, noting that the relationship between the audience and the presenter becomes much more real when this personal information is shared appropriately.

LEADERSHIP SELF-IDENTITY

It is very important that the leadership training include an emphasis on one's self-esteem and perception of self as a leader. We recommend training Promotoras who have survived domestic violence, and who have had some time lapse since receiving DV services. This time frame will differ for everyone, but it is very important for facilitators

to have robust tools to truly assess the readiness of applicants to the program. When we shared this recommendation with the group of Promotoras, they agreed. One in particular noted that three years had passed since her DV situation and becoming a Promotora, which she viewed as very positive. She shared that she could tell how Promotoras with more recent DV were sometimes too affected by their own DV to be fully engaged in the training. This sense of self-esteem is bolstered by the sense of belonging to a group, such as the Enlace Promotoras. In fact, we believe that leadership identity goes hand in hand with group identity (our next recommendation). EC leaders do not see themselves as singular perfect examples, but as part of a collective effort whose members support each other's leadership potential.

IMPORTANCE OF GROUP IDENTITY

It is important to recognize group dynamics and foster a strong group identity if Promotoras are to be effective over time in an expanding network of Promotora collaborators. Encouraging Promotoras to work together as a group and to reach out to one another for support enhances each Promotora's outreach efficacy. This support can be logistical and/or emotional, and is related to the program or outside of the program. In the case of EC, the Promotoras lean on one another tremendously for support. In many of the Promotora gatherings, the Promotoras shared with each other different places in the community that were giving away food or other services. Promotoras' sense of personal self is strengthened by identifying themselves as part of something larger than just themselves. Moreover, we believe that the domestic violence solutions and projects that the group will generate have greater potential for impact as ideas supported by an entire group of leaders. If a project has only one champion, it is much more likely that the project may fall to the wayside.

CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ONGOING PARTICIPATION

We believe that it is important to train a new cohort of Promotora leaders each year. This provides increasing opportunities for survivors to become leaders, and ensures that the community will have a significant number of Promotoras in the fight to prevent DV. We recommend, however, that organizations also provide ongoing opportunities for past Promotoras to continue supporting the agency. In the case of Enlace, our former cohorts of Promotoras have been essential in training new cohorts, conducting presentations when none of the current Promotoras are available, serving on the EC board or Domestic Violence Advisory Committee, and representing EC at community meetings. Moreover, in addition to ongoing monthly meetings of EC Promotoras, we have decided to host additional trainings on a regular basis that will be open to past and current Promotoras. This has strengthened the social networks of EC Promotoras. The Promotoras felt adamant about creating such ongoing opportunities. They also recommended having newer and more senior Promotoras conduct presentations together.

INCREASING SOCIAL CAPITAL IS AN IMPORTANT GOAL

Projects should be geared towards increasing social capital among participants. Increasing community connections also provides additional incentive to participate in the program and increases the likelihood that they will have the resources needed to remain engaged in the program. The EC Promotoras then bring their connections to strengthen Enlace. One example of this is that EC Promotoras assist EC staff to recruit and screen future Promotoras. As previously stated, social capital is an important protective factor to protect against domestic violence.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTORAS IS IMPORTANT

It is important to help Promotoras develop professionally. Moreover, this professional development should focus on preparing Promotoras for opportunities that will enhance protective factors for domestic violence. In the case of EC Promotoras, many have leveraged their experience with the Promotora program to help them advance professionally, through paying jobs at partner organizations, invitations to join non-profit boards of directors, by enrolling in continuing education classes such as GED and English, and by starting their own businesses, among others.

LOGISTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

PRESENTATIONS MUST BE DYNAMIC

We recommend that presentations be dynamic and interactive. Staff observation and Promotora feedback also indicated that in the earlier cohorts, the Promotoras did not always understand the information that they were presenting on the slides. Based on Promotora feedback in exit interviews and staff observation at presentations, we found that in general PowerPoint is an ineffective tool and community members seemed to engage much more when presentations were more informal. However, it is noteworthy that when we tried to confirm this recommendation with a group of Promotoras, a few Promotoras reported that they did not feel the PowerPoint was a distraction and noted that they liked the PowerPoint format, given that they could project the images that are passed out to audience members in large sizes. They emphasized that what was most important was that the content of the presentation had a lot of visual information and was very engaging. We recommend that if you do train Promotoras to facilitate using PowerPoint, that they are trained to not rely on the PowerPoint, and to use it more for projecting large images, than entire slides of information.

