

Integrating Community Building and Violence Prevention

Final Report

August 2003

A project of the

Institute for Community Peace
(formerly the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention)

and the Family Violence Prevention Fund

Supported by the Waitt Family Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to sincerely thank the following colleagues who contributed their time and thoughtful attention to this project. The lessons learned from this project reflect their willingness to share their experiences and inspiration, to be open to new ideas, and to push for deeper thinking about how to strategically partner to build peaceful and healthy homes and communities:

Camille Carter, *Cocke County Collaborative, Newport, Tennessee (representing an Institute for Community Peace site)*

David Chavis^a *Association for the Study and Development of Community, Washington D.C.*

Sherri Dunn Berry^a *National Community Building Network, Oakland, California*

Lee Farrow, *Harlem Children's Zone, New York, New York*

Milta Franco, *North End Outreach Network, Springfield, Massachusetts*

Ellen Furnari, *Waitt Family Foundation, La Jolla, California*

Albino Garcia, *Youth Development, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico*

May Louie, *Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Boston, Massachusetts*

Bart Lubow^a *Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, Maryland*

Beckie Masaki, *Asian Women's Shelter, San Francisco, California*

Curt McPhail, *McPhail & Associates, Spartanburg, South Carolina (representing an Institute for Community Peace site)*

Allen Moy^b *National Community Building Network, Oakland, California*

Susan Notkin^a *Center for Community Partnerships in Child Welfare, New York, New York*

Virginia Ortega^b *Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Pomona, California*

Bal Pinguel^a *American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

Kate Rhee^a *Prison Moratorium Project, Brooklyn, New York*

Joan Serra Hoffman, *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia*

Raquel Sotolo^b *Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Pomona, California*

Judy Stafford, *Waitt Family Foundation, Sioux City, South Dakota*

Aimee Thompson, *Close to Home, Dorchester, Massachusetts*

Mily Travino-Sauceda^a *Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Pomona, California*

Susan Williams^a *Highlander Research and Education Center, New Market, Tennessee*

Oliver Williams^a *Institute on Domestic Violence in the African American Community, St. Paul, Minnesota*

Junius Williams, *Urban Strategies Council, Oakland, California*

^aParticipated in key informant interviews only.

^bParticipated in the national strategy meeting only.

Thank you also to the following Institute for Community Peace (formerly the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention) and Family Violence Prevention Fund staff who provided valuable ongoing assistance in project design, coordination and implementation and to our meeting facilitator, Bob Hoffman, who guided and focused our discussions:

Family Violence Prevention Fund:

Lindsey Anderson
Senior Program Specialist

Leni Marin
Managing Director

Lucy Salcido-Carter
Consultant

Esta Soler
President

Miriam Touchton
Senior Program Assistant

Institute for Community Peace (formerly the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention):

Linda Bowen
Executive Director

Marcy Mistrett
Director for Training and Evaluation

Meeting Facilitator:

Robert Hoffman, Jr.
Human Resource Development

Finally, we give special thanks to Ellen Furnari and the Waitt Family Foundation for their ongoing commitment to strengthening families, communities and partnerships and providing the resources to support this initiative.

With much thanks and appreciation,

Victoria Gwiasda
*Director of Knowledge Enhancement
Institute for Community Peace (formerly the
National Funding Collaborative on Violence
Prevention)*

Kelly Mitchell-Clark

*Program Director
Family Violence Prevention Fund*

Last fall, the Family Violence Prevention Fund (Fund) and the Institute for Community Peace (ICP) launched a new initiative funded by the Waitt Family Foundation. Called *Building Collaboration Between Community Building and Violence Prevention Initiatives*, the project aimed to establish a common vision for integrating the fields of violence prevention and community building. It was hoped that by sharing information and expertise across the two fields, this project would yield ideas and opportunities to collaborate to increase program effectiveness and sustainability, and ultimately result in strengthened, peaceful communities.

The purpose of *Building Collaboration Between Community Building and Violence Prevention Initiatives* is three-fold:

1. To identify opportunities to weave together the work of the violence prevention and community building fields;
2. To understand learnings from and challenges to overlapping efforts; and
3. To develop and disseminate recommended actions.

The project work was completed in three stages: (1) Key informant interviews conducted with twenty-three experts from across the country engaged in community building and violence prevention work at the community and national levels. The interviews elicited definitions and principles of community building and violence prevention, asked how to apply the principles of one field to the other, and explored the opportunities and challenges presented by doing so (see Appendix B for a copy of the interview guide); (2) A one-and-a-half-day national strategy meeting, in which fourteen invited guests and Fund and ICP staff engaged in facilitated discussion to spur thinking and movement around the project goals; and (3) Production of this final report synthesizing the results of the interviews and meeting. (See the Acknowledgments for a list of participants in the key informant interviews and national strategy meeting.)

Each of the project participants was selected because of his/her unique expertise in specific areas of violence prevention and/or community building. For example, some participants represented agencies that focused on the prevention of a particular form of interpersonal violence, (e.g., domestic violence, youth violence or child abuse); while others organized grassroots support to promote economic growth and social cohesion of local communities; and finally, some built national networks to bridge all these activities. In general, participants were

selected because of their prior experience supporting projects that aim to both build community and prevent violence.

