

# Promoting Excellence in Prevention Award

## Guidance to Nominee(s)/Submitters

Period of Performance	Submittal Due Date
October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022	February 3, 2023 to HQMC SAPR

### About the Award

Each year DoD SAPRO sponsors recognition for an individual (military or civilian), group, or unit from each Military Service, component, or organization, to include Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) detachments, for their work in promoting excellence in the prevention of sexual assault.

Prevention activities, including policies, programs, or practices, at any level of the organization are eligible activities.<sup>1</sup> Prevention activities focus on teaching healthy skills and creating safe and supportive environments that stop sexual assault and contributing factors from occurring in the first place. Efforts to build collaborative relationships are highly encouraged as well. However, stand-alone awareness-raising activities (e.g., fun runs, obstacle courses, walk-a-mile, marches, mobile applications that only provide information) executed outside of a comprehensive prevention strategy are not considered sufficient to prevent sexual assault and, as such, are not in keeping with the intent of this award. This award will recognize those who have undertaken significant efforts (underway or completed), leading to demonstrable outcomes or helpful changes within their sphere of influence [military service academy, reserve officer training corps detachment, installation/base, unit, organization, ship, deployed environment, reserve component, or a state (for National Guard personnel on Title 32 status)].

Each Service SAPR office will internally select one overall nominee from their Service for a maximum of six awards and citations:

- Army
- Marine Corps
- Navy
- Air Force
- Space Force
- National Guard
- Coast Guard

Service SAPR offices are not required to submit nominations for the award, if they choose not to do so.

### Nominee and Eligibility Requirements

The nominee and prevention activity must meet the minimum eligibility requirements laid out below.

---

<sup>1</sup> As illustration: As part of a comprehensive prevention strategy, primary prevention efforts can take the form of a local policy (e.g., alcohol policies), program (e.g., healthy relationship curricula), or practice (e.g., friends using an app to check in with each other when attending a bar/party).

- The military components listed above are the only entities that may submit the nominee for an individual or group award.
- Each military component may only nominate one final individual or group (maximum of six individuals per group)
- Anonymous nominations are not accepted.
- The nominees must be military members or federal government civilians. Contractor personnel are not eligible.
- The nominee's prevention activity must have been implemented within the award period from 1 October 2021 to 30 September 2022. If a nominee executes a permanent change of station or is transferred, the military component or organization headquarters may still consider that nomination based on the award period.
- The nominee(s) must have no disciplinary action in the two years preceding the award period. Anyone with a conviction, non-judicial punishment, or punitive administrative action for sex-related offenses is not eligible.
- The activity, nominee or his/her involvement must not:
  - Violate UCMJ or DoD policy;
  - Contradict DoD or SAPRO's strategic messaging;
  - Violate victim or Service Member rights, to include rights of the accused;
  - Harm victims or Service Members;
  - Create or be perceived as creating undue or illegal command influence;
  - Negatively impact the military justice process or activities therein (as determined by the DoD Office of General Counsel, the Service Judge Advocates General or their representatives); or
  - Undermine the Chain of Command.

### **Selection Criteria**

The nomination must address the nominee's efforts in a variety of prevention domains, to include capacity building, collaboration and partnership development, use of evidence-based efforts, and evaluation methods. (See Appendix A for selected sources for information on the Selection Criteria.) The nomination must address efforts in each of the areas identified on the attached nomination template. In situations where the nominee lacks extensive detail on activities in an area (due to timing, budget, lack of appropriate examples, etc.), the submittal should identify those gaps and discuss how the gaps might be overcome should the activity be implemented/repeated elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As illustration, the nominated activity might be a prevention program within a university ROTC detachment. Using the topic of collaboration (Criteria D) as an example, perhaps that ROTC unit did not collaborate with those at the university also involved in prevention. That lack of collaboration could be a gap and might have happened for many reasons, such as timing or lack of support by the university. If implemented again or elsewhere, the nominee might include a recommendation that this ROTC-university collaboration be an integral part of the planning process.