AUDIENCE SIZE

We recommend that presentations have between 6 and 20 audience members. The resources expended for smaller audiences do not warrant the outreach accomplished. Despite the agency's best efforts, it is inevitable that some presentations will have more or less participants than our recommended ideal. Promotoras must be trained to be flexible and able to adjust to large and smaller audiences. Having five or fewer people also require that Promotoras adjust their presentation to have a more intimate conversation-like feel. On the other hand, facilitating a group with more than 20 audience members may create a group that is so big, audience members feel intimidated to participate. The Promotoras all mentioned that they felt that no matter the size of the audience, the presentation could have a very large impact. The Promotoras assume that each presentation participant will share the information gained with their friends and family members. It will take further data collection on the coming years to assess the extent of broader community impacted by the information shared.

DEVELOP STRONG COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

We found that the agency needs to be ready with opportunities for the Promotoras to present, in order to capitalize on the incredible energy that Promotoras finish the initial leadership training with. The Promotoras also recommend that each organization have a variety of dates available for presentations, including morning and evening opportunities and weekend and weekday opportunities. It is important to have a calendar of options for Promotoras to sign up for presentations immediately after the initial leadership training. In order to accomplish this, the agency must have strong community partners who will co-host, promote and recruit for presentations.

MISSION-BASED PRESENTATIONS AND COMMUNITY WORK

We found that being clear about the learning objectives of our presentations helped ensure that they are connected to the mission of our organization. The community will inevitably ask Promotoras to come back and train on a variety of non-domestic violence related topics. For those topics that are not (e.g. how to do your taxes), EC recommends having partners in the community who will take community referrals. This enables DV-focused organizations to spend more of their energy on their mission, in the case of EC, in the promotion of healthy relationships and the elimination of DV.

STIPENDS

It is important to provide some kind of compensation for the work that the Promotoras do. However, as many of the Promotoras shared, the stipend must not be the motivation for the work they do. We asked our group of Promotoras if they felt the \$30 per presentation was enough. Some responded that they thought it was too much

since they got so much joy out of being a Promotora, but several shared that the money had really come in handy. One Promotora shared that she never expected the stipend, but one day she was so happy to receive it, as she had come to the Promotora meeting, without even having enough gasoline in her vehicle. Another Promotora shared that she would continue donating her stipends back to EC, but she noted that she enjoyed having the opportunity to give a financial contribution. By the end of our conversation, the Promotoras recommended that \$40 per presentation for an individual presenter would be more appropriate (\$25 each for a shared presentation). They all agreed that it was important to pay Promotoras for staffing the informational tables.

THE NECESSARY TOOLS

In addition to cash stipends, we recommend providing Promotoras with appropriate materials to effectively do their jobs. In the case of Enlace, we provided community resource books, notebooks, a collared shirt embroidered with Enlace's logo to conduct trainings in, and gas cards. Additionally, it is important that Promotoras get to know the agency building, menu of services and the staff who work at the agency. We recommend doing a tour of the agency the Promotoras are representing during business hours. The Promotoras also recommended providing each Promotora with a calendar agenda, and if possible, an electronic one.

STAND ALONE PRESENTATIONS

While we believe it is ideal to have multiple “touches” with community members, it is important to recognize that many people will not be able to attend all of the different presentations. Each of the presentations should be able to stand alone, whether or not they are part of a series.

EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

PARTICIPATORY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

As the women participating in and implementing portions of the program, Promotoras have incredible insight into what is working well and what needs improvement. It is essential to create a relationship of trust with Promotora groups so that Promotoras will feel comfortable making suggestions and offering constructive feedback. We recommend piloting all evaluation tools with Promotoras and making changes that take the suggestions of Promotoras into account. It is important to note that this collaboration should not be a pro forma acceptance of all Promotora ideas. In the case of EC, we have made positive changes to the presentation content, presentation facilitation style, and aspects of the leadership training. It is also important to have guidelines for the group training and ongoing meetings that the Promotoras themselves create (e.g. begin and end the training on time).

