

# **2014 Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Policies and Programs Task Force**

## **TASK FORCE CO-CHAIRS**

**Faculty Co-Chairs: NiCole T. Buchanan and Sheryl Kubiak**

**Staff Co-Chairs: Tonya Jamison and Sheryl Shay**

**Student Co-Chairs: Megan Crawford and Emily Nichols**

## **MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE COMMITTEE**

**April 6, 2015**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2014 President Simon appointed a new Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence to review and assess the implementation of the recommendations from 2004 and to suggest ‘next steps’. Since the 2004 Task Force delivered its recommendations to MSU administrators, there have been many positive changes on campus. However, it is important to note that since 2004, the national climate regarding sexual assault and relationship violence has changed. Changes to Title IX, particularly the investigatory role of the Title IX Coordinator regarding campus sexual and relational violence, have required substantial changes to MSU’s policies and procedures. These new policies provide a backdrop to the current assessment by the 2014 Task Force and were considered as we reviewed and updated the proposed recommendations and next steps. During its review, the 2014 Task Force found that many of the 2004 recommendations were implemented, partially implemented or recently initiated, as suggested. On the following pages, the report outlines many recommendations that will progress MSU’s goals in addressing campus sexual misconduct and relationship violence. Below are the overarching recommendations that the Task Force considers to be the most important ‘next steps.’

- 1) **Climate survey/committee.** The 2004 Task Force recommended an assessment of all data collection efforts at the university and suggested integrating a campus climate survey related to sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV). The 2014 Task Force Survey Sub-committee reviewed campus data sources, such as the biannual National College Health Assessment, and discovered that several critical variables related to campus SA and RV climate were not assessed. To address these needs, a climate survey offered by the AAU will be conducted in April 2015 and an alternative survey will be offered in the fall of 2015. Results from these surveys should be shared with campus experts and the findings should be compared across surveys in order to create a plan for a regularly administered survey to assess change over time and identify campus needs.
- 2) **Choose Evidence Based Practices that best meet the specific needs of MSU’s campus.** Using climate survey data, identify the greatest campus needs and related evidence based practices. Implementation of these evidenced based practices should follow rigorous methods and their results evaluated. A ‘kick off’ summit to share the data and to bring experts in to discuss the EBPs is recommended as a mechanism to broaden awareness and collaboration.
- 3) **Support campus service/program staff.** In 2004 the Task Force forewarned of increasing demand for support services and recommended enhancing the financial support of these programs. Data indicates that there has been a significant increase in service demands and lengthy wait lists for survivors. It is critical that sufficient funding and staffing be provided to bridge the gap between the need for services and the capacity to fill these needs.
- 4) **Appointment of a ‘President’s Council’ that engages in, and provides oversight for, a strategic planning/visioning process.** There are two major distinctions between campus activities surrounding SA and RV: investigation/sanction and prevention/treatment. Although these functions can and should be in separate ‘silos’, the campus wide efforts should be coordinated and integrated through this council. Although the new mandate of the Title IX Coordinators is relatively clear, inclusive visioning and greater synergy across all relevant SA and RV programs and units is needed.

## **2014 University Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence**

### **Faculty Co-Chairs**

*NiCole T. Buchanan*, Department of Psychology

*Sheryl Kubiak*, School of Social Work

### **Staff Co-Chairs**

*Tonya Jamison*, Regulatory Affairs

*Sheryl Shay*, Infrastructure, Planning and Facilities

### **Student Co-Chairs**

*Megan Crawford* (Undergraduate)

*Femi Oluyedun* (Graduate)

*Emily Nichols*, Research Assistant, Department of Human Development and Family Studies

*Rebecca Campbell*, **Special Advisor to the Committee**, Department of Psychology

### **Task Force Support**

*Paulette Granberry Russell*, Title IX Coordinator, Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity

*Jessica Garcia*, Specialist, Intercultural Education and Development

*Justin Williams*, MSU College of Law School Extern

### **MEMBERS**

Alliance of Queer and Ally Students, *Shay Bradford*

Associated Students of MSU, *Greg Jackson*

College of Law, *Connell Alsup*

Council of Graduate Students, *Nadeeka Karunaratne*

Greek Organizations, *Alex Haddad* and *Davina James*

Intercollegiate Athletics, *Alan Haller*

International Studies and Programs, *Liz Matthews*

Liaison to the Council of Racial and Ethnic Students, *Monica Yuk*

Military Science, *Jeffrey Winston* (alternates *Wil McFadden* and *Emmett Richardson Jr.*)

MSU Police Department, *Val O'Brien*

MSU Safe Place, *Holly Rosen*

Residence Hall Association, *Marideth Tschirhart*

Residential & Hospitality Services/Residence Education & Housing Services, *Mackenzie Fritz*

SARV Prevention Program, *Kelly Schweda*

Sexual Assault Program, *Shari Murgittroyd*

Student Affairs and Services, *Aislinn Sapp*

Student Life, *Rick Shafer*

### **Ex Officio Members**

East Lansing Community Liaison/Governmental Affairs, *Janet Lillie* and *Suchitra Webster*

Human Resources, *Kathy Elliott* and *Melanie Trowbridge*

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research, *Karen Clark*

LGBT Resource Center, *Dee Hurlbert*

Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives, *Amanda Garcia-Williams* and *Lynn Lammers*  
(alternate *Rashida Harrison*)

Office of the General Counsel, *Kristine Zayko*

Olin Health Center, *Dennis Martell*

Recreational Sports and Fitness Services, *Angela Michael*

Women's Resource Center, *Jayne Schuiteman*

## Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Charge 1	7
Charge 2	17
Charge 3	19
Charge 4	25
References	30

Appendix A  
Appendix B  
Appendix C

## **Introduction**

In 2004, Michigan State University assembled a university Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence comprised of faculty, staff, and students to conduct a comprehensive analysis of programs and resources available to members of the MSU community and generate a list of recommendations, rooted in best practices, to pursue. Specifically, the 2004 Task Force was charged with doing the following:

- 1) Provide a comprehensive list of best practices for reducing incidents of sexual assault and relationship violence.
- 2) Conduct an environmental scan of MSU and indicate which activities/programs currently in operation reflect best practices for reducing incidents of sexual assault and relationship violence.
- 3) Comment on how greater synergy could be achieved among existing programs on campus and how these programs can be a part of a strategic initiative to better serve and inform the community regarding sexual assault and relationship violence.
- 4) Recommend, where applicable, additional cost effective best practices that have a high probability of reducing the occurrence of sexual assault and relationship violence on campus. Particular focus should be placed on the areas of prevention, education, communication and physical environment.
- 5) Give us your ideas on what would be the markers/indicators of a successful campus-wide sexual assault and relationship violence program.

The 2004 Task Force completed its report in April of 2005 generating a list of ten recommendations addressing sexual assault and relationship violence on campus.

In 2014, ten years after this report was generated, President Lou Anna K. Simon requested that a new Task Force be created to determine the progress made around the issue of sexual assault and relationship violence and to ensure that policies and resources on campus adhere to guidelines and criteria outlined by the White House Task Force on Sexual Assault, amendments to the Violence Against Women Act, and the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights (OCR).

Members of the 2014 Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship were identified by the Title IX Coordinator, Paulette Granberry Russell, and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Services, Denise Maybank, for their roles in the work around this issue and reflect the various constituencies of the University: students, staff, and faculty.

The 2014 Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence was charged with addressing the following issues:

1. Conduct a review of the 2004 Task Force Report and assess whether our efforts over the last 10 years align with the recommendations of the Task Force, and identify where they do, do not, are different or exceed the 2004 Task Force recommendations.
2. Comment on how greater synergy could be achieved among existing programs on campus or off campus and how these programs can be part of a comprehensive strategy to better service and inform the campus community regarding sexual violence, sexual assault, relationship violence, domestic violence, and stalking.
3. Based on a comprehensive view of MSU's current policies, programs, and initiatives, recommend additional EBP that have a high probability of increasing reporting of relationship and sexual misconduct on-campus (and off-campus involving MSU students). In addition, recommend best practices related to education for 'first responders' on campus who initially receive a report of relationship violence and sexual misconduct.
4. Recommend evidence-based practices (EBPs) that are likely to reduce the occurrence of relationship violence and sexual misconduct on campus (and off-campus involving MSU students). Particular attention should be given to the areas of prevention (e.g. awareness-raising campaigns) and education.

Comment on what metrics of successful prevention and education efforts, including on-line climate surveys—federally mandated and university supplemental surveys that should be used to measure success.

The Task Force met collectively five times between the months of November 2014 and February 2015 to discuss progress, efforts, collaborations, and obstacles related to addressing sexual assault and relationship violence in the MSU community. During these meetings, several members presented briefings to highlight the work of their units and data collected since 2004 as they relate to the charges. Briefings included:

- Val O'Brien, MSU Police Department
- Kristine Zayko, MSU General Counsel
- Amanda Garcia-Williams, Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives
- Rick Shafer, Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution, Student Life
- Shari Murgittroyd, Counseling Center, Sexual Assault Program
- Kelly Schweda, Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence (SARV) Prevention Program
- Holly Rosen, MSU Safe Place
- Juli Liebler and Jeff Murphy, East Lansing Police Department

In addition to these units, Dennis Martell of the MSU Student Health Center provided a review of the longitudinal data from the State of Spartan Health: Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence survey, Aislinn Sapp of Student Affairs and Services gave a presentation on the neurobiology of trauma, and Rebecca Campbell, Professor of Psychology, presented on the experiences of sexual assault victims seeking help.

