

Report of the MSU Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence

Presented to
Vice Presidents Lee June and Fred Poston
April 4, 2005

Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Members

Rebecca Campbell (Task Force Co-Chair), Faculty, Psychology

Jayne Schuiteman (Task Force Co-Chair), Acting Director, Program in Women, Gender, and Social Justice; WRC

Marilyn Amey, Women's Advisory Committee to the Provost

Bethany Andorfer, Student at-large

Lauren Beach, Special Events Coordinator LGBT

Sally Belloli, Assistant Director, Intramural Sports

Marta Belsky, Specialist, Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities

Brent Bilodeau, Coordinator, Office of LGBT Concerns

Anne Bresler, Co-Director, Womyn's Council

Angela Brown, Director, University Housing

Jaime Chao, Asian Pacific American Student Association

Sandra Conn, Assistant Vice President, University Relations

Laura DeArmond, Graduate Intern Women's Resource Center

Ernest Drake, President, Residence Hall Association

Lauren Filo, President, Panhellenic Council

Ann Flescher, Counseling Center and Sexual Assault Crisis & Safety Education Program

Paul Goldblatt, Director, Residence Life

Lauren Lichty, Graduate Research Assistant to the Task Force, Psychology

Janet Lillie, Assistant Dean of Undergrad Education, Communication Arts & Science

Pat Lowrie, Women's Resource Center

Abbey Mansfield, Panhellenic Council

Dennis Martell, Health Education Coordinator, Olin Health Center

Rosemary Max, Office of International Studies and Programs

Florene McGlothian-Taylor, Department of Police and Public Safety

Megan Muscia, Member, Women's Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services

Julie O'Connor, Council of Graduate Students

Charlene Patterson, Director, Counseling Center

Holly Rosen, Director, Safe Place

Peter Rossman, Interfraternity Council

Martha (Marti) Ruel, Director, Student Life

Paulette Granberry Russell, Director, Affirmative Action Compliance and Monitoring

Andy Schepers, Chairperson, Associated Students of Michigan State University

Rick Shafer, Student Life

Tonisha Shanks, Black Caucus Director, Black Student Alliance

Cris Sullivan, Faculty, Psychology

Carl Taylor, Faculty, Human Ecology

Toby Teneyck, Faculty, Sociology

L. Michelle Vital, Women's Advisory Committee to the Provost

Barb Walkington, Sexual Assault Crisis & Safety Education Program

Pam Weil, Women's Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Finance and Operations

June Youatt, Assistant Provost & Dean of Undergraduate Education

<u>Table of Contents</u>

Introduction _____	1
Charge 1 _____	2
Comprehensive Literature Review on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Prevention _____	2
The Federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act _____	4
California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault _____	5
Charge 2 _____	7
Part I Environmental Scan _____	7
Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault _____	7
National College Health Assessment Survey _____	7
MSU Services _____	8
Coordination of Services _____	12
Physical Environment Scan _____	13
Direct Feedback from Multiple Campus Constituent Groups _____	13
Part II Comparing MSU Programs/Activities to Best Practices _____	14
Campus Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Policy Development _____	14
Campus Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Protocol Development _____	15
Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Victim Services Delivery System _____	15
Campus Strategy for Preventing Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence _____	16
Plan to Provide Faculty & Staff Training _____	17
Charge 3 _____	18
Recommendation 1 _____	18
Recommendation 2 _____	19
Recommendation 3 _____	20
Recommendation 4 _____	20
Charge 4 _____	21
Recommendation 5 _____	21
Recommendation 6 _____	24
Recommendation 7 _____	24
Recommendation 8 _____	25
Recommendation 9 _____	25
Recommendation 10 _____	25
Charge 5 _____	27

Appendix A: Comprehensive Literature Review on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence _____	29
Appendix B: California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault _____	40
Appendix C: Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault _____	78
Appendix D: Michigan State University Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Services Charts _____	86
Appendix E: Physical Environment Scan Findings _____	95
Appendix F: Committee Evaluation of Best Practices and Recommendations for Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Education at MSU _____	99

Introduction

Vice Presidents Lee June and Fred Poston convened the Task Force on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence in Fall of 2004. The Task Force was comprised of faculty, staff, and students and was charged to look comprehensively at sexual assault and relationship violence within the MSU community. More specifically, the Task Force was charged to do 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.

This report will address each of the above charges in turn, providing recommendations where appropriate. Given that epidemiological data indicate that women are most often the victims of sexual and relationship violence, perpetrated by men (see the National Institute of Justice National Violence Against Women surveys 1998 and 2000), throughout the report we refer to the victimization of women by men. However, we acknowledge that sexual and relationship violence occurs in same sex relationships and is perpetrated by women against men. A comprehensive approach to sexual and relationship violence will address all forms of violence.

CHARGE 1

Provide a comprehensive list of best practices for reducing incidents of sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV).