DEVELOP EVALUATION SYSTEMS ON THE FRONT END

It is important to develop systems to collect and archive data, and to review them on an ongoing basis. Similarly it is important to develop systems that are appropriate for the capacity of the organization. For much of the evaluation, EC planned to use ATLAS.ti computer software to capture and code qualitative data. However, the staff members of Enlace were unfamiliar with the software and hesitant to learn it, since they would not be using it very regularly. Staff turnover experienced during the three years compounded this. Ultimately, EC decided that they would code narrative data using a hard copy paper system. This worked for EC and became easier to systematize.

EVALUATION TESTS/SURVEYS

Evaluation instruments can be very useful, but it is essential that they meet the literacy level of the target audience. In general, we recommend post-tests/surveys more than pre- and post-tests because participants may be resistant to pre-tests before a relationship has been developed. In the case of the EC pre/post leadership test, EC recommends only giving a post-test as a means of gauging whether or not Promotoras have the information necessary, regardless

of whether or not they knew it entering the program.

The Promotoras also liked the idea of creating an evaluation survey where participants could just circle a red or green light to show agreement and disagreement. The red/green light idea was borrowed from an evaluation developed by the Migrant Clinician's Network, another of the eight SWW grantees, developed to use with low-literacy Latino immigrant men. All of them noted that they had participants who did not know how to read or write in their groups. Other Promotoras commented that they still felt the evaluation questions were confusing. It is important to pilot all evaluations. It is also important to read the survey questions aloud, especially if audience members (both Promotoras and/or community members in trainings) do not read. If there is more than one facilitator, it is good because she can observe if any participants seem to need help, and if so, it is important to offer the help discretely.

HOW OUR THINKING ABOUT OUR WORK HAS BEEN IMPACTED BY THE EVALUATION

This evaluation has truly reaffirmed Enlace's belief that intervention services and prevention are intricately linked in several ways. First, it is effective to have survivors develop their leadership and work to engage the community, especially within immigrant communities. Secondly, it has affirmed that inclusion of outreach (information about resources and available DV services for immigrants, regardless of their immigration status), is important, even if a presentation is intended to be strictly domestic violence prevention. Given the prevalence of domestic violence in the lives of our community members, participants in every presentation share their personal experiences and seek resource and referral information. By being able to meet the needs of the presentation participants, we increase trust in Enlace and enhance our reputation. By having a positive reputation in the community, we are able to expand our prevention efforts, including among men who participate in our new efforts.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

While the evaluation has been very fruitful, we are extremely excited to create new evaluation tools that can solicit feedback and understand if our learning objectives were met, for participants with lower literacy levels. A key evaluation question that remains for our staff is: to what degree does an increase in knowledge about domestic violence and healthier ways of relating actually result in DV reduction and prevention?

LIMITATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES POTENTIAL BIASES

While we were extremely eager to evaluate our programs and receive constructive feedback, we also had biases that could impact the evaluation. First, we want to protect Enlace and Enlace's reputation. This desire sometimes led us to only seek out or notice the positive. While this could make us a little defensive at times, we continually reminded each other and ourselves that we were indeed looking for ways to improve. Secondly, our personal goals and/or opinions of what needs to be improved in the project potentially could lead us to interpret data in a particular way, or with a particular lens. To minimize this, we worked as a group to analyze and interpret data. Thirdly, we acknowledged a risk of overvaluing feedback from certain groups or individuals over others due to whether or not it was positive. To combat this, we made sure to document and input all data, regardless of what it said, and then review it as a group. Lastly, another potential bias we identified is that by having staff members facilitate the exit interviews, we risked participants feeling obliged to say more positive things than they felt. To mitigate this, we had staff who were not directly involved with the project conduct the interviews. In the future, we will have outsiders conduct the interviews.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS CHALLENGES

Some of the challenges to evaluation were that it was time consuming, stressful and overwhelming at times. The process was challenging because we needed an outside consultant to update the database and this could take a lot of time. Additionally, we had limited access to Promotoras and youth leaders so we did not engage them in the evaluation as much as we would have liked. And last but not least we experienced staff turnover, which meant we frequently needed to bring people up to speed. We now feel that a “culture of evaluation” exists at Enlace, making it much easier to bring new people in. We also managed the challenges by constantly noting that the evaluation was an opportunity vs. a burden, and that Enlace is a learning organization that expects to constantly find better ways to do things.