I. What are Community Building and Violence Prevention?

"I see community building and violence prevention as connected. One is the condition of the other. One leads to the other.... There can be no community building without violence prevention. Efforts of violence prevention cannot be sustained if there's no community building." -- Bal Pinguel, American Friends Society Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Although the concepts that undergird community building and violence prevention are not new, the use of these terms to designate distinct fields, each supporting research, effective strategies and policies, advocacy and training, has flourished over the past decade or more. Given the fields' infancy, no standardized definitions have been adopted to describe them—what defines "community" or "violence" within one organization may differ considerably from another. With regard to the terms "violence" and "violence prevention," leading state, national and international violence prevention and public health organizations have defined them for their individual use, all integrating common elements but with subtle differentiations in content. With regard to the terms "community" and "community building," fewer official definitions exist. (See the Definitions Box on page 7.)

Inconsistent terminology within each field has resulted in confusion about what merits the label "violence prevention" and/or "community building," leading practitioners to fill in the gaps based on their individual perceptions, beliefs or needs. To add further complication, most violence prevention practitioners do not think of themselves as "violence preventionists," but instead as legal and medical advocates for domestic violence survivors, gang prevention coordinators, school social workers, police officers, health educators and so on. Likewise, community builders can also be categorized and include economic developers, community organizers, housing preservationists, urban planners, etc. The principles this range of practitioners have developed to guide their work, the professional networks in which they participate, the strategies they adopt, and the populations they engage are often distinct, based

on the specific type of violence or community problem they hope to abate. As will be discussed in more detail in a later section, this "siloeing" in the violence prevention field leads to an overemphasis on programs designed to impact *individual* behaviors and attitudes that results in interpersonal violence and a slower recognition of the societal factors that give rise to multiple, interconnected forms of violence.

As a result of the compartmentalization and confusion within and across fields, many professionals do not appreciate the ways in which their work is mutually complementary. To begin to understand overlapping elements of violence prevention and community building, through interviews and at the national strategy meeting, participants teased out principles that guide the work of both fields. They suggested that violence prevention and community building both ideally . . .

1. Require racial, gender and class equity, and challenge imbalances of power;
2. Value and respect cultural strengths and diversity;
3. Forge partnerships and social relationships through collaboration, and shared resources and information;
4. Support comprehensive and multi-faceted efforts;
5. Foster broad community participation and civic engagement, and empower those most affected;
6. Begin with the local context;
7. Support and strengthen families and children (throughout their life span);
8. Build on and across individual, family, and community strengths/assets;
9. Improve factors, systems and policies that undermine individual and community health;
10. Build on demonstrated successes, and test and learn from innovation; and
11. Change norms, attitudes and behaviors to support respectful, healthy and peaceful homes and communities.

Principles Versus Practices. In developing this list, there was considerable discussion regarding the question of what delineates a principle from a practice. For example, it was asked whether "forging partnerships" (see principle #3 above) was simply a practice (or strategy) utilized by both fields? Ultimately the litmus test that distinguished a principle from a practice

was whether or not the item is *fundamental* to the work of the field. If in order to engage in effective community building and/or violence prevention, one *must* forge partnerships, then it emerges as a principle.

The discussion of principles versus practices was not simply an exercise of linguistic precision. Defining principles is important because it establishes whether or not a common foundation exists between the two fields. If such a foundation exists—and in this case, it clearly does—it makes sense to then consider how these principles translate into practices for each field. One would assume that two fields so closely linked in theory would also support similar strategies to achieve their aims. Surprisingly, while it appears from the shared list of principles that the two fields are inherently similar, *in practice*, they diverge more often than they converge.

Definitions

The terms violence, violence prevention, community and community building have been defined by various organizations in different ways. The following provides a select sample of definitions.

Violence is defined as . . .

- ◆ "Threatened or actual physical force or power initiated by an individual that results in, or has a high likelihood of resulting in, physical or psychological injury or death." --*Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia*
- ◆ "The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation." --*World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*

Primary violence prevention is defined as . . .

- ◆ "Broad-based efforts that affect conditions, norms and values related to violence so as to prevent violence from occurring. These efforts should reduce risk factors and/or enhance protective factors associated with violent behavior." --*Illinois Violence Prevention Authority, Chicago, Illinois*
- ◆ "Efforts focusing on root causes of violence that build comprehensive collaboration across multiple disciplines and sectors, including those most affected by violence; engage residents and empower communities; and promote community-driven solutions." --*Institute for Community Peace, Washington D.C.*
- ◆ "Approaches that aim to prevent violence before it occurs." --*World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*

Community is defined as . . .

- ◆ Communities may be defined in terms of place (e.g., localities, neighborhoods, history, diaspora), interest (e.g., faith, leisure, profession, political party, organization), identity and experience (e.g., race, gender, sexuality, class, age, disability), circumstance (e.g., workplace, residential institutions, school, colleges), and values and kinship. --*based on the work of Liz Kelly, London Metropolitan University*

Community building is defined as . . .