In order to organize a more fluid process of analysis, the Title IX Coordinator, Paulette Granberry Russell, appointed co-chairs within the Task Force to represent students, staff, and faculty. The co-chairs met independently of the larger Task Force throughout the six-month period to identify next steps, consolidate information, and ultimately to draft this report. Members of the Task Force were asked to submit independent summaries of the practices and services provided through their unit to the co-chairs. In the final stages of this review, the co-chairs divided the Task Force into four subgroups to help synthesize materials from the briefings, presentations, and summaries to align with the four charges. These subgroups included members with expertise in each area while representing diversity across programs and units. The co-chairs then used the information from these subcommittee reports to draft this final document.

**CHARGE #1: Conduct a review of the 2004 Task Force Report and assess whether our efforts over the last 10 years align with the recommendations of the Task Force, and identify where they do, do not, are different or exceed the 2004 Task Force recommendations.**

*The 2004 Task Force recommendations are provided below with an update on progress made over the past 10 years and suggestions to help the university progress toward meeting the spirit of the 2004 recommendations. Our review of the 2004 recommendations focused primarily on activities that were complete as of 12/31/14. Please note that many of the recommendations are almost identical to the original recommendations because the 2014 Task Force agrees that they continue to be needed for MSU to reach its full potential as a leader on SA and RV among comparable institutions.*

**2004 Recommendation 1: Create a new unit or program within an existing MSU unit to be charged with: coordinating existing program services, creating sexual assault and relationship violence policies and procedures, coordinating media and advertising, developing and maintaining a single point of access, and implementing new educational outreach efforts with students.**

There is a wide array of SA and RV services and programs available at MSU (see Charge 2 for more information). However, at this time, there is no single unit responsible for their coordination at MSU. For example, the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (I3) is providing e-learning to students, faculty and staff and is responsible for the implementation of Title IX and all reporting and investigation efforts on behalf of the university. Policy creation is primarily the responsibility of the Office of General Counsel. There are many additional programs and services depending on individual needs, such as the Sexual Assault Program, Safe Place, Student Life, MSU Police Department, and the SARV Prevention Program, which also provides SA and RV education for students, staff and faculty. Finally, outreach education efforts come from several units and student groups that are not centrally coordinated.

The 2014 Task Force agrees that this goal continues to be important, relevant, and aligns with best practices for campus SA and RV programming. However, due to the change in Title IX policies, there is an addendum to the 2004 recommendation. 2014 Task Force members do not necessarily believe a single unit should coordinate *all* SA and RV efforts. A single unit that

attempts to coordinate prevention efforts, reporting, investigations, sanctions, victim response and advocacy services could represent, or be perceived as having, a conflict of interest for respondents (alleged offenders) and victims/survivors. A single unit taking on the role of prevention expert, examiner/investigator, and judge (issuing sanctions), in addition to the coordination of victim and offender services may be perceived as compromising the objective nature of the process and victim/survivor safety. Instead, the 2014 Task Force recommends that two distinct ‘centers’ represent the two primary functions: 1) Prevention/Treatment and 2) Investigation/Legal [**2014 Recommendation 1-1**]. The Prevention/Treatment center would be coordinated from a single unit, preferably within Student Services, and focus on direct services and advocacy for victims as well as outreach and education efforts. Investigation and student conduct should be integrated within a companion unit, with integration across some members and routine collaboration via the advisory council noted below.

The 2014 Task Force identified an additional need for formalized services for those alleged to be offenders or perpetrators of SA or RV. Comprehensive services and programming for offenders should reflect evidence-based practices, specifically: offender services should be offered in locations that are physically separate from victim services, but should be coordinated within the larger umbrella of SA and RV Prevention/Treatment programming [**2014 Recommendation 1-2**]. SA and RV services and programming must be victim-centered and offender-focused, which mandates that comprehensive services also be made available to those accused of SA and RV. However, there are some limitations on the use of federal funding (i.e. Victims of Crime Act) in providing treatment services for anyone accused of sexual assault, stalking, relationship violence, hate crimes, or any other violent crime. As such, the Sexual Assault Program may be restrained in offering services to those accused of SA and RV. Currently, those accused of SA and RV are referred to Olin Health Center for counseling, but comprehensive services are also needed for this population.

### **2004 Recommendation 2: Ongoing advisory council on sexual assault and relationship violence that would discuss and strategize around coordination and outreach.**

Similar to 2004, the 2014 Task Force recommends the creation of an ongoing advisory committee that includes all of the relevant departments and units involved in SA and RV on campus. The 2014 Task Force recommends elevating it to a “President’s Council” that would play a central role in creating a vision for campus SA and RV programs and services as well as provide ongoing oversight. This council would engage in strategic planning with timelines towards implementation, and coordinate the two primary centers (i.e. Treatment/Prevention and Investigation, as outline above). The council would create a bridge across SA and RV programming, policies, and procedures across units and services (investigation, student conduct, victim services and offender services). Ideally, the council would ensure policies and procedures, particularly those relevant to Title IX, are complimentary and consistent across units (e.g., ensuring that victims are referred to the counseling center, but those accused of SA and RV are referred to Olin), guide the coordination of outreach, education, strategic planning, and potential grant and funding opportunities. The California Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault (2004) recommends identifying one group or individual to oversee victim services and conduct regular reviews of effectiveness. This report continues to be identified as a best practice for campus

sexual assault response and there are multiple studies that have researched and/or recommended using this model to guide college campus response to sexual assault (Amar, Strout, Simpson, Cardiello & Beckford, 2014; McMahan, 2008).

Recognizing the unique expertise of the various professionals involved, the advisory council should be comprised not only of administrative and professional staff, but also research faculty and students. The Title IX Coordinator, housed within I3 is ultimately responsible for compliance with Title IX federal regulations, giving this position a strong voice and influence in SA and RV initiatives on campus. As a result, the Title IX Coordinator must have a central role within this advisory council. However, to distribute and share power and foster communication across the various units and programs, the Task Force encourages the advisory council to draw its chair from tenured faculty and central leadership from a wide variety of SA and RV programs and sources including service providers, program directors and student SA and RV leaders [*2014 Recommendation 1-3*].

**2004 Recommendation 3: Re-assess and implement funding increases for existing sexual assault and relationship violence programs as needed.**

The 2004 Task Force recommended that increased institutional funds be earmarked for SA and RV services and programs in anticipation of increased demand resulting from greater awareness of SA, RV and related programming, which the 2014 Task Force sees as a continued need. Although I3 has expanded the number of investigators to a total of four as of January 2015, direct service programs appear to have maintained or lost ground in funding, potentially compromising their ability to meet service needs. Since 2004, Safe Place, SAP and the SARV Prevention Program have faced cuts and financial struggles, despite the expected increase in service need predicted in the 2004 Task Force recommendations. Although university funds have been allocated for the addition of SAFE and the “No Excuse” campaign, programs providing direct services continue to struggle as their increased utilization has not been met with comparable increases in institutional funding.

For example, per the Sexual Assault Program (SAP) records, 259 clients were served in 2006 compared with 565 clients served in 2014. To address the unmet financial and service needs, in 2012, SAP applied for and was awarded a grant from the Department of Justice to fund an additional therapist; however, this funding must be applied for annually and renewal is not guaranteed. This leaves the program vulnerable to future financial shortfalls and elimination of services. Students continue to face a lengthy waiting list for services and in response to this need, MSU Administration agreed to fund an additional therapist during the 2014/2015 Academic Year. However, it is unlikely that this one position will meet the expressed need of MSU students.

Similarly, Safe Place received continuous funding from 1999-2011 via a Department of Justice Campus (DOJ) Grant. However during a 2011 site visit, DOJ became aware of the low number of students involved in SARV and the lack of a hard mandate for this training. Because grant eligibility requires 100% participation by students in a SARV training program, MSU did not meet eligibility standards for subsequent DOJ funding in 2012. As a result of this loss of funding, Safe Place eliminated the full-time Administrative Assistant position, leaving the remaining three

employees to absorb these tasks. In 2011-12, MSU increased institutional funds to Safe Place; MSU now provides for a total of 2.5 full-time employees. Safe Place staff utilize grant writing, fundraising and other development efforts to cover the remaining 50% of one advocate position. Thus, Safe Place is operating with a director and two advocates, which is one fewer full-time staff position than in 2011. Moreover, the DOJ Grant funded staff training on evidence-based practices related to campus sexual and relational violence, which other members of the MSU community (e.g. MSUPD, Judicial affairs and prevention) could attend. The loss of these training opportunities negatively impacts the collaborative campus environment regarding SA and RV programming and limits staff members' ability to remain current on evidence-based practices.

As a final example, the SARV Prevention Program has grown from serving 1,677 students in 2009/2010 to serving 6,086 in 2014/2015. Despite a 262% increase in service demands, staffing has remained static (1 full-time staff, one part-time graduate assistant during the academic year and a half-time clerical staff person).

The demand for services related to SA and RV appears to outweigh the capacity of MSU programs to fulfill this need with their current resources. Moreover, the addition of relationship violence to the university's reporting protocol is likely to result in an increase in the number of students needing Safe Place services. Increases in dedicated institutional funding for SA and RV programs, particularly for staffing and infrastructure resources for programs serving victims of SA and RV, continue to be necessary [*2014 Recommendation 1-4*]. When compared to other universities nationally, MSU appears to have fewer of the mental health counseling and support services needed for those experiencing sexual and relationship violence. With 15.5 FTE staff and over 50,000 students, MSU has the lowest ratio of mental health professionals to students (1:3,200) among Big 10 Colleges. The average for Big 10 institutions is one therapist per 2,000 students; requiring an additional 10 FTE staff to meet the average of peer institutions. For example, the University of Michigan has 26 FTE staff for 43,700 students (1: 1,681), Penn State has 26 FTE staff for 46,068 students (1: 1,772) and Northwestern has 18.32 FTE staff for 17,010 students (1: 929)<sup>1</sup>.