To develop this comprehensive report of best practices for reducing incidents of sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV), three sources of information were examined. First, a review of existing empirical research on campus-based prevention was conducted. Second, the requirements of a federal mandate regarding campus SA and RV were reviewed. Finally, the *California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault* report prepared by the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA) for the California Legislature was reviewed. A summary of the findings from these reviews is provided below.

Comprehensive Literature Review on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Prevention

The purpose of this review was to identify empirically validated best practices for the prevention of SA and RV among college students. Literature in multiple disciplines was searched (psychology, sociology, public health, education, women's studies), which yielded 65 studies of empirically evaluated *prevention programs*. These programs focused primarily on broad-based prevention efforts targeting the general student population with the intent of impacting knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. Five consistent findings emerged across studies, which are summarized below. While the majority of this literature focused on SA, the findings are relevant to RV as well. The full literature review can be found in Appendix A.

- Comprehensive efforts are needed to change attitudes and increase knowledge. Increasing knowledge alone has no effect on negative attitudes and myth acceptance. Therefore, in order to change attitudes *and* change behavior, program material must go beyond definitions and statistics to address myths and the cultural basis for SA and RV.
- Interactive participation during programs is critical to effectiveness. Successful programs can use different formats to convey information (e.g., video presentations, skits, panel discussions, etc), and it does not appear that any particular format is more effective than others. For whichever format is selected, however, it *must* include opportunities for interactive participation to be effective.
- Same-gender audiences are most effective. Same-gender programs are *more effective* than mixed-gender programs in changing men's attitudes toward rape. Furthermore, mixed gender programs have mutually exclusive goals – for programs with men the goal is prevention, while with women it is avoidance. In teaching women how to avoid rape and battery, such programs may inadvertently teach some men *how* to rape and batter.
- Participants need multiple exposures to the material. The more times participants are exposed to information about SA and RV, the less likely they are to hold attitudes supportive of violence against women. Repeated exposure creates a cumulative effect in attitude change and can sustain positive attitude changes.

- Program evaluations must include delayed and repeated measures of outcomes. One-time evaluations conducted immediately after intervention programs provide biased results. Research suggests that respondents give socially desirable answers when tested immediately after the prevention program, giving a false indication of the program's effectiveness. These effects are not present when evaluations occur later. Therefore, in order to accurately reflect the impact of a program, the evaluation measures should be administered a significant time after the program, with repeated measures over time to assess the stability of the program effects.

Two promising practices also emerged from the literature. The impact of these practices on program outcomes has not yet been empirically evaluated. However, researchers consistently referred to the potential utility of these practices; therefore they are included in this review summary.

- Match audience-presenter characteristics (e.g., gender). Researchers suggest that the more similar a presenter is to the audience, the more likely the audience is to accept and perceive the information provided as credible. Although this positive effect has not been empirically explored with rape prevention programs, it has been found that the use of a female facilitator with an all male audience actually had the *reverse effect* on participants, with participants reporting a *greater likelihood* of committing a rape or engaging in rape-supportive behaviors.
- Measure actual behavior changes. Currently, the vast majority of program evaluations only assess changes in attitude, presuming that attitude change will lead to behavior change. This has not been empirically substantiated. Therefore, researchers recommend that assessments must include behavior changes (i.e., changes in SA and RV perpetrated by members of the campus community). To document such a decrease, it will be necessary to complete a campus-wide assessment of SA and RV perpetration prior to intervention implementation.

Based on this review of the existing research, the most effective, empirically evaluated, broad-based program at a similar institution appears to be the University of Illinois' Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program. The University of Illinois has a mandatory two-hour workshop for all incoming first year students. Trained student facilitators (typically two male and two female) provide a tightly scripted two-hour workshop that provides definitions, clarifies misinformation concerning SA, and provides information on the continuum of sexual coercion, consent, and legal definitions. Additionally, the workshop includes information on the effects of SA on a survivor, responding to survivors, victim blaming, and the role of drugs and alcohol. Included in the session is 40 minutes where women and men split into same-gender groups to discuss the issues that are gender specific around risk reduction for women and men as supporters, consent, a values continuum, and ambiguous date rape scenarios for the men. The session concludes with a brief conversation regarding campus resources and activism.

Workshop facilitators at the University of Illinois take a semester long one credit course through the Community Health Department. The semester is spent exploring the social foundations that support rape culture and increasing understanding of oppression and how it relates to assault in addition to learning the specific skills needed to facilitate the workshops. This course covers various forms of violence against women beyond SA including RV and pornography. CARE facilitators have also acted as witnesses for victims of SA and RV in the context of student judicial hearings.

Both the semester long facilitator training course and the two-hour educational workshop have been empirically evaluated. The semester long facilitator training course showed decreases in rape myth acceptance at a two year follow-up, the longest follow up assessment found in the extant literature. Furthermore, it was found that students in the facilitator training course showed a decrease in rape-myth acceptance, reduction in adversarial sexual beliefs, and more support for feminism when compared to students that had taken a human sexuality course. At posttest, women also reported increased willingness to be more directive and assertive in their sexual communication (Lonsway et al., 1998).