- ◆ "A comprehensive, principle-driven approach to economic and social revitalization that highlights relationships and partnerships among residents and others who care about the community. This approach builds on community assets and aspirations; strengthens a community's problem-solving capacities; and creates new relationships, more responsive institutions, new community resources, and empowered residents." --*National Community Building Network, Oakland, California*
- ◆ "Continuous, self-renewing efforts by residents and professionals to engage in collective action of problem solving and enrichment that results in improved lives, greater equity; strengthened relationships, networks, institutions and assets; and new standards and expectations for life in the community." --*PolicyLink, Oakland, California*

II. Why Should We Be Interested in Integrating Community Building and Violence Prevention?

"It doesn't seem like we've decreased our affinity for violence in our lifetime. We have issues named—family violence for example—but has it decreased? I don't know. We have people better protected with a few more options, but I don't think we're preventing violence. We don't have a sense as a society that we should prevent it.... It seems like community building would be a really good tool for violence prevention because you get more folks educated, informed and thinking about these issues." -- Susan Williams, Highlander Research and Education Center, New Market, Tennessee

Violence is a complex phenomenon that has its roots in individual, community and societal norms, behaviors and practices.¹ Given its multi-faceted and entrenched nature, one participant suggested that violence will never be solved or prevented through government action, legislation, the provision of services, or other "top-down" approaches, but only when communities are empowered, residents mobilized and partnerships forged to affect community norms and thus change community practice. Research suggests that community cohesion is strongly correlated with reduced levels of violence and that experiencing violence (as a witness or survivor) as a child or adult may result in poorer physical, mental health and economic outcomes for that individual. These two findings create a "chicken and egg" phenomenon for communities: in order to strengthen community ties, individuals must feel safe and secure enough to mobilize, but communities that lack cohesion may also have high numbers of residents who are directly impacted by violence, and therefore less able to develop strong social bonds. Given this symbiotic link between violence prevention and community building, (i.e., violence prevention may only happen when we engage communities, but violence impairs an individual's ability to be active in the community), it is crucial that we approach the two fields as necessarily integrated.

By recognizing the common roots between violence prevention and community building (as described in Section 1), participants provided a rationale for exploring ways to link and share insights across the two fields. The question that remains then is whether or not, given their underlying similarities, the two fields can learn from one another, and expand and enhance

strategies that will result in increased effectiveness? To consider this question, it is important to understand the limitations of each field as perceived by the other, which are certain to create obstacles for collaboration.

The remainder of this section is divided into two parts—one focusing on participants' perceptions of the violence prevention field, and the other focusing on their perceptions of the community building field. In each part, two main questions are considered: (1) In what ways does the work of this field complement the work of the other?; and (2) In what ways does the work of this field create impediments to working with the other? Using information culled from the key informant interviews and discussions at the national strategy meeting, a range of responses is provided. These responses do not necessarily reflect "facts" about the fields, but instead offer a snapshot of how professionals both within and outside each field view the two fields. Regardless of their accuracy, it is these perceptions that need to be leveraged or addressed to begin the process of successful coordination across the two fields.

A. Why Is Integration Important to the Violence Prevention Field?

"Community building is violence prevention.... If a family feels in control of their lives, if they can make a decent living, if their culture is respected in the larger society, if men of color are not feared and stigmatized, that creates a sense of community power, which is the building block of violence prevention." – May Louie, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Boston, Massachusetts

As noted earlier, participants felt that violence cannot be prevented without a diverse, empowered and mobilized public, and without partnerships between residents and others with power and resources in the community. In other words, participants perceived community building to be, in essence, fundamental to effective violence prevention. The mission of the Institute for Community Peace rests on the premise that effective violence prevention requires an engaged and mobilized populace and empowered communities—during its eight-year existence, ICP has supported local demonstration projects to determine whether and how

¹ For a comprehensive definition and typology of violence and an ecological framework to explain its root causes, see Krug, E.G. et al., eds. *World report on violence and health*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2002.

communities can be engaged to prevent violence as it is identified and defined locally (see Appendix A for a summary of those efforts). This report focuses on the challenges of doing so within the context of a violence prevention field that is heavily fragmented (although increasing less so).

The following list, gleaned from project participants shows how perceptions of the violence prevention field shape the opportunities for and obstacles to collaborating with community builders. In considering the violence prevention field, participants suggested the following