Additional limitations were that some evaluation questions were written above the literacy level of our participants. We also had limited data about what youth had gained from peer presentations due to the evaluation surveys focusing more on whether participants enjoyed the activity than what they actually learned from it.

NEXT PROGRAMMATIC STEPS

Evaluation Sustainability: We will sustain evaluation at Enlace by cross training multiple staff on evaluation so that we are not vulnerable to one person leaving the organization. On that same note, participating in evaluation activities is now an expectation for all new staff at EC. Most importantly, we will share the results with staff, Promotoras, leaders, and even participants in workshops. Without sharing the data and working together to analyze results, there is no incentive for anyone to engage in collecting the data. On that same note, we will keep evaluation simple. Some questions may be beyond the scope of our abilities, given our time constraints. All changes based on evaluation data will be documented.

DOCUMENTING AND DISSEMINATING EVALUATION RESULTS

The process of documenting and disseminating the evaluation results seemed tedious and time consuming until we sat down as a team and analyzed the results. This was very affirming to staff and provoked fantastic conversation about how we could improve the program.

HOW EVALUATION METHODS IMPACT OUR COMMUNITY WORK

In the beginning of this project, the team passed out the evaluations and just asked participants to fill them out. Today, we read the questions aloud and look around to see if anyone needs our help to fill it out. We also let participants know that the evaluation survey helps us to improve our presentations. Despite this, we still need to create a lower-literacy evaluation tool, so that participants can fill them out on their own, without EC staff influencing that process. The other change is that we will share our results with our Promotoras and youth leaders. That way, if changes to presentations and trainings need to be made, those facilitating the workshops take part in that discussion.

BRIDGES TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The other seven grantees selected by Strengthening What Works are also outstanding organizations. Through this grant process, we have met many of them for the first time. In particular, we learned about the Migrant Clinicians' Network's Hombres Unidos curriculum. With funds from another source, we made a formal collaborative agreement with them to implement their curriculum as part of our engaging men initiative.

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

A. LOOKING FORWARD

VALUE TO OTHERS: The model that EC uses for Promotora and youth leader projects as well as our training curricula and any evaluation tools can be used by other IPV prevention programs as a starting point to develop their programs. That said, it is essential that they work within their community and with those most impacted by IPV to identify their specific needs and to tailor the program.

By helping us to improve trainings for community members and our leaders, the evaluation also benefits future participants as well as the broader community in Albuquerque that will benefit from preventing DV.

B. ENLACE COMUNITARIO AND IPV PREVENTION

We view Enlace Comunitario as a leader in the IPV prevention movement. Our on-the-ground experience providing IPV intervention services informs all of our prevention work. We oscillate between intervention and prevention in our community engagement work, because the reality is that 1 in 4 women in every presentation has likely experienced or witnessed DV, and participants want and need both. Our ability to also respond to service needs of people in the immigrant community creates receptivity and support for our work.

Appendix

- A** EC Promotoras Logic Model
- B** EC Pre/Post Leadership Test
- C** EC Promotora Satisfaction Surveys
- D** EC Compiled Data Satisfaction Survey Scores
- E** EC Sample Facilitator Notes Recording Document
- F** EC Scenario Based Community Participant Evaluation
- G** EC Community Participant Evaluation Survey
- H** Enlace Exit Interview Guide

