



Evaluation readiness, program  
quality and outcomes in men's  
behaviour change programs

## Recommendations

ANROWS

AUSTRALIA'S NATIONAL RESEARCH  
ORGANISATION FOR WOMEN'S SAFETY  
*to Reduce Violence against Women & their Children*



# Recommendations

1. Program providers should be supported to give more attention to their program's theory of change, including the development of program logic models.
2. Program logic models should consider systems-level, individual-level and (if appropriate) community-level impacts and outcomes.
3. Program providers should be supported to implement processes that monitor and improve program integrity and fidelity – but not in a way that leads to rigid, over-manualised approaches.
4. The development of minimum standards, at the current time, should be based on (sufficiently detailed, articulated and nuanced) practice principles rather than practice prescriptions.
5. Minimum standards should focus as much on an organisation's capacity to safely and sustainably provide a range of specialist perpetrator interventions as on the specifics of any particular program run.
6. Accreditation systems based on monitoring program provider compliance with minimum standards need to be multi-component rather than singular 'tick and flick' registration processes, and include observations of live practice.





**7. Accreditation systems should be constructed and enacted in ways that support program providers to reflect upon and improve the quality of their practice in line with agency-level vision and ethos – not only as a means to monitor adherence to standards.**

**8. Safety and accountability planning should be prioritised in sector and practice development efforts as a potentially high impact way to improve the quality and effectiveness of MBCP provision.**

**9. If calls are to continue for community-based MBCP providers to adopt RNR and other principles to tailor their programs to individual perpetrator and family circumstances, they need to be funded and equipped to do so.**

**10. A national, MBCP outcomes framework should be developed to engender some consistency in evaluation frameworks and evaluation activity, and to help build the evidence base.**

**11. Program providers should be supported to extend their program logic models into evaluation and performance monitoring plans, even if not all aspects of the plan can immediately be implemented.**

**12. Australian jurisdictions should consider shared work to develop the equivalent of the European Project Impact outcome evaluation tools and researcher-practitioner partnerships.**



**13. A suite of outcome evaluation tools should include victim-centred measures that focus on exposure to coercive control.**

**14. Evaluation plans should include measures of impacts on adult and child victims that do not rely on changes in the perpetrator's behaviour.**

**15. Proximal measures of the impact of MBCPs offer considerable promise to guide clinical and program evaluation efforts, but work in this area needs to be embedded within a research and evaluation stream that is adequately resourced.**

**16. Research to identify quality practice in partner support and safety work is urgently needed.**

**17. Partner support and safety work needs to be properly funded and prioritised, rather than remaining secondary relative to resources allocated to engaging perpetrators.**