- ◆ **Violence prevention focuses primarily on individual-level change, whereas community building engages the whole community in a process to change norms and behaviors.** While participants recognized that violence prevention strategies aim to affect change at the individual, family, community and societal levels, they noted that evaluation (and corresponding practice) of violence prevention has historically centered on changes in individual attitudes, behaviors or skills. This focus is self-perpetuating as the field continues to build from what has been proven to be effective. Thus "best practices" in violence prevention tend to support programs that reach out to individual youth, adults, employees, gang members, domestic violence survivors, child witnesses, etc. while less attention has been paid to developing successful evaluation measures for identifying and tracking community and societal level factors that contribute to violence.
- ◆ **Violence prevention is still equated with public safety, suppression, or victim services, whereas community building strives for economic and social equity.** Although violence prevention, by definition, aims to affect broad-based changes in societal norms and behaviors to limit the factors that increase the likelihood of violent occurrences, in practice, participants noted that resources often get directed towards specific individuals or communities *in crisis*, or *at risk*. By integrating more community building approaches, participants thought that efforts aimed at reducing and preventing violence could achieve a more appropriate balance between prevention and intervention.
- ◆ **Violence prevention focuses on a specific problem, whereas community building effects broader community change.** Violence prevention encompasses several distinct movements, (e.g., the domestic violence movement, the juvenile justice system and corresponding attempts to combat delinquency, the proliferation of community

policing partnerships, etc.), each begun at different points of time and each aiming to impact specific forms of violence. Although historically these fields grew independently of one another, there is increasing recognition of their interdependence—to prevent or reduce *one* form of violence requires efforts that not only impact *multiple* forms of violence but also explore the societal structures that lead to *all* forms of violence. While the violence prevention field is still fragmented, promoting strategies that confront one or two forms of violence at a time, there is a burgeoning movement to strategically engage cohesive, coordinated efforts among violence prevention practitioners. Community builders, in contrast, typically did not articulate their work in violence prevention terms or even as addressing violence per se; instead, they challenged social, economic and political structures that give rise to violence, thus impacting the root causes of violence.

- ◆ **Violence prevention is often couched in terms of a public health disease model (that is deficit driven) whereas community building is asset-based.** Since the U.S. Surgeon General acknowledged violence as a public health concern, the public health model has been central to its prevention. Epidemiological solutions are supported that involve defining the problem, identifying risk factors, developing appropriate strategies, and evaluating results. This process results in an examination of individual or community deficits while not necessarily enhancing their strengths. Participants felt that community building, on the other hand, identified community assets and built from that foundation.
- ◆ **Some forms of violence prevention, such as family violence prevention, do not allow for community accountability.** Establishing both child abuse and domestic violence as a crime marked significant progress in the family violence prevention movement. As a result, both child protective and domestic violence services are heavily reliant on the response of the criminal justice and child welfare systems. While these remedies may provide civil and/or criminal accountability of the perpetrator, participants noted that they do little to change the context in which the violence occurs. Without accountability from community residents, and the recognition that family violence should not be tolerated, societal shifts cannot occur. Participants recognized that, as practitioners, they have offered few tools for communities interested and willing to support accountability among its residents.

B. Why Is Integration Important to the Community Building Field?

"Community building says to me that you need the voice of everyone in the community.... [It is about] engaging with everyone. Sometimes community building only focuses on poor neighborhoods where supposedly the problems are. In doing that, we reinforce the notion that violence belongs to the poor, the immigrants, or to other disenfranchised parts of a community. I don't know what community building looks like in more affluent neighborhoods.... For violence prevention to honestly work, it has to work across all those socioeconomic areas." – Judy Stafford, Waitt Family Foundation, Sioux City, South Dakota

Participants also considered the opposite challenge: how do their perceptions of the community building field shape the opportunities for and challenges to collaborating with the violence prevention field? The conversations converged around four major points:

- ◆ **Community building primarily addresses community development needs, including infrastructure, and economic and environmental conditions, whereas violence prevention enhances community health.** Participants noted that many outside the violence prevention field held a narrow view of what that field comprised; similarly, violence prevention practitioners erroneously felt that the focus of community building field was to enhance neighborhood infrastructure and economic development, (e.g., housing, transportation, business development, etc). The two fields were perceived to be divergent, in that community builders promoted the physical revitalization of a community while violence prevention strategies nurtured the social elements.
- ◆ **Community building addresses public concerns, whereas violence prevention focuses on both public and private concerns.** When considering what community building tools they adopt in their own work, participants identified strategies, such as community organizing and public awareness campaigns, that were public in nature. That is, these efforts were visible remedies to visible problems. When asked to consider whether and how these same strategies could be applied to so-called "private" concerns, (e.g., child sexual assault or domestic violence), participants recognized the limitations

and challenges. As noted below, in Section III, there is considerable tension and confusion about how to adapt strategies that incorporate public accountability and social connectedness (i.e., community building efforts) to what are considered traditionally private issues addressed in the violence prevention field.

- ◆ **Community building does not recognize the interconnections between forms of violence, whereas violence prevention strives to make those linkages.** There has been previous mention of the fragmentation or "siloeing" of the violence prevention field, yet current research and anecdotal evidence points to the necessity of coordination to achieve primary prevention. The World Health Organization recently released a report, *World report on health and violence*, that adds considerably to the science of the field and serves as a foundational tool in support of increased coordination. Through a review of existing literature, the report presents an ecological model for violence prevention that examines the interplay between individual, relationship, community and societal spheres that combine to place individuals at lesser or higher risk of victimization and/or perpetration. The report clearly details the complex relationships between multiple "risk factors" and multiple forms of violence and makes a compelling case for approaching the field comprehensively. Participants noted that community builders are generally not familiar with the frameworks and theories guiding the violence prevention field. Consequently, they do not recognize how their work with more visible aspects of violence, e.g., gang violence, environmental violence, racism, hate crimes, etc. is connected to one another and to violence occurring in homes.
- ◆ **Community building is perceived as being place-based (geographically defined), whereas the community served through violence prevention may be linked by other common threads, (e.g., survivors of domestic violence).** As noted in the box on page 7, the term "community" can convey a variety of groupings of individuals—by interest, identity, experience, and values as well as by place. Participants defined community building as "growth in social cohesion," which may not necessarily be geographically aligned, but they also noted that it tends to focus on collective action, mobilization, and economic development that most likely are place based. Violence prevention strategies often cross geographic boundaries and may provide new alliances for communities.