The increase in service numbers, coupled with clinical, advocacy, and outreach tasks – as well as administrative tasks related to fundraising, budget oversight and grant writing – will further strain the limited organizational resources associated with support services and treatment. SAP, Safe Place and the SARV Prevention Program staff routinely engage in grant writing, outreach, training, collaboration and supervision needs—all of which will further enhance SA and RV programming and the ability to meet service needs – with little or no support staff. Increasing efficiencies by providing a shared development or grant writer may free up some of the current administrative time for direct service provision. Finally, Safe Place must relocate their offices and the shelter before 2017 due to renovations of the current site, but a location has not yet been secured. Given that a relocation of this size will require either a large renovation or construction of a new space, and many special considerations, it is critical that a location be secured for Safe Place to function. Plans may be underway, but there was no information available/known to Task Force members at this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Becker, Scott. (March 19, 2015). Personal Communication with Scott Becker, Acting Director, MSU Counseling Center. Data was drawn from the Big Ten Counseling Center Directors listserv.

**2004 Recommendation 4: In order to understand the current climate of the university and to determine whether incidents decrease, needs are being met and cultural shifts are occurring, baseline information must be collected. Before instituting new data collection, existing data efforts should be identified and coordinated so that they can be adapted and utilized to address gaps.**

There are several data collection mechanisms at MSU that assess various aspects of SA, RV and behaviors that are associated with such misconduct (i.e., alcohol or drug use as measured in the Celebration Survey). Some data represent sub-populations (i.e., Life Behaviors Risk Assessment for KIN students; E-chug for freshman) while others are generalizable to the population of MSU students (National College Health Assessment – NCHA). Some are biannual (e.g., NCHA, Celebration Survey) and can provide information across multiple years. Although many of these surveys, particularly the NCHA, provide pertinent data on a number of variables related to high risk health behaviors, including SA and RV, the questions are not intended to measure campus climate or the needs of students who have experienced SA and RV. Furthermore, the baseline climate survey recommended by the previous Task Force has not been conducted. MSU did conduct a survey associated with the SAFE e-learning evaluation in 2014 that contained some elements of climate (i.e., who would you report to, etc.), but was lacking many elements that would lead to a ‘data driven’ choice of intervention or best practice for a next step.

In 2014, the Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey Committee was convened, comprised of the 2014 SARV Task Force Faculty Co-Chairs and other campus experts, with the goal of determining how to best proceed with a SA and RV campus climate survey. Examination of current data collection at MSU such as the NCHA, was assessed and compared to variables contained in climate and sexual assault surveys nationally. It was determined that additional factors need to be assessed in addition to information currently collected in NCHA and other existing surveys, in order to fully inform implementation of ‘best practices’ for addressing SA and RV on college campuses. To address these needs, MSU will launch the Association of American University’s (AAU) Sexual Assault Climate Survey in April of 2015. In addition, MSU will collect data in the Fall of 2015 using a companion climate survey developed by content experts and university administrators.

The Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey Committee should continue to work with university administrators to determine how these surveys can be individualized to capture the nuances of MSU’s campus, review content to ensure items are psychometrically sound and theoretically useful and to guard against survey fatigue and declining response rates among participants. Moreover, the committee could assist in the evaluation and interpretation of the data, make recommendations for campus responses based on survey data, determine a process for ongoing data collection to assess change over time and assist in openly disseminating results to faculty, staff and student groups [*2014 Recommendation 1-5*].

**2004 Recommendation 5: Development of ongoing, formalized student education, with attention to issues of diversity.**

The 2004 Task Force strongly endorsed “a required first year student course or seminar that would address issues of SA and RV that gave thoughtful consideration and coverage of diversity concerns related to SA and RV.” Toward these goals, the SARV (Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence) Prevention Program was implemented for all first year and transfer students. The SARV Prevention Program is a peer-led interactive 2 hour workshop that allows students to discuss SA and RV concerns. All first year students are ‘required’ to take the SARV Prevention Program during their first fall semester. In the first year of implementation (2009/2010 academic year), there were 1,677 students who participated. The program has been growing steadily and in the 2013/14 academic year 5,731 students participated.

As a companion to SARV Prevention Program, MSU SAFE (Sexual Assault First-Year Education) e-Learning was implemented in 2013/14 academic year. The e-learning modules are provided to all ‘accepted’ students with the expectation that the modules are completed prior to campus arrival. A 2014 random survey of 1131 students who engaged in the e-learning modules, fielded by MSU Office for Survey Research, found that 97% said that they received “at least a little information” from the experience. SAFE e-learning is now available for graduate students as well as undergraduate students.

The MSU National College Health Assessment (NCHA) provides evidence that these efforts are working. In 2004, only 46% of MSU students self-reported receiving any information from the university in the last year concerning SA and RV issues, but in 2014, the percentage rose to 76%, reflecting a 30% increase overall and a 10% increase over the national average. Although there are multiple trainings each year for certain student populations, such as student-athletes and students who work in the residence halls, formal courses/seminars and required continuing education that reflects developmental changes across college years and beyond are a necessary next step for MSU SA and RV educational programming [**2014 Recommendation 1-6**]. A one credit seminar course entitled ‘Go to Health’, addressing a myriad of health concerns that students may encounter – including RV and SA - has been piloted over the last two academic years. This course, and others like it, may begin to answer this recommendation.

While the 2014 Task Force commends these educational and training efforts, the 2004 report expressed the need for a SA and RV curriculum that was inclusive and pertinent to the diverse communities found on campus, such as racial/ethnic minority groups, LGBTQ, students with disabilities, and international students. A SARV Prevention Program workshop for LGBTQ students was recently piloted and a workshop is in preparation for international students. Although many programs have increased representation and attention to diversity, more is needed for SA and RV programs to fully represent the campus community and its diverse SA and RV concerns [**2014 Recommendation 1-7**]. For example, more programs that target the specific needs of a particular group, such as international students, are needed. Basic training, education, and programming, which include coverage of concerns relevant to a diverse population of SA and RV survivors are important (e.g. differences in experiences, risk, and perceptions of SA and RV perpetrated against women of color, students with disabilities, and members of the LGBTQ community). Similarly, increased coordination and outreach within vulnerable/marginalized populations and units that represent them is essential. Finally, diversity efforts should be assessed via evaluations and feedback solicited from participants.

### **2004 Recommendation 6: Development of Faculty and Staff Training/Education**

- **Formalizing training for all new faculty and staff hires**
- **Ongoing (e.g., annual) training regarding policies, protocols, and services available for all faculty and staff who have direct contact with students**

Faculty and staff are often one of the first points of campus contact for assaulted students and could be potential victims of SA and RV themselves. As such, the 2004 Task Force recommended training for all new hires and ongoing, annual training for all faculty and staff. The recommendation outlined multiple forms of dissemination of relevant resource materials (e.g., a single website or phone number for resources, hard copies of resources, and fact sheets about SA and RV), and information regarding the inclusion of SA and RV in course curricula. Currently, some employees receive periodic training on SA and RV, such as employees within the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the residence halls. In January 2015, a faculty and staff mandatory e-training was launched addressing SA, RV and related policies and procedures. The e-learning includes pre- and post-tests to assess the effectiveness of the training and participants must earn at least a 70% on the post-test for certification. Moving forward, MSU can 1) expand and streamline dissemination (single campus website/phone number, hard and electronic copies of campus policies/procedures and resource sheets), 2) create ongoing mandatory faculty and staff training that reviews the initial training and educates them about developments in SA and RV, institutional policy, and responses to student disclosures, and 3) expand resources and information regarding the inclusion of SA and RV information in course curricula (e.g., ensure instructors are aware of, and are including, the mandatory reporting information in course syllabi, language for which is currently available from the Office of the Ombudsman) [**2014 Recommendation 1-8**]. Finally, educational/training efforts should be evaluated to determine if they are effective and user-friendly, particularly for those staff that are less computer-literate.

### **2004 Recommendation 7: Hold a “Best Practices” Summit at MSU.**

The 2004 Task Force recommendation outlined that a Best Practices Summit should include any relevant members of the MSU Community and national experts on SA and RV, “with the mission of strategizing around coordination, outreach, education, and prevention.” The Summit was also proposed as a method of facilitating the development of a new unit/program on SA and RV, coordination, outreach and educational efforts.

In 2013, MSU’s Office of Faculty and Organizational Development offered, *Title IX Symposium: Addressing & Preventing Sexual Assault on our Campus*. This 2-hour symposium was promoted as an opportunity for faculty and academic staff to learn about the University Reporting Protocol, how best to support students in crisis and what faculty/academic staff can do to prevent sexual assault. The symposium included 30 minutes of introductory remarks from a panel of MSU administrators (Paulette Granberry Russell, Title IX Coordinator, Senior Advisor to the President on Diversity and Director of the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives; Kristine Zayko, Deputy General Counsel; and Denise Maybank, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs and

Services), a 1-hour presentation on *The Neurobiology of Sexual Assault: Implications for First Responders, Including MSU Faculty & Staff* by Rebecca Campbell, Professor of Psychology, and concluded with a 30-minute presentation by MSU's Transforming Theater Ensemble: "Survivor Impact" and Unveiling of MSU Campaign: "There is No Excuse for Sexual Assault."

This symposium was informative and useful for attendees and should be offered regularly as continuing education and training for faculty and staff. Future programs could invite students, and potentially community members, given its relevance to a broad range of people involved in SA and RV intervention, prevention, and investigation and prosecution efforts.