- Biographies – single-spaced biographies of all nominated team members (not to exceed one page for each team member)
- Citation – a citation, not to exceed 14 lines, highlighting the nominee's accomplishments. The citation may focus on 1-2 criteria that the nominee did exceptionally well at. For example, collaboration and evaluation.
- Nominations require 06/GS15 level endorsement.

As noted above, templates for each of the aforementioned components of the nomination package are included in Appendix B. Example/sample text is also included where appropriate. Please ensure that nominations conform to the elements outlined in the nomination submission package.

### **Award Review and Announcement Process**

The award review and announcement process will move through the following steps:

1. Service SAPR offices will review their respective nomination packages and set their own internal notifications and schedule to receive and review submissions in order to select an award nominee.
2. DoD SAPRO will review final nominations to ensure compliance with issued guidance, then, upon approval, develop and coordinate citations for signature.
3. DoD SAPRO will purchase the award trophies. (For individual nominations, one trophy is awarded. For groups, one trophy is awarded unless the organization is geographically separated, in which case one trophy per location is awarded.)
4. When final review is complete, DoD SAPRO will coordinate with Service SAPR offices to disseminate the award citations and trophies.
5. DoD SAPRO will develop a DoD News Story announcing the winners of the awards. The News Story may be released in January (or thereafter as determined by DoD SAPRO) after ensuring all internal Service notifications have been completed.
6. DoD SAPRO may share photographs, videos, media material, and/or sound recording for general use with the press and/or post information on electronic outlets.
7. Pending availability of funds and DoD Travel policy, nominees will be invited to Washington, DC to participate in a recognition ceremony, senior leader discussions and capacity building events.

Scoring criteria for the award are included in Appendix C. The objective scoring criteria may be helpful in determining whether one activity within your Service should be prioritized over another, particularly in cases where multiple nominations are being considered. These criteria also will be used by DoD SAPRO to ensure that all nominations align with the guidance as outlined in this document.

### **Point of Contact**

The Service SAPR office should be contacted for Service-specific guidance on submitting a nomination. For questions concerning the guidelines outlined herein, contact [SMB.Manpower.SAPR@usmc.mil](mailto:SMB.Manpower.SAPR@usmc.mil).

## Appendix A Selected Sources for More Information on Criteria

The terms and concepts outlined in the *Promoting Excellence in Prevention* awards narrative may be unfamiliar. Selected references to assist in aligning terms and concepts with the selection criteria are outlined below.

As a source for additional background information, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) offers numerous resources to learn more about designing, implementing, and assessing efforts in the violence prevention arena. For more information, visit:

<http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/index.html> or  
<https://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/sexual-violence>.

### **A. Brief description of the prevention activity being nominated.**

To be able to fairly assess the submittal, the reviewer needs to have a clear idea of the prevention activity and the specific problem the activity is addressing; that is "Which problem did we target and why?" Why is/was this activity undertaken? What might have happened had this problem not been addressed? The resource below offers helpful tips and questions to consider in laying out the overarching problem statement so the reader has a clear sense of the "who" and "what" involved in the activity.

- [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDCynergy Lite: Social Marketing Made Easy \(August 2010\). \(See pages 7-13 for tips on how to describe ideas behind the activity.\)](#)

### **B. Rationale for why the activity was implemented to prevent sexual assault**

In this section of the submittal, it will be important to discuss if the activity was based on an existing program, and if so, what is the "evidence" or research existing on that effort. To understand what constitutes evidence or research, please review the CDC document below, which provides a common language and approach for considering various types of research.