APPENDIX A EC Promotora Program Logic Model

January– December 2011 Year Two Promotoras Project Logic Model		Revised 3/11/11				
Goals:	Objectives	Baseline Data	Activities	Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators	
Engage Latino Immigrant IPV Survivors and Community Members to Develop their Leadership Capacity as Violence Prevention Leaders	1. Revise & Implement 2010 Leadership Training Curriculum for January 2011 training 2. A minimum of 8 (out of an expected 10) adult woman will successfully complete the EC Promotora Leadership Training as measured by improved score in post test and successful 15 minute presentation at end of training by February 2011 3. A minimum of 6 promotoras will each conduct three workshops/presentations geared towards raising awareness and increasing knowledge about IPV in the Latino immigrant community	1a. Documented Curriculum Changes made in 2010; 1b. Evaluation of 2010 training 2. Pretest 3. No baseline	1. Complete 2011 Core Training curriculum & Implement 2a. Conduct 5 week adult promotoras leadership training; 3. Conduct IPV Workshops/presentations	1a. Documented changes of 2010; 1b. Exit interviews; 1c. Facilitator Response Forms 2010; 1d. Participant Feedback 2010; 1e. 2011 Participant documentation 2a. Recruit 10 participants, 2 of whom are not EC clients; 2b. Conduct weekly sessions and track attendance; 2c. Administer and analyze pre/post test; 2d. Develop criteria to score final presentations. 2e. Organize 15 minute presentations at the end of training 3A. EC staff identify and secure new workshop/presentation venues for day and evening presentations by February 2011; 3b. Conduct & track one-on-one prep meetings between coordinator and promotoras; 3c. 2/3 workshops/presentations completed by 5/15/11; 3d. Track number of workshops/presentations per promotora in EC database.	1. Implementation of revised curriculum in 2011 2a. # of promotoras who successfully complete the training with an improved score on post test; 2b. # of promotoras who score 10 (out of a possible 18) or above on presentation scoring sheet 3. Number of community workshops/presentations conducted by each of the promotoras by August 2011	
	4. Enhance EC's IPV Prevention impact and visibility in the community through contribution of at least four hours/ month of community engagement by at least 6 promotoras by September 2011 5. Increase the # of IPV Awareness Presentations in Spanish to 10 6. A minimum of 60% of an expected 200 Spanish-speaking participants who take part in the IPV awareness presentations led by promotoras report an increase in their knowledge of IPV as measured by Evaluation surveys 7. Increase the # of Spanish-speaking participants in ongoing IPV workshops to 80 participants	4. No baseline 5. # of 2010 presentations in Spanish 6. No baseline 7. # of Spanish-speaking participants in 2010 workshops	4a. Tabling information; 4b. Distributing newsletters; 4c. Creating media campaigns; 4d. Representing EC at meetings; etc. 5a. Conduct outreach in schools, churches, etc. to recruit Spanish speaking participants 6. Conduct IPV awareness presentations	4a. Number of hours of community engagement activities conducted by each of the promotoras; 4b. Documented testimonial feedback from community partners 5. Number of IPV awareness presentations conducted in Spanish 6a. % of presentation participants who indicate they have gained knowledge on evaluation surveys. 6b. volunteered testimonials from participants demonstrating the personal impact of the presentations, as documented by presenters 7. Number of Spanish-speaking participants in IPV workshops	4a. Number of hours of community engagement activities conducted by each of the promotoras; 4b. Documented testimonial feedback from community partners 5. Number of IPV awareness presentations conducted in Spanish 6a. % of presentation participants who indicate they have gained knowledge on evaluation surveys. 6b. volunteered testimonials from participants demonstrating the personal impact of the presentations, as documented by presenters 7. Number of Spanish-speaking participants in IPV workshops	
	8. A minimum of 60% of an expected 80 Spanish-speaking participants who take part in the IPV ongoing workshops led by Promotoras will have knowledge of IPV as measured by score on test	8. Pretest when applicable	7. EC Staff and Promotoras will conduct outreach campaigns to increase the # of venues that reach Spanish-speaking participants. 8. Conduct ongoing IPV workshops	7a. Establish min criteria for venues; 7b. Outreach to schools, churches, etc. for participants and venues 8a. Administer pre/post tests or stand- alone post tests; 8b. Analyze test data; 8c. Track participation in ongoing workshops	7a. Establish min criteria for venues; 7b. Outreach to schools, churches, etc. for participants and venues 8a. Administer pre/post tests or stand- alone post tests; 8b. Analyze test data; 8c. Track participation in ongoing workshops	8a. % of ongoing workshop participants who increase score on post test; 8b. % of workshop participants who score correctly on stand-alone test.
	Prevent IPV in the Latino Immigrant in Greater Albuquerque Area					

APPENDIX B EC Pre/Post Leadership Test

Enlace Comunitario
Cuestionario de Formación de Promotoras

**POR FAVOR, NO DOBLAN ESTA PAGINA TODAVÍA
LEA ESTAS INSTRUCCIONES**

Esto NO es una prueba—no hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas.
Sus respuestas sólo se utilizarán para evaluar la efectividad del programa—no para la evaluación o la información sobre usted como individuo. Sus respuestas serán confidenciales.