The Task Force recommends that a "Best Practices" summit be planned in coordination with the public release of the climate survey data [2014 Recommendation 1-9]. This summit would provide an opportunity to discuss the data and decide upon a best practice strategy that best fits the campus needs. As part of this summit, national experts could provide education and expertise on the implementation of best practices, development of a new unit/program, coordination, and outreach. In addition, the 2014 Task Force members noted that meeting to hear presentations from other SA and RV programs and units with special interests in SA and RV initiatives, such as Intercollegiate Athletics and Greek Affairs has been beneficial and they would like similar opportunities in the future. A summit could facilitate these meetings as well. Finally, a plan for annual or biannual summits could increase the visibility of MSU as a national leader in SA and RV. As such, MSU is encouraged to host a 1- or 2-day Best Practices Summit soliciting international experts on SA and RV at regular intervals.

#### **2004 Recommendation 8: Development of comprehensive university policies and procedures related to sexual assault and relationship violence.**

The 2004 Task Force recommendation noted the need for comprehensive sexual assault policies that are widely disseminated, supported by central administration, articulate zero tolerance for sexual assault, outline appropriate channels for reporting and consequences for perpetrators. The University's Sexual Harassment Policy has been updated and revised regularly. Effective January 1, 2015, the policy was expanded to the Relationship Violence & Sexual Misconduct (RVSM) Policy. The policy addresses reporting, including a MSU Hotline for anonymous reports of RVSM Policy violations, and potential consequences for perpetrators. Student conduct hearing procedures have been developed and revised to address issues of SA and RV and the University Committee on Student Affairs has now endorsed revisions explicitly referencing stalking and other aspects of SA and RV to the General Student Regulations, which are scheduled to be forwarded to the University Council in March 2015.

#### **2004 Recommendation 9: All-university media campaign**

The "There is No Excuse for Sexual Assault" campaign is a comprehensive campaign developed by the collaborative efforts of Redhead Design Studio, the Office for Inclusion, and Violence Free Communities by Design (VFC), which includes the SARV Prevention Program, Olin Health Center, MSU Sexual Assault Program, MSU Safe Place, the MSU Police Department, Judicial

Affairs, Residence Education and Housing Services, Department of Sociology, Department of Social Work, Department of Community Psychology, IM Self Defense Program, and the Women's Resource Center. The campaign was created after an extensive review of current models from other campuses, unveiled in February 2013, and is being expanded to include relationship violence and stalking. Posters, stickers, t-shirts, and other items bearing the *No Excuse* brand have been regularly distributed on campus and the campaign has had some visibility on local media and Facebook.

To further the success of this campaign, MSU would benefit from an expanded, comprehensive communications strategy [**2014 Recommendation 1-10**], including but not limited to: coordinating all prevention efforts at MSU into one cohesive initiative; creating a single website with a smartphone app which includes all relevant resources related to prevention, reporting, and advocacy; increasing saturation and visibility of messaging, outreach efforts with first year students prior to arriving on campus, building on- and off-campus partnerships and deepening existing relationships; expanding *No Excuse* with a social norming campaign that uses data from campus climate surveys to illustrate misperceptions around SA and RV; creating targeted campaigns for particularly vulnerable populations; and expanding visibility via public service announcements and increased utilization of social media platforms. Campaigns such as this one are strengthened when they are responsive to ongoing market research, evaluation, and feedback (e.g., surveys, focus groups) to ensure continued effectiveness and inclusivity and when they are interactive. An example of an interactive communication strategy is "Bringing in the Bystander" at the University of New Hampshire: <http://cola.unh.edu/prevention-innovations/bystander>.

### **2004 Recommendation 10: Continue Ongoing Attention to the Physical Environment**

Below we summarize several changes that addressed concerns noted in the 2004 Task Force recommendations.

Campus and Campus Buildings: The Women's Advisory Committee for Support Staff (WACSS formerly, WACFO) reviews the annual campus safety report and inspects buildings on campus for a variety of safety hazards. WACSS volunteers inspect 4 buildings a year, in the hopes of having all buildings (including residence halls) inspected within 3 years. The safety checklist addresses several general safety concerns (e.g., emergency exit maps, proper lighting around building entrances and exits). Checklist items are not specific to SA and RV. They do not solicit information about dangerous spots in buildings and inspections are typically done during business hours (neglecting nighttime safety concerns). However, the committee is reviewing the process to determine if changes are needed and whether or not to continue the inspections.

Residence halls: RHS improved security at residence halls in several ways. Video surveillance cameras and exterior building access controls have been installed in all halls. Interior access control has been added to all residence halls except: Campbell, Williams and Mason Abbot. Student access to residence hall buildings has been improved in East, River Trail and South, but could not be extended to the neighborhoods and could not be implemented for Brody and North due to buildings' structural limitations. Card access to doors and elevators has been installed in all halls. Lighting at all entrances has been updated with hi-pressure sodium or LED lighting and

lighting is checked daily. RHS employees regularly tour with IPF Landscape Services to identify potential dark spots near the residence halls, and address overgrowth obstructing paths and sight lines. In 2005, peep hole/door viewers were installed in all residence hall doors. Corridor lighting was updated to eliminate glare when looking through residence hall door peep holes. Emergency green phones were installed in all residence hall corridors. Resident assistant (and other student staff) rounds have been increased to check for security breaches. Finally, RHS has a full time staff member who collects data regarding reported incidences of misconduct, which involves attention to the physical environment, and is primarily used to ensure compliance with reporting to I3 and other campus partners.

Additional general campus safety initiatives: The green light system is highly visible on campus and has been in existence for more than 50 years. The phones are strategically placed and IPF Telecom Systems can monitor all of the code blue phones remotely. Phones are tested daily with automatic notifications to IPF when repairs are needed. Finally, Statewalk is an escort service that is available to library patrons from 9pm-1am on Sunday through Thursday. The service was previously offered for patrons of the MSU Student Union, but this has been discontinued.

---

The 2004 Task Force recommended that safety efforts better address concerns relevant to assaults committed by acquaintances rather than strangers. Many of the safety initiatives addressing outside spaces relate to stranger assaults and are sufficient given its low occurrence rate. More is needed to be effective with regard to environmental safety and SA and RV perpetrated by known assailants. Unfortunately, there is very little information on evidence-based best practices in this domain. MSU could view this as an opportunity to develop and disseminate findings on implementation and success of processes developed on campus.

Moving forward, the 2014 Task Force recommends that the safety checklist and procedures be reviewed and updated with specific attention paid to SA and RV concerns, particularly as they relate to SA and RV perpetrated by acquaintances [**2014 Recommendation 1-11**]. Possible additions and changes include conducting internal building checks to assess areas with low visibility, installing corner mirrors in cross-traffic areas, evaluating and correcting gaps in the video coverage where camera surveillance is appropriate, building locations where individuals can be isolated due to difficulty seeing or hearing what is occurring, and increasing visibility and/or surveillance in these locations.

The publically-available MSU Security and Fire Safety report provides tables of annual fire statistics listing details of fire-related events by the location in which they occurred. A similar table is needed for SA and RV events on campus [**2014 Recommendation 1-12**]. Ideally, this information could be integrated with a comprehensive reporting website where survivors can provide information on where their assault occurred. It is important that this website collect data beyond that compiled by the MSU and East Lansing Police Departments, given the low reporting of sexual assault and sexual misconduct.

Many continue to be confused about which behaviors constitute SA and RV and which resources are available if such an event should occur. These challenges are similar to those faced regarding sexual harassment. Institutions are not mandated to post sexual harassment definitions, examples,

reporting procedures and resources in public spaces. A similar effort could be implemented, perhaps as an extension of the current public awareness campaign, to post more information in more public spaces where events may occur and victims are likely to see them and the Safety Checklist could be updated to include verifying these documents are posted and identifying additional places where they are needed [**2014 Recommendation 1-13**].

Finally, technological innovations can be promoted for student use to assist in improving physical safety and emergency response [See **Recommendation 4-2**]. Three cell phone applications show promise. Both UASK and One Love MyPlan mobile applications were developed and researched by Johns Hopkins University Professor Nancy Glass (Glass et al., 2014) and the GW Personal Alarm Locator (PAL) is currently being tested at George Washington University (George Washington University, 2015; Irwin, 2014). UASK is linked to all 9 Washington D.C. area universities and helps sexual assault survivors locate emergency legal and medical assistance. The One Love MyPlan application has several assessments to first help users determine the extent to which their relationship is unsafe and then create an individualized action plan if in danger (Lindsey et al., 2013). Last, GW PAL allows users to create a profile with various response options in an emergency, customize alerts, and notify police, fire and emergency medical services with a geo-tagged location alert. With this system, even if someone is unwilling or unable to talk, s/he can send a silent alert that notifies local dispatchers within one second. The system allows bystanders to send anonymous tips and users can include video or pictures with their submission.

**CHARGE #2: Comment on how greater synergy could be achieved among existing programs on campus or off campus and how these programs can be part of a comprehensive strategy to better service and inform the campus community regarding sexual violence, sexual assault, relationship violence, domestic violence, and stalking.**

Tremendous energy and collaboration exist across the multiple units dealing with sexual assault and relationship violence on campus; but like any institution the size of MSU, it could improve. At issue are the numerous activities and actors on campus that provide one or more functions across the various areas of prevention, treatment, advocacy, reporting and sanctioning. Multidisciplinary collaborative efforts do exist and are described below.

The University Response Review Initiative (RRI) was formed prior to the 2004 Task Force (in 2002) by campus service providers and relevant departments to review cases of sexual assault and relationship violence. RRI meets monthly to **review the quality of victim service and response**, encourages a victim-centered approach and collaborative efforts with relevant units on campus. RRI often identifies gaps in service delivery and university response, in addition to training and educational needs for campus units. The chair of RRI has rotated over the years and currently the Sexual Assault Program Coordinator leads the group.