Regarding the two-hour mandatory workshop, participants' responses revealed greater SA knowledge, less support for cultural rape myths, and less rape-supportive judgments in a hypothetical case compared with students who had not been to the CARE program. But this change was primarily found in those assessed immediately after the intervention, with no comparable impact observed in the context of the students who had been to the workshop months previously. SA knowledge, however, did show an effect for all CARE participants (both immediately following the intervention and months later). Interestingly, participants contacted four to six months after the workshop were significantly more likely to be willing to both volunteer and fund (through increased tuition fees) SA prevention efforts than those who had not been through the workshop. This alternative behavioral measure suggests that while attitude change after the workshop is less stable, participants are still impacted by the program as manifested through a willingness to support efforts to stop violence against women (Lonsway & Kothari, 2000). This distinction between the overall effectiveness of the semester long course and the one time two-hour workshop highlight the point that repeated, long-term exposure to this material is necessary to counter a lifetime education in our rape culture. While this program is the most effective broad-based program at a similar institution, the two-hour workshop does not include information on RV. An adaptation to the program or an additional workshop focusing on RV would need to be created, perhaps as an adaptation from the materials presented in the semester long course.

The Federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act

The Clery Act is an unfunded federal mandate signed into law in 1990 requiring any institute of higher learning that receives federal funding to publish an annual security report including crime statistics for the prior three-year period and a number of security policy statements. The annual report is to be made available to all current students, faculty, and staff and notice of the report's availability and directions for obtaining a copy must be provided to student, staff, and faculty applicants. The statistics for the annual report are submitted to the US Department of Education, who is responsible for monitoring compliance.

Specific to SA, the Clery Act requires that the annual report include:

- Crime statistics for SA (both forcible and nonforcible)
- Availability of campus-based programs aimed at preventing sex offenses
- Detailed information on efforts to increase awareness of rape
- Assurances of basic victim rights
- Procedures students should follow if a sex offense occurs
- Procedures for on-campus disciplinary actions including possible sanctions
- Information related to filing a formal police report
- The provision of information of both on- and off-campus mental health services

Given that victims may disclose their experiences to a variety of campus officials, compliance requires a coordinated effort between offices most likely to hear disclosures (e.g., campus administrators, victim services providers, campus law enforcement, etc). Colleges and universities must also issue timely warnings to alert the campus community about ongoing threats to safety posed by a reported crime and make available to the public a campus crime log containing a record of reported crimes.

California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault

The California Campus Blueprint was released in April, 2004 and is already recognized by state coalitions, academic researchers, and SA/RV programs throughout the country as the most comprehensive and current analysis of how campuses can effectively implement best practices to address SA and RV. The *Blueprint* identified five minimum components for any successful campus plan to address SA, which are summarized below (see Appendix B for full analysis). It is important to note that while the *Blueprint* focuses exclusively on SA, the Task Force members perceive the recommendations as relevant to RV as well.

- Develop campus SA policies. Establish institutions intent to proactively address SA complaints, respond to the needs of victims (including students, faculty, and staff), and hold perpetrators (including students, faculty, and staff) accountable.
- Develop campus SA protocols. Provide a detailed description of the procedures that will be implemented in response to a SA complaint. Such a protocol needs to establish: 1) a communication plan to ensure relevant campus offices and departments are included in responding to an incident, 2) procedures to ensure evidence is properly collected and preserved, 3) a plan for maintaining confidentiality of case information, and 4) a plan for addressing victims' needs. It is recommended that campus law enforcement/security; campus and/or community-based victim service providers; campus and/or community health services, counseling or mental health services and local hospital or SA Response Team (SART); and student affairs (including judicial affairs, residential services, campus ministries, and women's resource centers) entities be included in the protocol for responding to SA complaints.
- Create a SA victim services plan. At a minimum, the victim services plan must ensure that: 1) victims have access to services provided by people with the requisite expertise in various aspects of SA, including support for emotional, medical, and legal needs; 2) services for victims are available at all times, including non-business hours and academic breaks; 3) victims are informed about campus resources and community-based services, their programs and services, and the level of confidentiality they provide; 4) victims are assured that trained law enforcement or campus security officers are available and prepared to respond appropriately; 5) services are accessible and appropriate for all members of the campus community, including students, faculty, staff, minority groups, individuals with disabilities, gay/lesbian/ bisexual/ transgendered individuals, nontraditional college students, commuting or parenting students, and friends and families of victims. The service delivery plan should identify an individual or group on campus to oversee the victim services delivery system and conduct regular reviews of effectiveness. Funding for services should be consistent and adequate.
- Develop a campus strategy for preventing SA. Designate an individual or group with the responsibility for providing prevention education to the campus community. This may be an individual or a group of individuals from different areas of campus such as law enforcement/

security, counseling, health services, or women's centers. In some cases, an off-campus agency may be the most appropriate SA education provider. The prevention education strategy used must address:

- 1) *social factors* (e.g., establishing community standards for behavior, defining consent, and addressing myths and attitudes that support SA),
 - 2) *behavioral factors* (e.g., working with men on initiating the prevention of sexually violent acts and working with women on awareness and safety issues such as self defense) and
 - 3) *environmental factors* (e.g., physical and capital improvements to increase safety such as lighting, emergency-call boxes, maintenance of landscape vegetations, building locks, and appropriate equipment for campus law enforcement/security).
- Plan to provide faculty & staff training. The plan for training faculty and staff should take into account the different job functions and roles of all personnel on campus as well as their relative likelihood of coming into direct contact with a SA victim. Content of training courses and frequency of delivery should vary by occupation. The training plan must include a *mandatory* training session for *all new faculty and staff* during orientation activities and ongoing training tailored to individual job duties. At a minimum, the training plans should:
 - 1) Include a training component in orientation activities for all new faculty and staff
 - 2) Include follow-up training for all staff and faculty, varying the content, duration, and frequency for each profession
 - 3) Introduce all faculty and staff to the campus plan to address SA
 - 4) Emphasize that faculty and staff are not expected to be experts in SA, but that everyone should be prepared to make appropriate referrals
 - 5) Provide every employee with a copy of the campus' SA protocol and policy, including written information about how to connect victims with appropriate resources
 - 6) Address faculty and staff as potential victims of SA, resources for victims, and potential perpetrators
 - 7) Include a cultural sensitivity and competence component
 - 8) Train all employees about their reporting obligations under the Clery Act
 - 9) Identify an individual or office to spearhead, monitor, and enforce the campus-wide training initiative
 - 10) Support faculty initiatives to include information about SA in academic curricula across all disciplines and academic departments

CHARGE 2

Conduct an environmental scan of MSU and indicate which activities/programs currently in operation reflect best practices for reducing incidents of sexual assaults (SA) and relationship violence (RV)

To conduct an environmental scan of activities/programs currently in operation at MSU that address sexual assault (SA) and/or relationship violence (RV) (Charge 2), six primary efforts were undertaken: 1) a review of the Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault as published in the *Spartan Life* handbook (2004); 2) an examination of the National College Health Assessment Survey collected through Olin Student Health Center for information regarding the current incidence of SA and RV among MSU students; 3) a review of the services provided for victims of SA and RV, programs intended to hold perpetrators accountable, and prevention/education efforts on the MSU campus; 4) a review of the current efforts to coordinate existing services, 5) an analysis of efforts to maintain the physical environment and safety of the campus; and 6) direct solicitation for feedback from multiple campus constituent groups. The findings from these efforts are summarized first (PART I) followed by an analysis of which activities and programs currently in operation reflect best practices for reducing incidents of SA and RV (PART II).

PART I: ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault

The MSU Statement on Sexual Assault is included in the *Spartan Life* handbook and is accessible through the MSU website (see Appendix C for a copy of the full statement). This statement provides information regarding educational opportunities on campus, university policies, Michigan law, medical help/counseling services available on campus, reporting procedures and resources, the MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee, MSU Safe Place, a comprehensive list of the contact information for on- and off-campus resources, tips for SA prevention, services available to increase personal safety (i.e., State Walk and night transportation such as the Green and White Lines, Night Owl, and SafeRide), and the Green Light Telephones.

National College Health Assessment Survey (collected through Olin Student Health Center)

To obtain estimates of the incidence of SA/RV among MSU students, data from the National College Health Assessment Survey collected through Olin Student Health Center were reviewed. This assessment focused on violent experiences that occurred only within the last year. Regarding sexual victimization, 3.2% of the 1,135 respondents reported they had been verbally threatened for sex against their will, 7.3% had been sexually touched against their will, 2.7% had experienced attempted sexual penetration against their will, and 1.3% were sexually penetrated against their will. Regarding RV, 10.1% indicated they had been in an emotionally abusive relationship, 1.2% in a physically abusive relationship, and 1.1% in a sexually abusive relationship in the past year. Students were also asked if they had ever received information regarding SA or RV. Of the 1,135 respondents, 46.3% indicated that they had received some information.

MSU Services

There are eight units/departments/programs at MSU that address SA and RV in some form: 1) Department of Police and Public Safety, 2) Olin Health Education Services, 3) Residence Life, 4) Safe Place, 5) Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education Program, 6) Student Life, 7) Women's Resource Center, and 8) Self-Defense for Women Program through Intramural Sports. Representatives from all eight programs were contacted to collect information regarding services for victims, efforts for holding perpetrators accountable, and programs for prevention/education. Below is a summary of the findings from each service provider contacted. For full details please see Appendix D.

It is important to note although there are numerous programs at MSU that address SA and RV, there are no organizational protocols or policies regarding collaboration and coordination among the various services. Current coordination efforts consist of communication between individual staff members on a case-by-case basis. This approach to coordination is dependent upon the interpersonal relationships among various staff members, which appear to be particularly strong, respectful, and collegial. However, there is no evidence of institutionalized organizational relationships between the eight major programs that address SA and RV.