II. What Is Unique About Integrating Family Violence Prevention and Community Building?

“Stopping violence against women means that you have community values that work against oppression, power and control. Community building is the way to change society so that violence is unacceptable. [Practitioners] cannot do only direct service—children’s and women’s lives are not just in shelters. [Women and children] go back to communities and need jobs, housing, support from faith communities, health care that’s supportive, etc.” – Beckie Masacki, Asian Women’s Shelter, San Francisco, California

In this project, the issue that generated the most discussion was how to integrate community building with family violence prevention. Because of the private nature of family violence and the public nature of engaging communities, coordination across the two is complicated. The Family Violence Prevention Fund is not new to this struggle—it has been working to challenge traditional thinking in the family violence arena and foster new implementation models (see Appendix A for a case study of the Fund's work). Participants discussed the following tensions that they thought would emerge when addressing family violence (in particular domestic or intimate partner violence) through a community-building approach:

- ◆ **Family violence prevention relies heavily on a criminal justice response.** As noted previously, the family violence movement grew out of and continues to rely on legal and punitive recourse for perpetrator accountability. Advocates, for instance, worked persistently over the past 20 years to enact legislative change, including the recognition of domestic violence as a distinct crime and the expansion of the definition of child abuse and neglect. Family violence practitioners have encouraged survivors of domestic abuse to rely on a systemic response, (e.g., law enforcement, courts, health care, victim service agencies, etc.) to protect them and stop future assaults. At this same time, communities have been unable to carve out a clear and consistent role in support of survivors—not always trustful of public systems, residents have responded to family violence by offering informal networks of support, or by neglecting or stigmatizing those individuals involved. Participants believed that more emphasis needed to be placed on community involvement and ownership of family violence as an issue. They concluded that effective prevention of family violence needs to be rooted in resident-led

(not just survivor-led), community-based efforts (e.g., those strategies employed by community builders).

- ◆ **The family violence prevention field frames violence as interpersonal.** Family violence, whether child abuse, domestic violence, or elder abuse, is most commonly viewed as a physical, sexual or emotional act, or threat, between a perpetrator and a victim. While the field recognizes that this dynamic is reinforced by structural factors, e.g., patriarchy, poverty, racism, etc. that result in uneven distributions of power and resources, existing efforts to prevent or reduce these acts often focus on the interpersonal dynamic. Participants noted that this emphasis—that family violence is an interpersonal interaction instead of perhaps a societal failing—pulls the issue away from community-led and community-based solutions.
- ◆ **Acknowledging and discussing family violence is emotionally difficult.** Issues of family violence, including the physical, sexual and emotional abuse of children, partners/spouses and elders, typically do not surface in community discourse. Affected family members have ambivalent feelings about the incidents: although they want the abuse to stop, the perpetrator is often a loved and needed member of that family, or the survivor may be dependent on the perpetrator for financial or parental support. Further, talking about victimization can be traumatic and shameful, in spite of the fact that the survivor is not at fault. While community-building strategies can serve to strengthen social networks and thus reduce isolation—a common problem for family violence survivors—developing a safe and trusted space to engage those most affected by the violence can prove difficult.
- ◆ **Engaging perpetrators in family violence prevention is controversial.** Community organizing strategies, a central tactic of community building, purposefully engage and empower those individuals most impacted by the condition—when violence is the issue being addressed then those engaged would include survivors, witnesses, and perpetrators. For family violence practitioners, engaging perpetrators *and* survivors is a difficult obstacle—preserving the safety of the survivor is a core tenet of the domestic violence prevention field, which occurs, if necessary, at the exclusion of the perpetrator. It is difficult to balance the involvement of perpetrators while not excusing responsibility for their acts.

- ◆ **Family violence efforts are not universally embraced.** Family violence prevention and intervention is typically perceived to be women-centered work, yet women do not necessarily control the resources and make decisions in a community. This tension may represent an opportunity to empower women more equitably in their community and/or to engage men in an area in which they are traditionally underrepresented as resources and overrepresented as problems.