Se le pedirá que responda a una serie de declaraciones que son de selección múltiple, verdadero/falso.
Por favor, complete todos los artículos - no dejar espacios en blanco.

ALGUNOS EJEMPLOS

Circule Uno

Después de dar una presentación en la comunidad sobre la violencia doméstica, una mujer en la audiencia, confiesa que está siendo abusada. Yo debo:

- A. Dile a dejar la relación e invitarla a quedarse en mi casa.
- B. Dale el número de teléfono de Enlace Comunitario y decirle sobre sus servicios.
- C. Hablarle de mi experiencia personal como sobreviviente de violencia doméstica.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

Verdadero / Falso

Un líder autoritario nunca toma decisiones sin consultar a los demás. V_____F_____

*** ¿Está seguro de QUÉ HACER? ***

En caso afirmativo, favor de doblar esta página.

Si todavía no está seguro sobre qué hacer, pida ayuda.

POR FAVOR, dar respuestas honestas.

ENLACE COMUNITARIO
Cuestionario de Formación de Promotoras

Nombre: _____ Fecha: ___/___/___
Fecha de Nacimiento: ___/___/___

INSTRUCCIONES IMPORTANTES

Esto NO es una prueba- por favor, responde a las declaraciones con honestidad, cómo usted siente ahora.
Los resultados sólo se utilizan para mejorar la eficacia del programa, no para informar sobre usted.

Por favor marque la mejor opción (marque sólo una)

ACERCA DE ENLACE COMUNITARIO

1. La misión de Enlace Comunitario es la siguiente: B

- A. Prevenir la pobreza y eliminar la violencia en la comunidad latina inmigrante.
- B. Eliminar la violencia doméstica y promover familias saludables en la comunidad latina inmigrante.
- C. Educar a la comunidad latina sobre la violencia doméstica.
- D. Luchar por la reforma migratoria.

2. Enlace Comunitario ofrece: D

- A. Manejo de casos y de Servicios Legales
- B. Terapia individual y grupal.
- C. Clases para aprender nuevas habilidades tales como inglés y Yoga.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

3. Cuando Enlace Comunitario trabaja con las víctimas de violencia doméstica, EC siempre: B

- A. Le dan todo lo que la victima necesitan para dejar al abusador.
- B. Trabajar con la victima para desarrollar habilidades que necesitan para tener acceso a los servicios.

EL PAPEL DE UNA PROMOTORA

4. Después de dar una presentación en la comunidad sobre la violencia doméstica, una mujer en la audiencia, me confía que está siendo abusada. Yo debo: B

- A. Decirle que deje la relación e invitarla a quedarse en mi casa.
- B. Darle el número de teléfono de Enlace Comunitario y decirle sobre sus servicios.
- C. Hablarle de mi experiencia personal como sobreviviente de violencia doméstica.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

5. Como Promotora de Enlace Comunitario, yo: D

- A. Daré presentaciones en mi comunidad y seré voluntaria por cuatro horas cada mes.
- B. Ayudare a Enlace para distribuir sus materiales en la comunidad.
- C. Asistiré a entrenamientos mensuales durante mi año de servicio.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

LIDERAZGO EN LA COMUNIDAD

6. Un líder siempre debe: C

- A. Estar de pie frente al grupo.
- B. Ser la principal persona al hablar.
- C. Proporcionar a otros la oportunidad de dirigir y participar.
- D. Saber todo.