1) Department of Police and Public Safety (DPPS)

Victim Services

- All officers receive initial training on sexual and RV when they attend the police academy. Officers are provided with the latest updates (e.g., law changes) in training for their individual response during the course of their work duties.
- DPPS is represented on multiple committees dealing with developing response to relationship and sexual violence.
- DPPS also partners with Safe Place and other organizations to provide in-service trainings regarding sexual and RV for all officers.
- DPPS has adopted the MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee (see Appendix C for the full text of the Guarantee)

Work with Perpetrators

- DPPS has a policy of always referring SA and RV cases to the prosecution (with a note made regarding victim's preference for proceeding with prosecution) and will also encourage judicial intervention when appropriate.

Prevention/Education

- DPPS is extensively involved in bringing education programs regarding sexual and RV to the residence halls, Greek organizations, and other community organizations
- During programs, they provide statistical information regarding sexual and RV, information on how they respond to calls regarding SA reports, personal safety tips, and reference material for individuals needing further assistance.

2) Olin Health Education Services

Victim Services

- The HIV Education, Counseling & Testing program does HIV testing and counseling, and provides referrals to the Olin clinics for STD testing and counseling for victims. Through this program, initial counseling and general information is also provided.

Prevention/Education

- Sexual & Relationship Health Presentations. Discussion-oriented educational programs typically covering: a) laws, b) male responsibility, c) how to reduce risk. These discussions of sexual and RV are embedded in discussions of healthy relationships which also cover the importance of clear communication, relationship styles, etc. Presentations are typically done for residence halls, student organizations, caucuses, or at health fairs (in the form of information booths). Attendance is not mandatory. Approximately 20 presentations are done per semester. Special attention is paid to presenter characteristics with the goal the audience perceiving the presenter as credible. Typically it is either a paid staff Health Educator or a trained undergraduate.
- In Your Face Theatre Troupe. Eleven skits are performed at each presentation covering healthy sexual communication, coercive sexual behavior, HIV counseling and testing, STD and STI behavior and consequences, healthy alternatives for sexual expression, alcohol drugs and sexual expression, sexual orientation, communicating with health clinicians about sexuality, pregnancy, sexual diversity, and sensual experiences. The troupe is based on the idea of educational entertainment with the goal of providing quality information in a fun and interactive format. This program is based on Western Michigan's theatre troupe program and began at MSU in 1993. Presentations are typically done in the residence halls. Attendance is not mandatory. Typically 10 presentations are conducted per semester. Trained undergraduate students are the presenters with nine involved in each performance currently.

3) Residence Life

Victim Services

- Mentors are trained to refer victims to the appropriate organizations for support and other services.

Work with Perpetrators

- Mentors, Aides and senior staff are trained to be neutral towards accused perpetrators and offer support and resources to them, just as they would victims.

Prevention/Education

- Mentor/ Residence Hall Staff Training. Mentors, Assistant Hall Directors, and new Directors are trained in RV during the Fall Training. It is a 110 minute mandatory comprehensive training session (~390 staff) in August that covers RV and SA. DPPS training includes contacting Police for emergencies including SA. The presenters are from the Relationship Violence Institute (staff from DRL, DPPS, Safe Place, WRC, IM West & the Counseling Center).
- Overview of Initiatives for Residents. (For a complete list see Appendix D) Channel 12 airs a wide variety of safety and SA prevention tips. Safety Week including topics such as self defense, DPPS visits, Healing Hearts (decorate hearts for those who have been victims of domestic violence), Safe Place information, Smarties and Dum Dums (talking about smart choices), Gotcha (noting things on rounds that are not safe such as open doors with no one in the room, propped doors, etc.), and

many bulletin boards on safety. These informational efforts are intended for residents of residence halls. It is difficult to determine exact exposure because it is unknown whether or not students see tables, bulletin boards, flyers, etc. Mentors also bring in a variety of speakers from other units (e.g., Safe Place, SACSE Program, DPPS). These programs are typically initiated by mentors, not at a departmental level (e.g., by Residence Life), and often involve mentors requesting outside speakers. Information regarding audience, attendance, and presenters is maintained by the department/organization putting on the program (e.g., Olin Health Center, Safe Place); however it is important to note that these initiatives are not mandatory.

4) Safe Place

Victim Services

- Services are exclusive to RV and include:
Shelter. 30-day, 12-bed facility for survivors and minor aged children.
Support services. Examples include counseling, support groups, transportation, childcare and support to friends and family members of those battered.
Advocacy. Examples include walking survivors to and from class or work if they are being stalked; court accompaniment; contacting the Ombudsmen if grades are affected; meeting with other representatives who work with a survivor to make sure their needs (legal, housing, financial, emotional, etc.) are being met.
Scholarships. Available to individuals whose educational efforts were disrupted or terminated due to domestic violence, and now they are able to continue their education at MSU.
- All services are free. The priority for receiving services is for those campus-affiliated (students, staff, faculty, or partners of those affiliated), but services are provided to non-MSU affiliated when staffing and shelter beds make this possible. Safe Place is the only shelter program associated with a university in the country.