V. Where Do We Go From Here?

"There is increasing interest in research on the interconnection between community building (i.e., social capital or collective efficacy) and violence. Based on this research, my sense is there are many natural experiments occurring in communities around the country where community building is contributing to violence prevention and where the erosion of a sense of community is fueling the problem of violence. It would be useful to systematically identify those experiences." -- Joan Serra Hoffman, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

This report lays out a rationale for why it is important to simultaneously engage the two fields of violence prevention and community building, outlines to what extent the fields currently build from similar principles or philosophies and share practices, and explores how perceptions about the fields create impediments to integration. If we believe that community building is essential to violence prevention, and vice versa, then this information provides only a first step in the long road of uncovering how best to nurture cross-field alliances. While this report provides a snapshot of the current state of collaboration between the two fields, in assembling this picture, participants also raised a number of questions that need to be answered to take the next leap forward. The following questions can be used to generate new and deeper discussions about whether and how to build stronger networks and alliances across community building and violence prevention practitioners. The conversations that ensue need to be synthesized, challenged, refined, and disseminated broadly.

1. Are there commonly agreed upon definitions of violence, violence prevention, community and community building? Can standardized definitions be established? If not, where are there points of contention, causing definitions to diverge?
2. Are there commonly agreed upon principles that are shared between the two fields? How do these principles uniformly apply within and across the fields? With what principles is there most convergence and divergence? With what groups of practitioners?
3. Do violence prevention and community building each represent distinct, cohesive fields? How do they operate as cohesive fields? How are they compartmentalized? How do practitioners within each field identify themselves? What does this say about the fields' cohesiveness? What implications does that have for cross-field and within-field integration?
4. How much are community builders aware of violence prevention theories and practice, and vice versa? How can greater awareness be built?
5. Recognizing that all forms of violence are interconnected and stem from the same root causes, how do we move from the focus on individuals to an emphasis on community engagement? How do current grantmaking strategies perpetuate fragmentation? How do current evaluation methodologies do so?
6. How can integration between the two fields be strategically supported? What is the role of grantmakers? Policymakers? Evaluators? Practitioners?
7. What models exist that integrate community building and violence prevention strategies? Do these models address family violence? What are the essential and shared elements of those models? What lessons can be gleaned for communities starting out in these efforts?

Recommended Actions. Following the national strategy meeting, participants had an opportunity to reflect on what they learned at the meeting and recommend ways they could participate in next steps for action. Their suggestions are as follows:

- ◆ **Disseminate information in easily digestible formats.** To appeal to a broader audience, participants felt that the report could be presented in different formats, including a condensed version, handouts, tipsheets, newsletter articles, and on websites. As Camille Carter of the Cocke County Collaborative noted, “The report... should of course be circulated and promulgated, but some tipsheet-style summary of definitions,

contrasts, inter-relations, etc. would be more widely usable. The definitions are extremely valuable—we can't get out of our boxes until we see where the edges really are."

- ◆ **Provide visibility to communities doing this work.** Many participants indicated that the meeting offered an opportunity to learn for the first time about communities who were beginning to effectively integrate community building and violence prevention strategies and to connect with practitioners engaging similar work and facing similar challenges. They want more and new venues for this type of information sharing. As Aimee Thompson, from Close to Home notes, "On the ground, I feel we are making a big effort to integrate family violence prevention in to community building/organizing efforts in Dorchester [Massachusetts]. It would be helpful to get this story told more visibly... [and] to have more support evaluating our effort so we can have a better idea about what is working, what isn't and what kind of impact we are having."
- ◆ **Leverage local and national networks to foster dialogue and increase awareness on how to successfully bridge the two fields.** The participants provided a long list of local, national and international networks to whom they have access and to whom this information would be of interest, including consortia, coalitions, and partnerships encompassing a range of social services providers, community organizers, housing and economic developers, civic institutions, technical assistance providers, researchers, and grassroots organizations. These constituents can be leveraged to support a concerted movement toward integration across the two fields.

To supplement the recommendations outlined above, policymakers, researchers and funders need to work hand-in-hand with practitioners to strategically advance the integration of the two fields of community building and violence prevention. A comprehensive plan must review and disseminate the burgeoning relevant research that explores the efficacy of connecting violence prevention with community building; outline new research questions (including those listed above) and commission projects to answer them; identify communities that represent models of current best practices; encourage innovation and test new community-based models; and advocate for organizational change among violence prevention practitioners and community builders to promote integration within and among the fields.

VI. Appendices

The following items are included as appendices:

- ◆ Appendix A: Case Studies of the Institute for Community Peace and the Family Violence Prevention Fund
- ◆ Appendix B: Key Informant Interview Guide
- ◆ Appendix C: Resources

APPENDIX A: Case Studies

This project represents a collaboration between the Institute for Community Peace (ICP) and the Family Violence Prevention Fund (FVPPF), two national organizations that support work at the community and national levels to explore emerging issues in violence prevention through demonstration and research; build the skills of community collaboratives, technical assistance providers, evaluators, funders and policymakers by offering tools, training, consultation, and information; and educate and advocate for efforts to reframe the public debate on violence and generate more responsible policy and media attention to the issue.

Both organizations have demonstrated leadership and commitment to exploring new models for preventing violence that build grassroots support for and involvement in strategies to effect and maintain change. We recognize that in order to sustain peaceful homes and families, that it is imperative to embrace strategies that foster connections between community building and violence prevention. The following provides a brief overview of the work spearheaded by ICP and FVPPF to that end.