- [Puddy, R. W. & Wilkins, N. \(2011\). Understanding Evidence Part 1: Best Available Research Evidence. A Guide to the Continuum of Evidence of Effectiveness. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, pg. 3](#)

### **C. Describe how the prevention activity addressed risk and/or protective factors**

Identify the main risk and/or protective factors targeted and how the activity was designed to address them. To better understand the risk and protective factors for sexual violence, please refer to the following materials:

- Primary reading:
  - [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Prevention Institute. \(July 2014\). Connecting the Dots: An Overview of the Links among Multiple Forms of Violence.](#)
- Supporting reading:
  - [Teten, Tharp, A., DeGue, S., Valle, L.A., Matjasko, J, Massetti, G.M., & Brookmeyer, K. \(2013\). A Systematic Qualitative Review of Risk and Protective Factors for Sexual Violence Perpetration. 14, 133-167.](#)
  - [Gold, M. \(2016\). Stages of Change. Psych Central.](#)

#### **D. Identify any collaboration used in the prevention activity**

Collaboration can take a variety of forms depending on the issue, level of desired interaction, time available, etc. Please review the resource listed below for a clear understanding of the attributes of collaboration, and the associated levels of involvement and expectation:

- [Mashek, D., Nanfita, M. People, Tools, and Processes that Build Collaborative Capacity. \(November 2015\). \(See definitions on pg. 1\)](#)

To get a sense of how various groups could work together in the public health space (and how that interaction could be measured), please review the documents below:

- [Cohen, L., Aboelata, M., Gantz, T., Van Wert, J. \(2003\) Collaboration Math: Enhancing the Effectiveness of Multidisciplinary Collaboration. Prevention Institute.](#)
- [Prevention Institute \(2014\). A Multi-Sector Approach to Preventing Violence. http](#)

#### **E. Describe how the activity is being evaluated and describe the impact the activity will have on preventing sexual assault before it occurs**

In order to evaluate or assess the prevention activity, it is important to develop an understanding of evaluation plans or frameworks and to include these plans in prevention activities at the outset. The CDC and others have developed a variety of tools and guides, such as those listed below, to aid in understanding how a program might be evaluated from the perspective of both performance (i.e., program evaluation) and effectiveness (i.e., outcome evaluation):

- [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. \(2005\). Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health Programs: A self-study guide.](#)
- [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. \(2011\). Developing an Effective Evaluation Plan.](#)
- [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. \(2013\). Building Our Understanding: Key Concepts of Evaluation - What is it and how do you do it?](#)

**Appendix B  
Nomination Submission Package Templates**

**Checklist of Materials**

	<b>Document</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
	<b>Contact information for nominee(s)</b>	Provide the full name, title, affiliation, office/ mailing address, phone number and e-mail address of nominee(s)	
	<b>Contact information for submitter</b>	Provide the full name, title, affiliation, office/ mailing address, phone number and e-mail address of submitter	
	<b>Nomination template</b>	Provide as much detail as possible on each of the elements in the attached template.	
	<b>Biographies of nominee(s)</b>	Include single-spaced biographies of nominee(s) - not to exceed one page for each nominee	
	<b>Citation</b>	Include recommended citation, not to exceed 12 lines, highlighting accomplishments	

**Contact Information for Nominee(s)**

<b>Contact information for nominee(s).</b>	
<b>Full name of nominee 1</b>	
<b>Title &amp; affiliation of nominee 1</b>	
<b>Office address of nominee 1</b>	
<b>Phone number of nominee 1</b>	
<b>Email address of nominee 1</b>	
<b>Full name of nominee 2</b>	
<b>Title &amp; affiliation of nominee 2</b>	
<b>Office address of nominee 2</b>	
<b>Phone number of nominee 2</b>	
<b>Email address of nominee 2</b>	
<b>Full name of nominee 3</b>	
<b>Title &amp; affiliation of nominee 3</b>	
<b>Office address of nominee 3</b>	
<b>Phone number of nominee 3</b>	
<b>Email address of nominee 3</b>	

*\*NOTE: Please add lines for additional nominees, as needed.*

**Contact Information for Submitter**

<b>Contact information of submitter</b>	
<b>Full name of submitter</b>	
<b>Title &amp; affiliation of submitter</b>	
<b>Office address of submitter</b>	
<b>Phone number of submitter</b>	
<b>Email address of submitter</b>	



### Nomination Template

Establishing an organization that is optimized to support and sustain the development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive sexual assault prevention approach can be a long-term undertaking. As such, the Department has identified and prioritized actions to take related to each system element and step in the prevention process. The *Promoting Excellence in Prevention Award* focuses on activities that are used in support of a comprehensive approach to prevent sexual assault.