Work with Perpetrators

- Student Accountable in Community (SAC) program. SAC does not address SA OR RV. SAC is a unique program on campus that helps hold students accountable when they use privilege-based intimidation or are threatening in any way towards others (racism, sexism, homophobia, or incivility or threats to others). When dating or other violence or assaults occur, the legal or campus judicial system is utilized, along with referrals to campus or community counseling or other intervention programs. Four sessions of SAC help students learn to be accountable for their actions. After an intake is completed, participants learn in a group or individual session to take a full account of what they have done; understand the full consequences of their actions on others; and accept responsibility for all of their actions, both positive and negative. This program is run in collaboration with Student Life.

Prevention/Education

- Safe Place runs 5 domestic violence education programs: 1) Exploring personal values, 2) Who is to Blame for Abuse? 3) Bullying, 4) Anger, Assertiveness and Abuse, and 5) Elimination of Victim-Blaming Responses
- The first four programs typically target students. Presentations are made in residence halls, typically reaching about 60 residents annually, and in classrooms, typically reaching about 300 students annually, and help participants learn about RV dynamics, myths and facts, cultural response, area resources and healthy and unhealthy behaviors through interactive activities.

Discussion occurs on the role each person plays in our culture on condemning, condoning or ignoring violence that occurs around us.

- Elimination of Victim-Blaming Responses. This program is targeted at professionals who may encounter domestic violence victims (e.g., mental health workers, medical personnel, Residence Hall staff, and other MSU staff and community professionals) and focuses on identifying and exploring the tendency to blame victims for being battered.

5) Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education (SACSE) Program

Victim Services

- Services are exclusive to SA and include:
Support Services. This includes counseling for both victims and significant others, a 24 hours-a-day/ 7-days-a-week hotline, and support groups.
Advocacy. This includes medical, legal, academic, and personal advocacy. For example, this advocacy involves working with the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners at Sparrow Hospital, accompanying survivors to court or to the police station to file a report, and generally ensuring survivors needs are being met.
CaSART. The SA program is involved in the development of a coordinated community response for both the campus and broader community.

Prevention/Education

- Outreach includes educational programs and information sharing through table presentations of materials
- Topics typically covered in programs include: definition of SA, prevalence statistics, myths and facts, available resources and information on the healing process. Other issues covered include: learning how to identify signs of abusive relationships, learning that forced or unwanted sexual contact could be SA, learning how to protect themselves and others from drugs being put in their drinks, learning how to provide supportive intervention to friends that are abused, assaulted or stalked, learning how to create a culture that holds assailants accountable for their abusive behavior, and learning where to go for help and available volunteer opportunities.
- Approximately 10 educational programs occur per year, with a highly variable number of students attending (attendance is not mandatory). The number of tables annually varies, and it is unclear how many students are reached by the information provided at the tables.
- In previous years the educational outreach coordinator conducted all presentations, however this position no longer exists within the program. Program volunteers are now trained to facilitate presentations, with other staff members such as the counselor attending at times to assist answering audience questions.
- SACSE program is also involved in training faculty and staff (e.g., Residence Life)

6) Student Life

Victim Services

- Through the judicial process, Student Life offers adjudication services for faculty, staff, and students who allege that an MSU student violated a University policy. This includes sexual and RV.

Work with Perpetrators

- SAC program (See Safe Place)

- Those found responsible for SA through the University's judicial process are typically expelled from University Housing indefinitely and suspended from school for at least one calendar year. Additionally, the student is often required to seek professional counseling as a condition of re-enrollment. In extreme cases, the Vice President of Student Affairs can summarily suspend a student while the judicial process is still in progress. Called an "interim suspension," such an action would prohibit the alleged violator from being on campus, except to participate in the judicial process.

Prevention/Education

- Collaborate with other offices such as Residence Life, Safe Place, and the Counseling Center to offer training programs. Trainings are conducted for those who serve in prevention/intervention roles (e.g., for Resident Mentors, judicial boards).

7) Women's Resource Center (WRC)

Victim Services

- WRC staff refers survivors to Safe Place and the SACSE Program when appropriate.
- The WRC also assists with the Residence Life RV training for Mentors (see Residence Halls chart for details)

Prevention/Education

- Resource sheets are available to students that provide basic information about sexual and RV as well as campus resources.
- An extensive video library is available to all students and faculty.
- In the past, WRC ran the Safety Cluster monthly meetings. This group discussed individual departments' efforts to address sexual and RV.
- Out of the Safety Cluster emerged the Safe Spring Break program. Every year, prior spring break, the residence hall cafeterias are used to provide information on topics relevant to spring break (e.g., sexual violence, responsible drinking, etc) in a fun yet useful manner.

