



Tailoring Strategies for Disparity-Focused Institutional Analysis

Praxis Institutional Analysis methods¹ (Safety & Accountability Audits and Community Assessment) have been used to explore aspects of institutional response in distinct communities, with specific attention to how that response produces problematic outcomes for specific cultures and identities. Below are highlights from several projects that were designed to analyze responses to survivors of specific cultures and identities:

Focus of project	Key tailoring approaches
<p>Saint Paul Blueprint for Safety</p> <p>Location Saint Paul, MN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interagency commitment to Blueprint principle: Reduce unintended consequences and disparity of impact • Project partners raised concern about community corrections seeing more African American men that were convicted of felonies due to violations of domestic abuse no contact orders • The Blueprint Steering Committee agreed to pull together a team of Blueprint practitioners to analyze the concern • Probation data disaggregated by gender and race • Extensive review of probation case files to determine nature of no contact order violations (continued violence? Or non-violent contact, mutually agreed upon?) • Conducted focus groups with battered women whose batterers were African American men • Tailored data gathering activities as new perspectives and information was uncovered
<p>Addressing Violence Against People with Intellectual Disabilities²</p> <p>Canadian Association for Community Living developed a guide for others to do this</p> <p>Locations Grand Falls, New Brunswick Winnipeg, Manitoba Toronto, Ontario Whitehorse, Yukon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication strategies with project partners to help agencies understand the relevance of the issue of violence against people with intellectual disabilities • Defining the problem through the lived experience of people with intellectual disabilities • Team make up: representative of many diverse sectors, organizations and social groups (i.e. ethno-racial, income, sexual orientation and identity, immigrant, First Nations, older and younger people, etc.), family members, and individuals with intellectual disabilities • Team training: current analyses of the problem, statistical info about the problem, audit methodology

¹ <http://praxisinternational.org/institutional-analysiscommunity-assessment-2/>

² <http://www.cacl.ca/cacl-action/projects/community-safety-audit>



Focus of project	Key tailoring approaches
<p>Accounting for Culture in Supervised Visitation Practices³ (audits of three culturally-specific visitation centers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chicago Mayor’s Office on Domestic Violence Apna Ghar The Branch Family Institute Mujeres Latinas en Acción <p>Location Chicago, IL</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detailed information was shared when facilitators and note-takers were bilingual and bicultural. Translation of certain words into meaningful language was missing but necessary (eg, “what is your ethnic background” didn’t translate to the participants). Practitioner interview question included: What kind of changes have you made or might make to better meet the needs of diverse families? Text review: How are aspects of culture visible, erased, imposed, or appropriated? How do forms account for and guide workers to account for aspects of cultural identity?
<p>How does it come about that, after a substantiation of child neglect, African American children are more likely to be removed from their homes?⁴</p> <p>Praxis and Center for the Study of Social Policy</p> <p>Locations Wayne County Saginaw County Michigan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project was guided by a set of assumptions that addressed realities of child maltreatment, over-representation of African American families in the foster care system, individual, institutional, and structural racism, etc. Teams participated in a two-day workshop entitled <i>Undoing Racism</i>, conducted by representatives of the <i>People’s Institute for Survival and Beyond</i>, and included the history of the involvement of children of color in public child welfare systems in the United States. Audit team members included parents and foster parents who have experienced the child protection system. Qualities looked for in team members included: respect for individuals of diverse backgrounds, the ability to focus on institutional features that produce disproportionality and disparity.

³ <http://praxisinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/ChicagoSafeHavens-FULL.pdf>

⁴ http://praxisinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Michigan_Report_Jan09-1.pdf