Institute for Community Peace

Begun in 1994 as a collaboration among grantmakers concerned with the escalation of violence in our society, particularly with the involvement of young people, ICP serves as a national resource center for violence prevention. ICP's mission is to promote the development of a safe, healthy and peaceful nation by mobilizing community resources and leadership. We support strategies that emphasize resident engagement, community empowerment and expanded national attention to the range of factors that contribute to and prevent violence.

ICP's focus is on primary violence prevention, meaning we address the root causes of violence, build comprehensive collaborations across multiple disciplines and sectors (including those most affected by violence), engage residents and empower communities, and promote community-driven solutions to foster and sustain peace.

Initially ICP was established to explore, test and model locally-driven efforts designed to demonstrate that violence is, in fact, preventable. Beginning in 1995, ICP began supporting the following pilot communities nationwide to serve as demonstration sites:

- ◆ East Bay Corridor, California
- ◆ Santa Barbara, California
- ◆ Cocke County, East Tennessee
- ◆ Rockford, Illinois
- ◆ New Orleans, Louisiana
- ◆ Flint, Michigan
- ◆ New York, New York
- ◆ Spartanburg, South Carolina

The sites represented a diverse geographic and demographic mix of communities found throughout the country. In support of local control, ICP encouraged sites to identify and prioritize their own violence issues. The resulting initiatives were broad-ranging, focusing on multiple, interconnected forms of violence.

Over time we noticed that each site working independently, developing strikingly similar ways to describe their community's work. We came to understand that the sites were expressing a natural series of what we eventually referred to as developmental stages. The stages were voiced by virtually every collaborative at some point in their development and represent an evolutionary framework for sustaining peace that is based on the principles of community building. The five stages are as follows:

Stage 1: Creating Safety. When we began to work with the local sites, each was mired in violence. Thus the first step in violence prevention was to create both a safe physical and emotional space to stem the crisis. Communities acknowledged the pain and loss, attended to community spirit, provided crisis intervention, and mobilized residents.

Stage 2: Understanding Violence. After communities developed a modicum of safety, which took up to one year or more, they became interested in developing long-term solutions to violence. They wanted to understand why crime and violence occur, where it occurs, who are its victims, and who are its perpetrators. At this point, communities move beyond their emotional responses and gain clarity about violence issues by engaging broader collaborative membership and residents in intensive information gathering.

Stage 3: Building Community. This third stage marks the first step in primary violence prevention. Communities cannot support this stage if they have neglected to create a safe space for their constituents. Having a safe community depends on having a strong, cohesive community. In this stage, residents begin to understand their own power, taking on shared leadership responsibilities and engaging collectively in civic activities. Collaboratives begin to implement programmatic strategies to impact specific forms of violence, engage media campaigns, and build stronger systems.

Stage 4: Promoting Peace. This next stage is marked by greater reflection and deeper insights into the root causes of violence. In this stage, communities consider external influences and the external image of their community. They recognize that while preventing violence is of paramount concern, they need to be equally concerned with replacing the violence with something positive. They begin to concentrate on changing norms that contribute to violence including gender, class and racial biases and power differentials. Hallmarks of this stage include an increased understanding of diverse perspectives, deeper respect for racial, ethnic and class differences, and an intolerance of attitudes that lead to the denigration of any group within the community.

Stage 5: Building Democracy and Social Justice. The final stage is a very advanced stage of collaborative development. Here communities begin to realize the effect of larger societal policies on their ability to sustain peace, and they begin to react to it. Voter registration drives, public education, and advocacy for pro-community policies began to occupy large proportions of community attention. Collaboratives focus on how individuals can exercise their civic rights an obligations and challenge and influence policies that undermine peace.

ICP recognizes that community building, including the engagement and mobilization of residents and creation of broad multi-disciplinary partnerships that support grassroots involvement, is an essential process that moves a community from a point of violent crisis to sustained peace.

Family Violence Prevention Fund

The Family Violence Prevention Fund (Fund) is committed to working in partnership with community organizations to integrate the prevention of violence against women and children into existing community-building initiatives. We recognize that violence prevention cannot be achieved in isolation. And we believe efforts to build community gain in power and effectiveness when they include strategies for preventing violence against women and children.

Violence is not an issue among other issues. It has priority, because it blocks so many other important social agendas. Violent acts against individuals also inflict injuries on the community and its institutions. Those working for educational reform know that children cannot learn when frightened. Those working for economic development know that revitalization is unlikely, when citizens are shadowed by violence and fear both at home and on the street. Housing advocates know that violence is at once a cause and a consequence of homelessness. Artists know how violence deforms our imaginations and impoverishes the narratives through which we know our neighbors and ourselves.

Violence damages every aspect of our common life. Only as communities can we repair the damage and end abuse.

The Fund has much to learn and much to offer. Joining our efforts with those of community-based partners, we work to:

- **Educate** about the impact of violence occurring in individual homes upon the entire community;
- **Enlarge the discourse** about violence against women and children to include men and boys;
- **Develop leadership** on the issues of violence against women and children; and
- **Sustain the work** over time by developing dependable funding streams.