8) Self-Defense for Women Program through Intramural Sports

Prevention/Education

- Two-hour workshops are intended to provide practical information regarding SA prevention/avoidance. Participants learn skills for verbal, nonverbal, psychological and physical techniques for defusing potentially violent encounters.
- Workshops are free and open to both male and female students. Open workshops are offered, and they are available upon request. Last semester 23 programs occurred with 350 participants
- No formal evaluations are conducted

Coordination of Services

MSU has a Campus Relationship Violence Coordinating Council (CRVCC) that encourages collaboration and community networking between RV and SA service providers and the campus community. Members of the CRVCC include representatives from many campus programs such as Safe Place, DPPS, SACSE Program, Olin Health Center, Student Life, the Ombudsman, Residence Life, University Housing, Office of International Students and Scholars, Child and Family Care Resources, University Relations, Greek Life, WRC, and certain academic departments including the College of Nursing, Human Medicine, School of

Social Work, Sociology, Women's Studies, Criminal Justice, and Ecological Psychology. There are also student groups represented, including Safe Place interns, Olin Health Care Advocates, Resident Hall Association and others. Another coordinating of services occurs through the Response Review Initiative. Members of the RRI represent many of the same programs involved in the CRVCC. This group reviews confidential cases to identify potential needs of an SA/RV victim, ways to address those needs, and mechanisms for holding perpetrators accountable.

Physical Environment Scan

In order to assess the campus physical environment, interviews were conducted with multiple stakeholders to learn about current efforts to address the physical safety of the campus (a full report of these findings can be found in Appendix E). First, information regarding the Green Light System was provided by Deputy Chief of Police Michael Rice. Currently, there are no mechanisms to assess the utilization of the green light system. The phones are tested a minimum of once a month (on average once every 2-3 weeks) by student employees under the supervision of full time employees. Approximately \$80,000 annually is spent on lines, materials, student labor, and repairs. The general observation of MSU police officers is that green light phones are not used because the vast majority of emergency calls are made with cell phones; however there is no data to verify this.

The Women's Advisory Committee for Finance, Personnel, and Operations (WACFPO) conducts an environmental scan twice annually. Four to six people including a representative from DPSS conduct the scan. During the fall a driving tour is done and during the spring a walking tour is conducted. The results of the environmental scan are recorded in a grid format that notes the day, the location, the unit responsible, and the area of concern. Pertinent information is forwarded to the related departments including a request for a timeline for the completion of each task. Approximately 75% of the recommendations are typically acted upon, with funding cited as the most common reason changes were not made.

MSU State Walk was started roughly ten years ago. It was funded in the past by the Residence Hall Association (RHA), the student government affiliated with the residence halls. The demand decreased and the funding was withdrawn. Alpha Phi Omega (APO), a service fraternity, has been running the program on a volunteer basis for approximately 4 years. Volunteers estimate they provide less than one walk per night on average. This limited utilization is most likely due to a lack of awareness of the service. Because there is no money allocated to State Walk by the university or other affiliated organizations, APO cannot afford to generate publicity for the State Walk due to their limited budget.

Direct Feedback From Multiple Campus Constituent Groups

To solicit feedback directly from various constituents on the MSU campus, four work groups were created within the Task Force, each focusing on a different population: 1) faculty and staff; 2) Residence Hall staff and residents; 3) the general student body, with particular attention to diverse student groups (e.g., racially/ethnically diverse, LGBT, international students); and 4) socially and/or geographically isolated students (e.g., athletes, members of the Greek system, off-campus students). Over 1,100 constituents provided feedback on how the campus currently responds to the problems of SA and RV and recommendations for improvement. A summary of this feedback is provided below.

- Campus-wide student education. Respondents consistently and repeatedly stated the need for campus-wide, mandatory education for male and female students. Respondents emphasized that

the programs need to present SA and RV issues in a multicultural context that is attentive to the diverse experiences and cultural backgrounds of MSU students. Furthermore, respondents indicated that the education should be an ongoing process and emphasized the need for peer-to-peer outreach, specifically men-to-men outreach programs.

- Faculty/staff training. Respondents emphasized the need for formal training for faculty and staff, possibly similar to the mandatory sexual harassment training. This training needs to cover University policies and procedures for reporting as well as the variety of resources available on campus for students, staff, and faculty. This training should also attend to the diversity of the campus community and how different cultures represented in the MSU community may uniquely view SA and RV.
- Centralized source for coordination of information, programs, services. Respondents repeatedly mentioned the strong need for a central location for obtaining information about services, resources, policies/protocols, campus statistics, etc. A single website and phone number were consistently mentioned as useful tools for communicating this information.
- Comprehensive university policy/protocols. Constituents emphasized that the University needs to make a strong statement regarding institutional values with respect to campus safety, alcohol policy, and violence. Respondents indicated a need for cross-departmental coordination of the response to SA and RV through protocols for managing reported cases and appropriate informing of the campus community about such attacks.
- Improvements in physical environment. Respondents reported feeling unsafe on campus because of inadequate outdoor lighting and a perceived lack of police presence. Students were also skeptical of how effective the Green Light system would actually be in a situation of stranger assault. Respondents called for more information on the Green Light System as well as improved outdoor lighting and increased police presence.
- Comprehensive data collection. Respondents reported that the University needs to invest resources to conduct an in depth study of the student population on the subject of SA and RV using anonymous self-report data collection. This will provide insight as to why some students are uncomfortable utilizing the campus services and mechanisms for increasing awareness and service utilization.