Focus of project	Key tailoring approaches
Safety & Accountability Audit of the Response to Native Women who Report Sexual Assault⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong foundation of collaboration to engage in system reform.• Start with data: no reports of sexual assault by Native women were prosecuted in the previous 10 years.• Team members needed to be non-defensive, open, have an understanding and willingness to acknowledge individual bias, institutional racism, sexism, bias.• Training included one day to dialogue about institutionalized racism and the basics of Native culture: storytelling, historical trauma, etc.• Relationship building was crucial to handle the challenging issues the arose.• Give the process adequate time to address the challenging issues that will arise: <i>we had to process the fact that we were failing a particular group of survivors.</i>• Every meeting, focus group, interview, etc. was led by Native women.• Focus groups:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provided child care, transportation, and a stipend.○ Native women facilitated the focus groups (the white advocates weren't in the room).○ Leaders in the Native community actively recruited focus group participants.○ The dominant culture (all white staff) sexual assault advocacy program was present to provide advocacy during and after the focus groups.• When we started to lose the participation of Native women on the audit team, they consulted a Native Elder who advised a ceremony with the whole team.• Blatant racist/sexist/victim-blaming comments arose during interviews, observations. Team members leaned on audit etiquette, <i>tell me more</i>, didn't go alone, and/or scheduled debriefings with another audit team member immediately after.
Mending the Sacred Hoop, Praxis, PAVSA	
Location Duluth, MN	

⁵ <http://praxisinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/TTAMSHTaAuditReport2011.pdf>



Focus of project	Key tailoring approaches
<p>New Orleans Blueprint for Safety</p> <p>Location New Orleans, LA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conducted a literature review of current research on domestic violence in the African American community. ● Connected with and contributed to other local initiatives that dovetail with the area of focus, e.g. NOLA for Life. ● Basic data collection regarding the number and disposition of cases, broken down by gender, race, ethnicity, and other characteristics. ● Revealed concepts that influenced response, such as a commonly held belief that African American women in NOLA are angry, hostile, fighters. ● Team membership: Meaningfully represent the community. ● Focus groups recruited by African American women in the community. ● Text analysis: identify case files involving African American women.
<p>Understanding the Needs of the Victims of Sexual Assault in the Deaf Community Council on Crime and Justice⁶</p> <p>Location Minneapolis, MN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Literature review of sexual assault, Deaf community, help seeking in the Deaf community. ● Extensive interviews with Deaf individuals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project coordinator respected leader in Deaf community. ○ Extra measures to ensure safety, comfort, and consent. ○ Provided interviewees option of Deaf or hearing interviewers (some participants did not want to be interviewed by someone in their Deaf community) ● Advisory group of community stakeholders: law enforcement, hospital staff, Deaf and hearing human service providers, and children of Deaf adults. ● Practitioner interviews and observations included 911, sexual assault response team members, sign language interpreter and crime prevention specialist patrol officer, ASL coordinator, Job Placement Center, and sexual assault program staff. ● Text review challenge: Police database not set up to query cases involving Deaf individuals. Instead interviewed policies, protocols, forms, checklists, etc.

⁶ <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/212867.pdf>



Focus of project	Key tailoring approaches
<p>Native Women’s Research Project⁷ Mending the Sacred Hoop and Praxis International</p> <p>Location St. Louis County, MN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team membership: Indigenous Researchers and Native women in the community (advocates, community members, housing, health care, etc.). • Training on Indigenous Ways of Knowing, audit methodology, and legal jargon and case processing steps. • Team members’ personal experiences with data collection activities were included as “data” (including dreams). • Extensive review of police reports involving Native women (because race was infrequently recorded in police reports, we identified cases involving Native women by last names common in the Native community and addresses of predominantly Native housing communities). • Meetings, focus groups, feasts started with smudging.
<p>York University Safety Audit: Leading the Way to Personal and Community Safety⁸ York University & The Metropolitan Action Committee on VAW and Children</p> <p>Location Toronto, Ontario, Canada</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combines principles of crime prevention through environmental design and a gender-aware, anti-oppressive, and intersectional analysis • Upfront acknowledgement that marginalized constituents are most likely to face violence and crime, yet their safety needs and ideas tend to remain unheard. • Participatory action research model rooted in the diverse voices and perspectives of students, staff, and faculty. • Qualitative methods were used to collect data in partnership with individuals and groups who are impacted by social inequities based on gender, race, age, disability, ethnicity, faith, sexual orientation, and class.

⁷ <http://praxisinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/nwrpSummaryReport.pdf>

⁸ <http://safety.yorku.ca/files/2013/01/METRAC-Audit-Report.pdf>