**A. Brief description of the prevention activity being nominated.** *Please provide a brief description of the activity being nominated and indicate why it should receive the award. Include the current status of the activity and the target population. How does this activity fit within sexual assault prevention efforts as a whole?*

**B. Rationale for why the activity was implemented to prevent sexual assault.** *Please provide information on WHY the activity is being implemented (e.g., is it addressing a particular need in the military community). What are/were the goals of the activity (broad statements about what the activity will accomplish)? Was the activity adapted or adopted from a civilian, non-military environment or another DoD community? Was there existing evidence or research to suggest this activity had been successful elsewhere or used for preventing another type of violence/problem behavior (e.g., suicide)?*

**C. Describe how the prevention activity addressed risk and/or protective factors.** *What is the context in which the activity is taking place? What risk/protective factors did you expect to impact based on the activity? What specific risk factors did it aim to decrease or what protective factors did it aim to enhance?*

**D. Identify any collaboration used in the prevention activity.** *Who was involved in the development and implementation of the activity? Please provide information on any internal (to the military community) and external (to the military community) groups/entities who were involved in the development and implementation of the activity.*

**E. Describe how the activity is being evaluated and describe the impact the activity will have on preventing sexual assault before it occurs.** *What changes are expected (or were observed) in the target population based on implementation of the activity? What measures of performance (MoPs) and/or measures of effectiveness (MoEs) were used? For example, MoPs could include how well the activity was planned and delivered to the target audience, both of which could be reflections of "performance". MoEs help assess if the activity has had an impact on the audience or a change in behavior and/or attitude. Any activity being nominated should have at least a process evaluation (MoPs) or an outcome evaluation (MoEs) associated with it.*

**F. Other notable information about the activity.** *Please include information about challenges encountered during implementation of the activity and how they were overcome. Describe other notable information not provided elsewhere.*

**Biography of Nominee(s)**

***Please include biographies of all included nominee(s). Do not exceed 1 single-spaced page per nominee.***

## Citation

***Please include the recommendation citation for the nominee(s). Do not exceed 14 lines, highlighting the nominee's accomplishments. The citation may focus on 1-2 criteria that the nominee did exceptionally well at. For example, collaboration and evaluation. A sample citation is included below.***

### *Sample*

Master Sergeant John Doe demonstrated exceptional effort to strengthen sexual assault prevention for the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program at the 377<sup>th</sup> Air Base Wing, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico from October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2012. In order to engage men as allies in sexual assault prevention, Master Sergeant Doe adapted and implemented a research-based civilian program designed to improve bystander behavior, healthy gender norms, and decrease perpetration. Follow-up surveys at 6 months found that 75% of men who participated in the program reported changes in their acceptance of sexist attitudes and improvements in their willingness to intervene. This innovative initiative supports the DoD's goal to build and sustain a system that prevents sexual assault. Master Sergeant Doe's actions reflect great credit upon himself, the United States Air Force, and the Department of Defense.

### **Citation:**

### Appendix C Scoring Criteria

**1. Overall Quality of the Nomination:** The quality of the nomination is of utmost importance. Nominees and submitters should prepare their nominations with care, assuring that the reviewer understands the background of the issue(s) and the objectives of the activity. The nomination must show the prevention implications of the activity and how the activity will (or has the potential to) advance the field of sexual assault prevention.

0	1	2
The nomination is limited in details. Some components of the nomination are not included or are of poor quality.	The quality of the nomination is good but lacks details that could help in better understanding some parts of the activity. Some components of the nomination are not included or need additional work to improve clarity and conciseness.	The overall quality of the nomination is outstanding. The activity and its objectives are clearly described and in a concise manner. All necessary components of the nomination are included.