The Title IX Coordinated Response Team (TCRT) was formed in 2012 to **address the reporting and investigation of sexual harassment and sexual assault claims**. Key stakeholders from I3, MSU Police, Residence Education and Student Affairs gather to discuss issues related to

coordination of law enforcement and campus investigators associated with I3 due process. Sharing of information across specific cases, as well as system level collaboration, are addressed in weekly meetings (meetings are held every Monday). These two committees (RRI and TCRT) examine similar issues from different perspectives, but are comprised of similar individuals and organizations. Members from the advocacy community are not a part of TCRT.

The Capital Area Sexual Assault Response Team (CASART) was formally constituted in 2004 by the MSU Sexual Assault Program & Sparrow Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) unit. Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs) are best practice for a ***multidisciplinary collaborative approach to victims of sexual assault***. CASART was one of the first formal teams founded in Michigan to create policies and procedures and have a strong community presence. SARTs include the first primary responders to sexual assault: victims service advocacy agencies, sexual assault nurse examiners, and law enforcement. CASART is very comprehensive and includes most victim service providers, Sparrow SANE, Ingham County Law Enforcement (including MSU Police and East Lansing Police Department), Ingham County Prosecutors Office, Michigan State Crime Lab, etc. CASART is not specific to MSU student victims of sexual assault, it responds to all victims of sexual assault in the Capital Area.

Violence Free Communities by Design (VFC) was formed in 2006 to ***coordinate prevention efforts and consistent messaging***, modeled after President Simon's Boldness by Design strategic framework. The original co-chairs were the MSU Safe Place Director and Sexual Assault Program Coordinator. Co-chairs have rotated over the years to allow for diverse leadership opportunities and to share responsibility. Current co-chairs of VFC are the SARV Prevention Program Coordinator and IM Sports & Recreation Director. In 2007, VFC members applied and received a prevention training grant sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control.

Many of the same individuals, representing their organizations, sit on multiple committees. Although the objectives of each of the above committees differ, there is a great deal of time afforded to these coordination efforts. In spite of this, there does not appear to be a 'strategic plan' that encompasses a university wide agenda and direction. Moreover, there are few efficiencies in place across program that would reduce duplication in development and fundraising efforts.

Synergy is best accomplished when there is a shared vision and goals. While all involved actors on campus would agree that the prevention of relationship violence and sexual assault is a shared vision and goal, the divergent roles and functions across units and actors on campus, coupled with the power-differentials between units, may inadvertently create barriers to greater synergy and visioning. For example, service providers treating survivors of sexual assault have the well-being and recovery of their clients as a primary focus. Accepting the "victims" perceptions of events, and advocating for them during reporting, is a 'best practice' standard. In contrast, I3 has to maintain impartiality if there is a "student on student" allegation.

Visioning of a model that incorporates multiple best practice standards across the roles and functions of the various actors and programs across campus could be led by a faculty or staff expert who could link together community resources, other experts, and campus administrators and service providers.

**[2-1] Recommendation:** Create and document a vision for SA and RV programming on campus, including strategic planning with timelines for implementation. The advisory council suggested in Recommendation 1-3 should be instrumental in the development of the vision and strategic plan.

**[2-2] Recommendation:** Greater involvement of faculty with expertise in the areas of relationship and sexual misconduct to assist in shaping the vision, policies and practices related to SA and RV on campus. Collaborations between faculty experts and campus staff experts who provide direct services in the planning and implementation of best practices on campus will benefit affected students. Faculty experts can contribute research initiatives to campus staff experts, who have insights into the advocacy and safety needs of MSU students who experience SA and RV. Collaborating between these two groups can help facilitate and improve identification of best practices that can be utilized at MSU.

**[2-3] Recommendation:** Create a data-driven quality improvement practice that begins with a climate survey, in conjunction with the epidemiologic campus surveys (i.e., NCHA) to define the areas of concern and then use annual data, as well as student satisfaction surveys and focus groups, to assess progress and continually improve reporting processes, outreach and services. Synergy is achieved by looking across the data and collaboratively working toward solutions.

**CHARGE #3: Based on a comprehensive view of MSU’s current policies, programs, and initiatives, recommend additional evidence-based practices (EBPs) that have a high probability of increasing reporting of relationship and sexual misconduct on-campus (and off-campus involving MSU students). In addition, recommend best practices related to education for ‘first responders’ on campus who initially receive a report of relationship violence and sexual misconduct.**

To illustrate issues related to the reporting of relationship and sexual misconduct on campus, we use data derived from the National College Health Survey (NCHA), an annual survey delivered to MSU every Fall. Using incidence estimates and the number of students on campus in 2014 (n= 50,085 students), we can determine, within a  $\pm 3\%$  margin of error, that in the **past year**:

- 2,905 students report being sexually touched without consent (5.8% of students)
- 1,152 students report an attempted rape (2.3% of students)
- 701 students report that they were raped (1.4% of students)<sup>2</sup>.

While the survey does not include information on where these assaults occurred, and we do not presume their location was on campus, we do know that all of these incidents involved current MSU students. Moreover, we know that the MSU Sexual Assault Services Program on campus provided support, counseling and/or advocacy to 480 individuals in 2013.

---

<sup>2</sup> We do not know from the presentation how many unique individuals experience one or more types of sexual assault.

Given these data, the reporting of relationship and sexual misconduct remains very low among MSU students, lower than reporting in other community settings<sup>3</sup>. Campus law enforcement (MSU Police) statistics describe 23 sexual misconduct reports in 2013 and 27 in 2014. Similarly, East Lansing Police data cites 27 reports of sexual misconduct during 2014 involving MSU students. In a 2014 report from the MSU Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (I3), there were 174 reports of student-on-student sexual misconduct between 2011 and 2014; approximately 44 reports per year.

Considering only students who experienced either attempted or completed rape in the 2014 NCHA Survey – 1,853 individuals – we can estimate a reporting rate of approximately 2% to university administration (i.e., I3 44/1853) and 3% to law enforcement (2014 reports MSU=27 & East Lansing = 27; 54/1853).

Although the university policies have newly incorporated relationship misconduct in their revised standards, there is very little data on reporting of these incidents. Using the same NCHA Survey data (2014; and campus census), we estimate the following students experienced relationship violence on campus.

- i. Emotionally abusive = 3,606 students (7.2%)
- ii. Physically abusive = 801 students (1.6%)
- iii. Sexually abusive = 701 students (1.4%)

Given the high incidence of both relationship and sexual misconduct among MSU students, and the low reporting behaviors of students, 2014 Task Force members searched for ‘evidence-based practices’ (EBP) that might increase the probability of reporting as charged. It should be noted, however, that the recommendations below are not necessarily ‘evidence-based,’ given that EBP implies rigorous, randomly controlled studies, and college campuses have generally not supported such research on campus. Instead, Task Force members have provided ‘best’ and ‘promising’ practices based upon the existing available evidence.

Below is a series of recommendations to increase reporting on MSU’s campus and the rationale for such recommendations.

**[3-1] Recommendation:** Review and monitor standard processes for responding to reports of relationship violence and sexual misconduct in the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (I3).

**[3-2] Recommendation:** Develop and perform an annual evaluation of the I3 reporting and investigation process. The standard process and annual evaluation should include the following elements:

- Public availability of the standard process.
- A standard checklist and timeline for investigators to follow during the reporting process that can be measured against.
- Model intake forms and standard communications for claimant/respondent interactions.

---

<sup>3</sup> Research on reporting sexual victimization in community settings finds that only 16-36% of those experiencing sexual victimization formally report Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & McCauley., 2007; Rennison, 2002. Victims of sexual victimization consistently have the lowest reporting rate of all victims of violent crimes (Beck & Harrison, 2007; Planty, Langton, Krebs, Berzofsky, & Smiley-McDonald, 2013).

- A tracking system of those who go through the investigation process.
- Reporting to academic governance and the campus community about the results of the annual evaluation.
- Evaluation of ‘victim’ satisfaction; including their perceptions of procedural justice and their treatment in the process. This evaluation should allow as much confidentiality as possible and protect the student from any negative consequence. De-identified satisfaction reports should be available for the TCRT team to review so that changes to the process can be initiated across campus groups and law enforcement.

According to Langford (2004), the key to ensuring accountability in sexual misconduct policies, programs and procedures is to rigorously evaluate whether the initiatives achieved their intended outcomes. Evaluation results can also be used to revise and improve the programs and procedures to maximize their effectiveness and ensure that those conducting investigations are following proper and timely practices (Langford, 2004). Futures Without Violence (2012) also states it is critical to use consistent protocols, scripts, and resources for all investigation and reporting processes because variation in procedures from case to case often leads to mistakes in the investigation process. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2013) found that tracking all reports and parties involved within the reports, aids those conducting sexual assault investigations and prevent repeat offenses. Additionally, Amal, Strout, Simpson, Cardiello, and Beckford (2014) found campuses that have consistent and regularly evaluated protocols for responding to reports of sexual misconduct were more likely to assure consistency in treatment, referrals, and services. Providing the results of the annual evaluation to academic governance and the campus community will create a sense of accountability in the reporting and investigation process and help develop more trust between students that have experienced sexual misconduct and administration conducting the evaluation (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006).

**[3-3] Recommendation:** Develop and administer an annual survey to individuals who have participated in the investigation and student conduct process. This survey would be similar to the anonymous survey conducted of the faculty grievance process and would contain the following elements:

- Anonymous feedback from any student, faculty, or staff involved in the process.
- Administered through an academic governance or other independent committee.
- Conducted in a manner that respects the privacy and confidentiality of the individuals who have participated in the investigation and/or student conduct process.