7. Un buen líder comunitario, debe: D

- A. Estar informado y tener mente abierta.
- B. Tener la valentía de hablar cuando algo está mal.
- C. Proporciona a los demás la oportunidad de dirigir y participar.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

8. Un buen líder comunitario, debe de: B

- A. Actuarse como un profesional y nunca dejar que sus antecedentes culturales afecten su presentación.
- B. Recurrir a su propia cultura y antecedentes familiares para ayudar a conectarse y responder a los valores y experiencias de los miembros de la comunidad.
- C. Reclutar gente de la comunidad cuyas experiencias culturales son similares a la suya.

9. Cuando alguien está preparado para una presentación, conoce: D

- A. El motivo de la presentación.
- B. La razón por la que se le ha pedido que presente.
- C. Sobre el tema de la presentación.
- D. Todas las anteriores.

POR FAVOR, MARCAR VERDADERO O FALSO

- 10. V La violencia doméstica ocurre entre personas de todas las razas, edades, clases económicas y religiones. V____F____
- 11. F Para ser considerado violencia doméstica, debe haber violencia física. V____F____
- 12. F Un líder siempre debe trabajar solo/a. V____F____
- 13. F Un líder autoritario nunca toma decisiones sin consultarle a otros. V____F____
- 14. V Un líder comunitario consulta con los demás antes de tomar decisiones. V____F____
- 15. F No es importante saber que la audiencia antes de una presentación, porque la información no cambia. V____F____

APPENDIX C Sample Promotora Satisfaction Survey (Session 1)



Primera Sesión de Promotoras¹

Por favor, haga un círculo en el número que refleje su evaluación de esta sesión:

1. Entendió más sobre la misión y el trabajo de Enlace Comunitario.

Totalmente en desacuerdo

Totalmente de acuerdo

1 2 3 4 5

2. Entiendo bien lo que se espera de usted como Promotora.

Totalmente en desacuerdo

Totalmente de acuerdo

1 2 3 4 5

3. Comenzó a desarrollar relaciones con otras Promotoras.

Totalmente en desacuerdo

Totalmente de acuerdo

1 2 3 4 5

4. Las facilitadoras demostró cocimientos sobre los temas que presentaron.

Totalmente en desacuerdo

Totalmente de acuerdo

1 2 3 4 5

5. En general esta usted satisfecha con esta primera sesión.

Totalmente en desacuerdo

Totalmente de acuerdo

1 2 3 4 5

Comentarios adicionales:

¹ Esta evaluación fue tomada del curriculum de Casa de Esperanza – Desarrollo de Liderazgo para Líderes- Primera Sesión – Plantilla de Evaluación.

APPENDIX D Compiled Session Evaluation Data

Enlace Promotora Session Evaluation Data				
		2010	2011	2012
Session 1	§ Mission	-	5	4.60
	§ Promotora	-	4.8	4.78
	§ Relationships	-	4.8	4.70
	§ Facilitator Knowledge	-	4.7	4.80
	§ Satisfaction	-	5	4.90
Session Total		-	4.86	4.76
Session 2	§ Leadership	4.63	4.82	4.90
	§ Qualities	4.50	4.91	4.70
	§ Role	4.75	4.55	4.80
	§ Facilitator Knowledge	5.00	4.91	4.90
	§ Satisfaction	4.88	4.91	5.00
Session Total		4.75	4.82	4.86
Session 3	§ Leadership	-	-	4.90
	§ Qualities	-	-	4.80
	§ Role	-	-	4.90
	§ Facilitator Knowledge	-	-	5.00
	§ Satisfaction	-	-	5.00
Session Total		-	-	4.92
Session 4	§ Comfort	4.67	4.33	4.8
	§ Information	4.78	3.83	4.9
	§ Knowledge	4.56	5.00	5
	§ Satisfaction	4.89	5.00	5
Session Total		4.72	4.54	4.92
Session 5	§ DV Knowledge	5	5.00	4.90
	§ Barriers	4.8	4.67	4.90
	§ New Techniques	4.8	5.00	4.90
	§ Facilitator Knowledge	4.6	5.00	4.90
	§ Satisfaction	5	-	-
Session Total		4.84	4.92	4.90
Grand Total		4.78	4.79	4.87

APPENDIX F Scenario Based Participant Evaluation

Enlace Comunitario EVALUACION DE LA PRESENTACION

Nombre: _____ Lugar: _____ Fecha: _____

Por favor encierre el número que corresponde en los siguientes puntos:

La Información Presentada	1 No Me Fue Útil	2 Poco Útil	3 Útil	4 Muy Útil	5 Extremadamente Útil
La Persona que presento	1 No Fue Efectiva	2 Poco Efectiva	3 Efectiva	4 Muy Efectiva	5 Extremadamente Efectiva
Los Materiales usados:	1 No Fueron Efectivos	2 Poco Efectivos	3 Efectivos	4 Muy Efectivos	5 Extremadamente Efectivos

Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas:

- Rosita tienen 10 años de edad. Cada día ella tiene que ayudar a preparar la comida y servirle a su papá y hermano Roberto. **Circule las siguientes respuestas con las que usted este de acuerdo.**
 - Esto está bien porque la está preparando para su vida como mujer.
 - Sería más justo que Roberto y Rosita tomaran turnos, para servir la comida.
 - Esto está bien porque enseña a Rosita y Roberto que la obligación de la mujer es servir a los hombres.
 - El papá de Rosita trabaja todo el día, es lógico que ella lo atienda.
- Yo creo que puedo reconocer las señales de abuso tanto en mis relaciones como en las de los demás. **Circule el número que usted esté de acuerdo.**

Casi Nunca

Casi Siempre



- ¿Qué es lo más importante que usted aprendió acerca de la Presentación y/o sobre la violencia doméstica de esta presentación?

- En su propia opinión. ¿Qué piensa usted que la comunidad necesita saber sobre este tema?

Otros comentarios acerca de la presentación:

Muchas gracias, Enlace Comunitario agradece sus comentarios y opiniones

APPENDIX G EC Community Participant Evaluation Surveys

Enlace Comunitario EVALUACION DE LA PRESENTACION

Lugar de la Clase/Presentación: _____ Fecha: _____

Por favor encierre el número que corresponde en los siguientes puntos:

La Información Presentada	1 No Me Fue Útil	2 Poco Útil	3 Útil	4 Muy Útil	5 Extremadamente Útil
La Persona que presento	1 No Fue Efectiva	2 Poco Efectiva	3 Efectiva	4 Muy Efectiva	5 Extremadamente Efectiva
Los Materiales usados:	1 No Fueron Efectivos	2 Poco Efectivos	3 Efectivos	4 Muy Efectivos	5 Extremadamente Efectivos

Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Qué es lo más importante que usted aprendió acerca de la Presentación y/o sobre la Violencia Domestica de esta presentación?

 2. En su propia opinión. ¿Qué tema piensa usted que la comunidad necesita saber?

 3. ¿Que aprendió acerca de como este tema afecta a la comunidad, o a su familia?

 4. ¿Usted ha presenciado/vivido o conoce a alguien que haya presenciado/vivido alguna vez violencia Intrafamiliar? Si _____ No _____
- Otros comentarios acerca de la presentación:
- _____

Muchas Gracias, Enlace Comunitario agradece sus Comentarios y Opiniones

APPENDIX H Promotora Exit Interview Questions

Preguntas para Entrevistas de Salida con Promotoras:

1. ¿Tú te consideres como líder? ¿Por qué si o no?

2. ¿Qué talentos, fuerzas o conocimientos tiene usted ahora?

3. Imagine que tú tenías la oportunidad de facilitar el entrenamiento de liderazgo de las 5 semanas-- ¿Cuáles temas crees que son lo más importante de tener en el entrenamiento y cuales temas te gustaría agregar, sacar o mejorar? ¿De qué maneras?

4. ¿De toda tu experiencia de promotora, que fue lo más beneficioso para ti personalmente, y que fue de menos provecho para ti?

5. ¿Qué impacto crees está teniendo el programa de prevención en la comunidad, con respecto al:
 - a. Presentaciones:

 - b. Mensajes en los medios de comunicación:

 - c. Distribución de materiales en la comunidad:

6. ¿En qué otras maneras crees que Enlace podría tener más impacto de prevención de la violencia doméstica?

7. ¿En qué capacidad, tú te vez siguiendo el trabajo en la comunidad como líder, después del programa de Promotoras termina?