Current Approaches

The Fund has a long history of designing programming to address violence against women and children locally, nationally, and internationally. Our current programs afford examples of the sorts of work we intend to do on a broader scale through this initiative.

Coalition Building. The Fund positioned the issue of violence against women as a central element of our Immigrant Rights program. The strategies we developed with collaborating organizations and institutions resulted in far-reaching public policy victories, such as the protections for immigrant women in the Federal Violence Against Women Act. Community building, leadership development and collaborative work can lead to effective public policy change.

Building Community Awareness. Public education is a necessary condition for meaningful change. An example is *It's Your Business*, a Fund national public education campaign designed to raise awareness in African American communities about the nature of violent relationships and the roles that community members can play in combating them. The Fund reverse-engineered the effort by partnering with a local community health clinic in a predominantly African American neighborhood. The Fund provided its advocacy, technical assistance and community alliance-building capacity to our partners. Drawing upon lessons the Fund learned in developing the national campaign, the local partnership organized an on-going series of community meetings, rallies, and other public occasions that continue to reinforce the anti-violence message.

Developing Leadership. Increasing the capacity of individuals and communities to advocate for themselves is essential to effective, sustainable change. Effective advocacy requires that the population being served understands its rights and has the tools to stand up for those rights. The Fund provides support and training for community members, and it helps create forums for indigenous leaders to advocate on behalf of their communities. The Fund has done leadership development with rural women in El Paso and Iowa. Now the lessons learned from these sites are being applied in Kentucky, Alabama, Hawaii and Alaska.

Sustaining the Work. Community-based programming cannot survive over the long-term without dependable sources of funding. The Fund's California Clinic Collaborative is a model of sustainable programming. Designed to help twenty community health clinics in California improve their response to violence, the program has resulted in a cohesive network of health advocates who promote the importance of violence prevention strategies among policy makers. The clinics that comprise this network have benefited from "pass-through" funding by the Fund. Also, the Fund has worked to make screening for violence a billable service so that clinics can both serve their patients better and be compensated for it – a policy change with national implications.

Extending the Fund's Community-Building Reach

The Family Violence Prevention Fund has a long history of working with grassroots organizations dedicated to preventing violence against women and children – providing them with support, materials, and leadership development. As the examples above suggest, it has also on occasion worked on issues of violence with community organizations and institutions that are not primarily focused on violence but rather on the rights of immigrants, for example, or public health.

The Fund now intends to be more strategic about establishing collaborative relationships with grassroots organizations working on a range of community issues: economic revitalization, affordable housing, public safety, health care, and so on. Our role, as we understand it, is to lend support to their efforts by providing tools to help them make prevention of violence against women and children an integral part of their work. In the process, our understanding and practice are continuously enriched by what we learn from our grassroots partners, as we work together toward the ultimate goal of building a broad-based human rights movement grounded in nonviolence and dedicated to social justice.

The essence of nonviolence is what Gandhi called *the constructive program*: the practical work of repairing the world at the local level. The Fund is committed to nurturing strong collaborative relationships with those engaged in such work on the ground. Stitch by stitch, we are working to weave the prevention of violence against women and children through the social reform fabric.

APPENDIX B: Key Informant Interview Guide

The following are the primary questions that guided the key informant interviews. Follow-up questions were asked as needed to clarify and expand responses. The interviews took approximately 45 minutes to complete, on average, and were conducted over the telephone. Some participants submitted responses in writing.

1. Please start by telling me a little bit about your background and your specific role or experience in community building and/or violence prevention.
2. How do you define violence prevention, and what are its key principles?
3. Name three principles or core values of violence prevention that lend themselves easily to community building efforts.
4. How do you define community building, and what are its key principles?
5. Name three principles or core values of community building that you feel lend themselves easily to violence prevention efforts.
6. When you think of using community-building strategies to prevent violence, do you think of it as more effective with certain types of violence?
7. What, in your view, are the benefits and challenges of the cross-fertilization of the fields of violence prevention and community building?
8. What, in your view, are some possible opportunities and strategies that would facilitate more effective collaboration between the two fields, both locally and nationally?
9. How do you see social, economic and racial justice fitting into both community building and violence prevention efforts?
10. Do you know some examples where the cross-fertilization of community building and violence prevention has worked and where it hasn't?
11. How do you keep current in the two fields of violence prevention and community building? What publications or resources did you rely on? Who do you think are the leaders in the field?

APPENDIX C: Resources

Aspen Institute *Voices from the Field: Reflections on Comprehensive Community Change*

Family Violence Prevention Fund, *Preventing Family Violence: Community Engagement Makes the Difference*, September 2002..

Krug, E.G. et al., eds. *World report on violence and health*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2002.

Institute for Community Peace (formerly the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention),
Case Studies:

- *The Neighborhood Violence Prevention Collaborative*, Flint, Michigan
- *CONTACT Council*, Newport, Tennessee
- *Violence Prevention Collaborative*, Rockford, Illinois
- *Pro-Youth Coalition*, Santa Barbara, California
- *East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership*, Oakland, California