Amal, et al. (2014) found that one of the key areas that influence students’ decisions to report sexual assault is trust in the process and campus response to reporting and adjudication of sexual misconduct. Allowing students to anonymously provide feedback on their experiences with the investigation and student conduct process creates trust between students and administration (Amal, et al. 2014). Additionally, creating a separate entity that **is not involved** in the investigation and student conduct process (i.e., Advisory Council – see Recommendation 1-3) to review allows for more transparency and accountability in the process (Langford, 2004).

**[3-4] Recommendation:** Enhance campus awareness of the University’s Misconduct Hotline for anonymous reporting of relationship violence or sexual misconduct.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2013) states that having an anonymous reporting option, in addition to direct reporting by name and confidential reporting, allows the university to better understand the campus climate around sexual misconduct and relationship violence. Anonymous reporting allows universities to gather and record information regarding the incidence of sexual assault on and around campus, and better track incidents of sexual assault on campus (AAUP, 2013). Additionally, Krivoshey, Adkins, Hayes, Nemeth, and Klein (2013) found providing and promoting anonymous reporting will encourage those who have experienced sexual misconduct to report the incident to the university, when they may not be ready or desire to complete a formal investigation. For many students that wish to report sexual misconduct, the goal is to make the unwanted behavior stop and obtain a sense of safety and personal justice, not to pursue formal action against the alleged perpetrator (Futures Without Violence, 2012). Informal interventions can be powerful opportunities for learning and change, and can be reparative for the student making the report while also supporting behavioral change of the alleged perpetrator. MSU currently has a misconduct hotline administered by a third party, through whom any individual (faculty, staff, student, or member of the public) may report misconduct; however, its existence does not appear to be well-known on campus, particularly to students. In addition to increasing awareness of the hotline, it will be important to verify that the reporting line does not identify the calls and that numbers are blocked.

**[3-5] Recommendation:** Convene a team of campus experts to consider whether the University should create an investigation protocol for reports of relationship violence and stalking that is separate from the current policies related to sexual misconduct. The work of this team would be guided by input from campus experts and research that will be adjusted over time based on input from student survivors, campus relationship violence and stalking advocates, and other experts, and those involved in the reporting, investigation and evaluation processes.

Currently, there is limited research on empirically supported practices for reporting and investigating relationship violence and stalking on college campuses. However, research has shown that reporting relationship violence can put the survivor at severe risk of retaliation by the perpetrator (Gielen, et al., 2000; Hyman, Schillinger, & Bernard, 1995). Violence typically escalates when survivors seek help or make attempts to separate from the relationship (Gielen, et al., 2000; Hyman, et al., 1995). A separate reporting protocol that utilizes a survivor-controlled process and considers case-specific safety factors might better enhance the safety of the campus community and survivors seeking to report, or being reported, after disclosing relationship violence to a first responder.

**[3-6] Recommendation:** Develop and maintain a central MSU Title IX website<sup>4</sup>. This website would include the following elements:

- Links to the University's reporting procedures and policies, including an easy-to-read guide that summarizes those policies in language easily understood by students.
- Information regarding relationship violence, stalking, and sexual misconduct.
- Links to the numerous campus offices providing services and support regarding relationship violence, stalking, and sexual misconduct.

---

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that this is currently in process and that I3 currently has someone under contract.

According to AAUP (2013), policies and procedures regarding sexual misconduct should be clear, readable, and accurate. Current MSU policies and procedures are complex and may be difficult to comprehend for some students. Given the sheer volume of the information that must be imparted by the policies, one way to better explain the policies and procedures to students would be to develop an easy-to-read guide that summarizes the complaint procedures, interim measures available, and student conduct process. Brubaker (2009) found that students are more likely to report sexual assault if they believe that campus judicial procedures will hold perpetrators accountable by outlining adequate sanctions and explaining interim measures during the investigation and adjudication processes. All university information on sexual misconduct must also be widely disseminated and readily accessible to all members of the campus community (AAUP, 2013). Currently, there are separate websites that outline the different resources, policies, and investigation and adjudication processes. Creating one website where students, faculty, and staff can find all available resources makes the process easier for all involved in the sexual misconduct process.

**[3-7] Recommendation:** Incorporate MSU reporting procedures and policies into Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence (SARV) Prevention Program workshops<sup>5</sup>. In assessing how to update the SARV Prevention Program, consider the following issues:

- Whether it is appropriate and/or feasible to develop a stronger or separate SARV Prevention Program workshop to address disclosure and reporting relationship violence and sexual misconduct, or add this to the current program.
- Discuss development and enforcement of a hard mandate for completion of SARV Prevention Program workshops, such as not permitting students to register for classes the next semester if they have not signed up for or attended a workshop.
- Create a mechanism to assess student retention after the first year.
- Discuss the development of additional workshops for upperclassman and graduate students; keeping in mind the additional resources that would be required.

The formal training or education of MSU students receive about the reporting process is through the e-learning SAFE video. Students are told where they would go to report an incident of sexual misconduct in the SARV Prevention Program workshop, but not what the process of going through an investigation entails, how MSU would respond to a report of relationship violence or sexual misconduct, or the definitions of those terms under the current MSU policy. Amar, et al., (2014) found that when students are educated about and understand the reporting/investigation process on their campuses, they are more likely to report sexual misconduct and trust the university to handle the investigation correctly. Expanding the SARV Prevention Program workshops to include more information about reporting and policy changes, as well as workshops for upperclassman or graduate students, could also increase awareness and understanding of relationship violence and sexual misconduct among students. DeGue, et al., (under review), found that programs that fit within one class period or can be delivered via video or large group settings are appealing to universities, but are not sufficient to change behavioral patterns that are developed and continually influenced and reinforced across the lifespan. *Across*

---

<sup>5</sup> SARV Prevention Program incorporated the new policy and procedures into their training modules in January 2015, and routinely updates their training to reflect university policy.

dozens of studies using various methods and outcome measures, no brief, one-session educational programs conducted with college students that aim to increase knowledge or awareness about rape or reducing rape myths have demonstrated lasting effects on risk factors or behaviors (DeGue, et al., under review). Creating a hard mandate for students and evaluating whether students are effectively learning over time allows universities to actually determine whether prevention efforts create changes in behavioral patterns and not just awareness (DeGue, et al., under review). Nation, et al. (2013) also found that educational programs should be developmentally appropriate, and that additional educational trainings for upperclassmen need to be developed because the needs and understanding of upperclassman around sexual misconduct and relationship violence are different than underclassman in universities.

**[3-8] Recommendation:** Create a Title IX Advisory Committee.

Similar to the Recommendation 1-3 earlier in the report, this recommendation proposes an advisory committee that would focus on Title IX. The 2014 Task Force believes that the functions of the committee as recommended here can, and should, be part of the SA-RV Advisory Council (1-3). However, as discussed below, the special regulations and responsibilities of the Title IX Coordinator included under Title IX, needs to be emphasized.

Futures Without Violence (2012) found that Title IX requirements can be complex, complicated, and unclear, making it difficult for universities to implement the procedures that must be put in place to comply with legal requirements. Title IX requirements have many nuances that can be difficult to understand and implementation of legal requirements can be difficult on a large, decentralized campus. There are currently several groups of individuals meeting on campus that discuss specific incidents of relationship violence and sexual misconduct or review and assess the University's policies and response protocols in the Title IX context. Creating a formal committee made up of campus experts to advise the Title IX Coordinator regarding policies, reporting protocols, training efforts, awareness campaigns, climate surveys, and other Title IX issues would bring consistency to the broad Title IX efforts, as well as transparency and accountability. The Advisory Council would also be able to provide an ongoing forum for faculty, staff, and students to express their views on the University's response to relationship violence and sexual misconduct.

**[3-9] Recommendation:** Develop a comprehensive training for first responders on how to react when a student, staff, or faculty member discloses relationship violence or sexual misconduct.<sup>6</sup>

Development of this training should consider the following issues:

- How the format and style of the training can best impart information about responding to disclosures of relationship violence or sexual misconduct in a way that does not traumatize or discourage the person reporting.
- How to define the term "first responders."
- Whether separate trainings for different groups of first responders is beneficial (e.g., faculty, graduate employees, RAs)
- Whether such training should be mandatory (and if so, how enforced) for faculty and staff.

---

<sup>6</sup> Note: An e-learning training for all mandatory reports was announced in March 2015 with required completion due by June 1, 2015. Since Task Force members had not experienced the training modules as of the time of this report writing, the recommendation was maintained.

- How to evaluate and measure whether faculty and staff are effectively learning from the trainings on how to respond to disclosures of relationship violence and sexual misconduct.
- How often this training, and other training about relationship violence and sexual misconduct, should be repeated for staff and faculty.

AAUP (2013) states that all members of campus communities, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students, share responsibility for addressing the problem of campus sexual assault and need to be trained adequately on how to respond to disclosures of sexual misconduct. Research shows that if a student or campus community members discloses sexual misconduct, and is met with a perceived harmful response, the person that disclosed this may experience harmful post-traumatic consequences including poor mental health outcomes and lower academic performance (Black, et al., 2011). Perceived harmful responses include lack of recognition that the experience was a crime, lack of sensitivity, and fear of loss of confidentiality (Amar, 2008; Evans, Stevenson, & Jordan, 2005; Logan, et al., 2005; Sable, et al., 2006). The current e-learning videos for staff and faculty could be expanded to help them to properly address this area or show how a first responder should react; it only briefly touches on the fact that first responders should “stay in their lane” and not interrogate. Similar to education on prevention and awareness for students, brief, one-session trainings are not shown to have demonstrated lasting effects on understanding or learning of how to respond to a disclosure of sexual misconduct (DeGue, et al., under review). Any member of the MSU community has the potential to be a first responder to someone that discloses sexual misconduct and incorporation of this topic into training for all employees would help employees understand that they are a first responder and appropriate ways to respond.