**2. Novelty and Potential Contribution of the Activity:** Does the nomination demonstrate that the activity is innovative or present a new topic or application for sexual assault prevention in the military? Does the nomination present a significant contribution to the field? Does the nomination clearly state how the activity will contribute to the development of knowledge for the military on sexual assault prevention?

0	1	2
The nomination is limited in details. It is unclear whether or how the activity will prevent sexual assault in the military community. The activity focuses on response outcomes and not on prevention.	The nomination lacks details to clearly outline the potential contribution of the activity on sexual assault prevention in the military community.	The nomination demonstrates that the activity has the potential to substantively impact sexual assault prevention in the military community.

**3. Description of the Activity and Rationale:** Is the description of the activity clear and concise? Does the description of the activity include the activity's current status and population of focus? Is the focus of the nomination and its relevance to sexual assault prevention clearly stated?

0	1	2
Limited details are provided on the activity or the rationale for developing/ implementing the activity in a military community or the rationale focuses on something that occurs after a sexual assault has occurred.	Although some details are provided on the activity and its rationale, gaps still remain and questions unanswered. For example, the target population or the goals of the activity may be unclear.	The description and rationale for the activity are clear and concise. The nomination clearly states why the activity is being implemented and the potential impact on the military community.

**4. Context of the Activity/Risk and Protective Factors Targeted:** Does the nomination clearly state the context where the activity is occurring? What risk/protective factors were the focus of the activity? What specific risk factors did it aim to decrease or what protective factors did it aim to enhance?

0	1	2
The nomination provides limited details on the context of the prevention activity. No details are provided on specific risk and protective factors to be targeted with the activity.	Some details are provided on the context of the activity but questions still remain as to the specific risk and protective factors to be targeted with the activity.	The nomination clearly states the context of the activity. The specific risk and protective factors for the activity are articulated, and it is clear how these are being addressed with the activity.

**5. Collaboration:** Who was involved in development and implementation of the activity? Were any groups/entities internal or external to the military community involved? If yes, what were the roles of each of the collaborators?

0	1	2
It is unclear whether collaboration was used in development and implementation of the activity. The nomination does not provide details addressing collaboration.	Some details are provided on the role of collaboration in the activity; however, there is some concern about roles of those involved, as limited details are provided.	The nomination clearly states the role of collaboration in the development and implementation of the activity. Roles and responsibilities of those involved are clearly articulated.

**6. Expected Outcomes/Describe the Impact:** What are the changes anticipated after implementation of the activity (both in the short- and long-term)? What risk and protective factors are expected to be impacted? Are these changes clearly articulated? Are the changes expected reasonable? For example, it is unlikely that changes in sexual assault will occur immediately (or be observable in a small population); however, changes may be observed in specific contributing factors or in specific behaviors targeted by prevention programming such as bystander behavior and alcohol use.

0	1	2
The nomination provides no or limited details on expected outcomes related to the activity. The expected outcomes may not be feasible with the activity.	Some details are provided on the expected outcomes; however, it is unclear how the activity will impact these outcomes.	The nomination clearly states what changes are anticipated as a result of the activity in both the short- and long-term. The expected outcomes appear to be feasible based on the description of the activity.

**7. Evaluation:** Is an evaluation of the activity being conducted? Are details about the evaluation clear and concise? Are the data sources clearly specified? Is the evaluation appropriate to the activity being implemented?

0	1	2
The nomination does not include information to indicate	No evaluation is taking place (and that is clearly articulated) or the details of	The nomination clearly states that an evaluation of the activity is being conducted.

DoD SAPRO - Promoting Excellence in Prevention Award

whether or not an evaluation is taking place.	the evaluation are unclear or of limited detail.	The details of the evaluation are clear and concise, with data sources clearly specified.
---	--	---