**Charge #4: Recommend evidence-based practices (EBPs) that are likely to reduce the occurrence of relationship violence and sexual misconduct on campus (and off-campus involving MSU students). Particular attention should be given to the areas of prevention (e.g. awareness-raising campaigns) and education.**

**Comment on what metrics of successful prevention and education efforts, including on-line climate surveys—federally mandated and university supplemental surveys that should be used to measure success.**

As attention to the issue of sexual assault and relationship violence on college campuses has grown, so too has the interest in evidence-based prevention strategies. To be clear, the term ‘evidence-based’ implies rigorous, randomly controlled studies and to date, there have been no such studies used to assess prevention programs on college campuses. However, what follows is a brief review of literature in this area with special emphasis on ‘promising’ or ‘best-practices’. Particular focus is given to the evidence that is most applicable to a large-scale public research institution like MSU.

Multiple research reviews have been conducted recently in an effort to provide college campuses with guidance as to what constitutes effective and methodologically-sound prevention strategies in the area of sexual and relationship violence. Nation, et al. in their 2003 review noted that

effective prevention strategies are: 1) comprehensive; 2) developmentally appropriate; 3) of sufficient dosage (i.e. multiple rather than single-session interventions); 4) administered by well-trained staff; 5) socio-culturally relevant; 6) based in sound theory of change; 7) built on or supportive of positive relationships; 8) utilize varied teaching methods; and, 9) include outcome evaluation.

Echoing this, DeGue in a 2014 report prepared for the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault noted that prevention efforts in the area of sexual and relationship violence should utilize a social-ecological model which would:

*...highlight the need for comprehensive prevention strategies that focus on risk and protective factors at the following levels: the individual, their relationships, their communities, and the larger cultural and societal context in which they exist. It is unlikely that approaches that only focus on the individual, when implemented in isolation, will have a broad public health impact” (DeGue, 2014, page 3)*

Following this recommendation, DeGue (2014) offered a model for comprehensive campus-based primary prevention strategies aimed at reducing sexual and relationship violence. The model called for prevention and education efforts to be enacted across the multiple levels identified above. **Individual-level** interventions focus initiatives in two primary areas: those that build bystander and healthy relationship skills, and those that establish positive norms about gender, sexuality, and violence using interactive, multi-session interventions for incoming students. **Relationship-level** interventions focus on peer and partner initiatives such as coach-implemented interventions for male athletes and residence-hall-based interventions that reinforce positive norms and skills related to bystander intervention and healthy sexuality. **Organization-level** initiatives engage campus leadership to promote a culture of safety and respect. Prevention efforts at this level should also utilize social marketing campaigns to reinforce the social norms around sexual violence, gender and sexuality that are being addressed at the individual level. Finally, comprehensive campus-based primary prevention strategies should engage the larger community in which the campus is embedded. Prevention efforts at the **community level** would, ideally, examine initiatives to implement or enforce alcohol policy efforts to reduce excessive alcohol use (see Abbey, 2002, and Lippy & DeGue, under review for a review of the link between alcohol use and sexual and relationship violence). Efforts at this level should also, wherever possible, strengthen and support the enforcement, response and reporting of sexual and relationship violence both on- and off-campus.

A review by the Task Force of the various strategies, programs and initiatives being offered at MSU noted that the **majority of the interventions currently being implemented are focused at the individual-level**. In order to enact a more comprehensive (and therefore effective) prevention strategy, interventions, programs and strategies must also be developed for use at the relationship, organization and community levels. Additionally, many of the prevention efforts currently in use at MSU utilize a single-session format. While this method has been shown to be effective in raising awareness of the issue of sexual and relationship violence, to date no study has demonstrated the ability of single-session interventions to have a lasting impact on risk factors or behavior (see DeGue et al., under review). Several researchers (Casey, 2009; DeGue, 2012; Dodge, 2009) note that while these single-session programs are appealing in educational

settings because of their ability to be easily implemented and delivered at relatively low-cost, continuing to invest in strategies that have low- or no-impact on important outcome measures may be counter-productive. Ultimately, preventing sexual assault and relationship violence will likely require an investment in more comprehensive strategies such as those outlined above in order to address risk factors at multiple levels (Casey, 2009; DeGue, 2014). Appendix A of this report includes a review of specific programs already in existence that have both a strong evidence-base and that may be appropriate for adaptation or use at MSU.

With respect to successful metrics of prevention, federal guidance notes that campus climate surveys are an essential first step in preventing sexual assault and relationship violence (see Not Alone, 2014). Prevention efforts, and in particular social norm campaigns, cannot be effectively tailored to a particular institution without first having an understanding of the climate of that institution and how students view problems and solutions currently available on campus. In addition, the impact of campus prevention efforts cannot be effectively assessed without ongoing climate data. The literature regarding sexual assault and relationship violence prevention efforts is also clear that successful prevention efforts include metrics that assess students at multiple points in time, and that assess changes in behaviors related to sexual assault and relationship violence rather than simply changes in attitudes (e.g. DeGue, et. al., under review). Appendix C of this report provides a detailed description of data collection currently being done at MSU. At present, MSU does not have an ongoing climate survey<sup>7</sup> that is specifically designed to assess the University climate around sexual and relationship violence.

In light of this review of the literature, the 2014 Task Force recommends the following ‘best practices’ to be implemented on the MSU campus:

#### **4-1. Training Recommendations**

- Hard mandate for attending/completing SARV and SAFE e-learning (e.g. hold on student accounts or other penalty for failing to complete).
- The addition of a “booster” or follow-up training for students to be administered one to two years following SARV Prevention Program and SAFE.
- Graduate student version of SARV Prevention Program.
- Hard mandate for faculty/staff to complete e-learnings.
- Requirement that faculty and staff update sexual and relationship violence training at regular intervals (e.g. every 5 years).
- Targeted prevention efforts (possibly via adaptations of existing trainings) to address specific populations where cultural or risk factors may require more intensive training (e.g. Athletics, Greek Organizations, International Students).
- Utilizing the Neighborhood model to allow for more intensive bystander intervention training via the creation of peer mentor or peer leadership opportunities.
- Continued support of the Self Defense workshops run through the Department of Recreational Sports and Fitness Services.

#### **4-2 Recommendations regarding Technology:**

- Make SAFE compatible on mobile devices.

---

<sup>7</sup> The AAU survey will be launched April 6, 2015 at MSU.

- Development of a “Safe Campus” app (See Charge 1; Recommendation 10).
  - Would include:
    - Reference numbers (e.g. Sexual Assault Crisis Intervention (SACI) Hotline, I3, Counseling Center, MSUPD, Safe Place)
    - Reminders on effective bystander intervention
    - Steps to take during a crisis or after an assault
    - Map of campus resources (e.g. SAP, I3, Counseling Center, MSUPD)
  - The White House ‘Not Alone’ Report (2014) mentions a smart phone application that has been developed that MSU could possibly use as a model

#### **4-3 Recommendations regarding Marketing/Messaging:**

- Campus messaging that includes students, staff, faculty, and recognized campus leaders (athletic coaches and upper level administrators).
- Create a social norming campaign specific to sexual assault and relational violence – or investigate collaboration with other social norm campaigns (i.e. Duck Campaign) to increase peer-norming efforts
  - Use the MSU data derived from the biannual National College Health Assessment (NCHA) to begin to address the discrepancy between actual and perceived attitudes regarding sexual and relationship norms
  - Include messaging such as “Would You Intervene?”

#### **4-4 Recommendations for Prevention Programs:**

- Outside programs to consider for use at MSU (See Appendix A for more information):
  - Safe Dates (Foshee, et al., 1996)
  - Shifting Boundaries (Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011)
  - Coaching Boys into Men (Miller, et al., 2012)
  - Bringing in the Bystander (Baynard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007)
  - Green Dot (Edwards, 2007)
- Increase access to services (both for victims and perpetrators) (See Appendix B for data)

#### **4-5 Recommendations for Enhancing Evaluation Metrics:**

- Focus on sexual assault and relationship violence *behaviors* as the primary outcome or metric rather than changes in *attitudes*.
- Establish an ongoing University-wide Campus Climate Survey by:
  - Surveying faculty, staff, and students to measure the existing climate (base-line data) regarding incidence and prevalence of sexual assault and relationship violence, use of and knowledge of existing services, etc.
  - Administered every 1-2 years to measure change
- Use data-driven methods to aid marketing and development of social norms campaign.
  - **Note: In order for social norming campaigns to be methodologically sound, baseline data needs to be collected via web based surveys. Specifically:**
    - Design and implement a stand-alone survey of MSU undergraduate and graduate students
    - Collaborate with other MSU entities currently conducting similar university wide surveys:

- Spring 2016 – National College Health Assessment – again partner (share costs) to increase the sample size (over-sample “at risk” groups)
  - NCHA –allows participating universities to add university specific questions.

## References

- Amar, A. F. (2008). African-American college women's perceptions of resources and barriers when reporting forced sex. *Journal of National Black Nurses' Association, 19*(2), 35-41
- Amar, A. F., Strout, T. D., Simpson, S., Cardiello, M., & Beckford, S. (2014). Administrators' perceptions of college campus protocols, response, and student prevention efforts for sexual assault. *Violence and Victims, 29*(4), 579-93.
- American Association of University Professors. (2013). Campus sexual assault: Suggested policies and procedures. Washington, DC.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481.
- Beck, A. J., & Harrison, P. M. (2007). *Sexual victimization in state and federal prisons reported by inmates, 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L. Merrick, M. T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Brubaker, S. J. (2009). Sexual assault prevalence, reporting and policies: Comparing college and university campuses and military service academies. *Security Journal, 22*(1), 56-72.
- DuGue, S. (Under Review). Prevention sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice. Washington, DC: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence prevention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*, 346-362.
- Edwards, K., Mattingly, M., Dixon, K., & Banyard, V. (2014). Community matters: Intimate partner violence among rural young adults. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 53*(1-2), 198-207.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, G. F., Bauman, K. E., Lanwick, S. A., Arriaga, X. B., Heath, J. L., McMahan, P. M., & Bangdiwala, S. (1996). The Safe Dates Project: theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Prevention Medicine, 12*(5), 39-47.
- Futures Without Violence. (2012). Beyond Title IX: Guidelines for preventing and responding to gender-based violence in higher education. San Francisco, CA.

- George Washington University (2015). *GW Pal (Personal Alarm Locator)*. Retrieved April 5, 2015 from <https://safety.gwu.edu/gw-pal-personal-alarm-locator>
- Gielen, A. C., O'Campo, P. J., Campbell, J. C., Schollenberger, J., Woods, A. B., Jones, A. S., Dienemann, J. A., Kub, J., & Wynne, E. C. (2000). Women's opinions about domestic violence screening and mandatory reporting. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 19(4), 279-285.
- Glass, N.E., Perrin, N., Clough, A., Eden, K., Campbell, J. & IRIS/MyPlan Research Team (2014, November). *Testing the effectiveness of internet/smartphone based interventions on IPV survivor safety and health*. Presented at the Annual International Congress of Women's Health Issues conference, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Hyman, A. Schillinger, D., & Lo, B. (1995). Laws mandating reporting of domestic violence: Do they promote patient well-being? *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273(22), 1781-1787.
- Irwin, J. (2014). University Launches Safety and Security App: GW Personal Alarm Locator provides location-based alerts, platform for anonymous tips (August 18, 2014). *GW Today*. Retrieved April 5, 2015 from <http://gwtoday.gwu.edu/university-launches-safety-and-security-app>
- Lindsay, M., Messing, J. T., Thaller, J., Baldwin, A., Clough, A., Bloom, T., Eden, T. B. & Glass, N. (2013) Survivor Feedback on a Safety Decision Aid Smartphone Application for College-Age Women in Abusive Relationships. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 31(4), 368-388, DOI: [10.1080/15228835.2013.861784](https://doi.org/10.1080/15228835.2013.861784)
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Rugiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study* (NCJ 219181-Final Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Krivoskey, M. S., Adkins, R., Hayes, R., Nemeth, J. M., & Klein, E. G. (2013). Sexual assault reporting procedures at Ohio colleges. *Journal of American College Health*, 61(3), 142-147.
- Langford, L. (2004). Preventing violence and promotion of safety in higher education settings: Overview of a comprehensive approach. Newton, MA: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention.
- Logan, T. K., Evans, L., Stevenson, E., & Jordan, C. E. (2005). Barriers to services for rural and urban survivors of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(5), 591-616.
- McMahon, P. P. (2008). Sexual violence on the college campus: A template for compliance with federal policy. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(3), 361-365.
- Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., Silverman, J. G. (2012a). "Coaching boys into men": A cluster-randomized controlled

- trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*(5), 431-438.
- Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., Silverman, J. G. (2012b). "Coaching boys into men": A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health.*
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist, 58*(6-7), 449.
- Planty, M., Langton, L., Krebs, C., Berzofsky, M. & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2013). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010: (NCJ 240655)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Rennison, C. M. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 157-162.
- Taylor, B., Stein, N., Woods, D., & Mumford, E. (2011). *Shifting boundaries: Final report on an experimental evaluation of a youth dating violence prevention program in New York City middle schools*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

## Appendix A

### **Safe-Dates (Foshee, et al., 1996)**

- Universal dating-violence prevention program for middle- and high-school students
- 10-session curriculum addressing attitudes, social norms, and healthy relationship skills
- 45-minute student play about dating violence
- Poster contest
- Research indicates that four years post-program, students in the intervention group were significantly less likely to be victims or perpetrators of sexual violence involving a dating partner (e.g. Foshee, et al., 2004)

### **Shifting Boundaries (Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011)**

- 6-10 week school-based dating violence prevention strategy for middle-school students
- Addresses policy and safety concerns in schools via:
  - Use of temporary building-based restraining orders
  - A poster campaign to increase awareness for dating violence
  - Hotspot mapping to identify unsafe areas of the school for increased monitoring
- Building-level intervention
- Research results indicate that the building-level intervention was effective in reducing perpetration and victimization of sexual harassment and peer sexual violence, as well as sexual violence victimization (but not perpetration) by a dating partner (e.g. Taylor, et al., 2011)

Other primary prevention programs have demonstrated increases in sexual violence protective factors and/or decreases in risk factors for sexual violence, but have not been evaluated for their ability to reduce/impact sexual violence behaviors.

### **Coaching Boys into Men (Miller, et al., 2012)**

- Based on social norms theory
- Utilizes high-school coaches to engage male athletes in 11 brief (10-15 minutes each) structured discussions throughout the sports season
- Sessions cover:
  - Dating violence and respectful relationships
  - Gender Equity
  - Positive and non-violent forms of masculinity
  - Bystander intervention
- Research results indicate at one-year follow-up participants showed positive impact on general measure of dating violence impact (e.g. Miller, et al., 2012)

### **Bringing in the Bystander (Baynard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007)**

- Bystander education and training program developed for college students
- Delivered in 4.5 hours over 1-3 sessions.
- Provides participants with skills to help them act when they see behavior that puts others at risk for violence victimization or perpetration
- Skills include:

- Speaking out against rape myths and sexist language
  - Supporting victims
  - Intervening in potentially violent situations
- Research indicates a mix of positive and null effects on risk factors for sexual violence, including bystander skills, intentions and behavior, and attitudes about sexual violence (e.g.. Banyard, et al., 2007)

### **Green Dot (Edwards, 2007)**

- Informed by social change theory
- Targets all community members as potential bystanders
- Seeks to empower potential bystanders to actively engage their peers in both reactive responsiveness and proactive responses
- Training includes three primary components:
  - Overview speech (5 minutes to an hour; motivational/inspirational in nature)
  - Bystander training that uses videos, role-playing and other forms of active-engagement
  - Social Marketing Campaign
- Research has demonstrated that campuses with Green Dot intervention had significantly lower rates of violence victimization and violence perpetration among males than comparable institutions without Green Dot interventions (Coker, et al., 2007)

## Appendix B

NCHA Survey Data for 2014 estimates of sexual and relationship violence are as follows:

- 2,905 students reported being sexually touched without consent (5.8% of students)
- 1,152 students reported an attempted rape (2.3% of students)
- 701 students report being raped (1.4% of students)
- 3,606 students report experiences of emotional abuse (7.2%)
- 801 students report experiences of physical abuse (1.6%)
- 701 students report experiences of sexual abuse (1.4%)

Estimates of the prevalence of PTSD and other negative mental outcomes associated with sexual assault and relationship violence range from a 31 percent lifetime prevalence of PTSD among rape victims to lifetime prevalence rates for depression and anxiety among rape and relationship violence victims between 38 percent and 75 percent. MSU currently has the lowest ratio of mental health professionals to students among Big 10 Colleges<sup>8</sup>:

Illinois	25 FTE staff; 43,603 students	1: 1,744
Indiana	23.7 FTE staff; 42,634 students	1: 1,799
Iowa	13.25 FTE staff; 31,500 students	1: 2,377
Maryland	21.55 FTE staff; 37,610 students	1: 1,745
Michigan	26 FTE staff; 43,700 students	1: 1,681
<b>Michigan State</b>	<b>15.5 FTE staff; 50,000 students</b>	<b>1: 3,200</b>
Minnesota	25.8 FTE staff 48,300 students	1: 1,872
Nebraska	12.2225 FTE staff; 25,006 students	1: 2,046
Northwestern	18.32 FTE staff; 17,010 students	1: 929
Ohio State	22.75 FTE staff; 58,000 students	1: 2,549
Penn State	26 FTE staff; 46,068 students	1: 1,772
Purdue	15.2 FTE staff; 38,770 students	1: 2,546
Rutgers		
Wisconsin	22 FTE staff; 5.8 FTE prescribers; 43,000 students	1: 1,955
		-----
		Average 1: 2,000

<sup>8</sup> Becker, Scott. (March 19, 2015). Personal Communication with Scott Becker, Acting Director, MSU Counseling Center. Data was drawn from the Big Ten Counseling Center Directors listserv.

## Appendix C

### Current Evaluations Related to Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence in Use at MSU:

- Prior to viewing the SAFE e-Learning video, students are required to complete a 15 question pre-test assessment that measures their current knowledge and understanding of important concepts covered in SAFE and in the SARV workshops.
- After attending the SARV Prevention Program workshops, students are given a post-test assessment in which the same 15 questions from the pretest are administered. Also in this assessment are program evaluation questions and targeted questions asking what information presented they found to be the most useful.
- All incoming students who were required to participate in SAFE and SARV are asked to complete an evaluation of the programs in the Spring (March) that asks them the same 15 key questions as well as what information they found to be the most useful from the programs and what information they have been able to apply. Students are also presented with images of the “No Excuse” campaign and asked if they recall seeing the poster in campus buildings.
- Results from the pre-test are compared to both the SARV post-test evaluation and the student evaluation to measure impact of the program.
- In Spring 2014, as part of the SARV-SAFE evaluation, a series of questions were piloted to measure the campus climate regarding sexual assault and relationship violence services.
- Every two years beginning in 2002, the MSU Student Health Services under the direction of Dr. Dennis Martell has participated in the National College Health Assessment through the American College Health Association. This assessment measures a wide range of health and behavior topics as well as services that students have used at universities and sources of information on various health topics they have received from their university. A random sample of undergraduate and graduate students is selected to participate.