PART II: COMPARING MSU PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES TO BEST PRACTICES

Campus Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Policy Development

MSU has created a comprehensive Statement on SA (the Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault), which includes the Department of Police and Public Safety's (DPPS) MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee. The Statement on SA is generally consistent with the recommendations in the *Blueprint*. The Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee is, to the best of our knowledge, the first such initiative in the country. This Guarantee is plainly written, making each of its 10 points clearly and succinctly, and serves as a model for policy development.

There are three issues regarding policy development that warrant further attention. First, the university has created a *Statement* on SA, but RV is not included in that statement nor has it created a comprehensive *policy* on SA or RV. MSU has a policy on student conduct, but a specific zero-tolerance *policy* on SA and RV needs to be created. Second, neither the Statement nor the Guarantee outlines a University policy or protocol to hold perpetrators accountable. This lack of reference to perpetrators, the University's intent to hold them accountable, and the University's intent to proactively address SA complaints are clear gaps in the existing Statement. Finally, the Statement itself is quite comprehensive (which is consistent with the *Blueprint* recommendation), but it is also very lengthy. As such it does not provide a concise message regarding the University's position on SA. As noted previously, the constituent feedback collected by the Task Force called for a concise statement that reflected a zero-tolerance policy on SA and RV. The "Introduction" section of the Statement could be modified to become such a concise statement and the rest of the Statement can expand upon critical issues in detail.

Campus Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Protocol Development

Within the MSU Statement on Sexual Assault there is a section on "Reporting Procedures and Resources." This section states that an individual who is a victim of SA should immediately report the incident to law enforcement and preserve whatever evidence may be present by immediately going to the hospital. If the assailant is a MSU student, the incident should be reported to the Judicial Affairs Office. This portion of the Statement also notes victim and accused rights to representation at disciplinary hearings and entitlement to be informed of the outcome of the disciplinary hearing. The Statement goes on to address procedures if the assailant is an employee of the University. In this case the incident should be reported to the employee's supervisor or to the Director of the Office of Affirmative Action Compliance and Monitoring. This portion of the Statement concludes with a paragraph on resources for victims wanting assistance in changing their academic or housing situation. Specifically, it states that they should contact the University Ombudsman regarding academic changes and their residence hall director regarding housing changes.

As it is currently written, the "Reporting Procedures and Resources" section of the MSU Statement on Sexual Assault suggests that victims have the responsibility for independently contacting the various offices and departments to attend to the varying issues that may arise due to the assault (e.g., police, Judicial Affairs, Ombudsman, residence hall director, etc). As such, the current University protocol is *not* consistent with *Blueprint* recommendations for a University-initiated communication plan to ensure relevant campus offices and departments are included in responding to the incident. Furthermore, no statement is made regarding victim or offender rights to confidentiality. A protocol needs to be created and consistently implemented that would coordinate efforts between the various MSU programs with which SA and RV victims may have contact post-assault.

Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Victim Services Delivery System

MSU has multiple programs that serve victims of SA and RV. Counseling and crisis intervention services are available through the SACSE Program and Safe Place; medical needs can be met at Olin Health Center or Sparrow Hospital; academic needs can be met through the Ombudsman; criminal and university accountability for perpetrators involves DPPS and Judicial Affairs; and housing needs are met through residence hall directors. All staff of SACSE, Safe Place, DPPS, Judicial Affairs, and the residence halls are involved in sensitivity training regarding SA and RV. Crisis intervention and medical services are available 24 hours/day, 7 days a week. The MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee also states trained law enforcement officers are available and will respond appropriately. Furthermore, MSU has the only campus-

based RV shelter and victim services program in the United States and serves as a model for other programs.

There are five areas regarding victim services that warrant further improvement: 1) informing the campus community about resources and services available; 2) attention to diversity and appropriateness of services for individuals across the campus community; 3) the coordination of the victim services into a plan that is regularly reviewed and evaluated; 4) ongoing evaluation of services; and 5) funding. Based on constituent and service provider feedback, members of the campus community are largely unaware of the services available or how to access them. Constituent feedback emphasized the need for attention to cultural diversity present in the MSU community, which is consistent with the *Blueprint* recommendations. The feedback emphasized the need for both sensitivity/awareness training as well as diversity in service providers themselves. Both service providers and constituents have also indicated that there is minimal coordination of services. This may be due to the lack of a primary individual or group that oversees the service delivery as a system which is suggested in both the *Blueprint* recommendations as well as constituent feedback. While the CRVCC creates a forum for addressing services, this effort is not institutionalized. As indicated by the services charts, very few efforts underway on this campus are evaluated for effectiveness. Finally, funding has been expressed as a concern by constituents. Strains on + program budgets limit their ability to improve service delivery coordination and conduct regular evaluations of service effectiveness.

Campus Strategy for Preventing Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence

There are five organizations within MSU that are currently involved in preventive education: DPPS, Olin Health Education, Safe Place, SACSE Program, and the WRC. In addition, the Self-Defense for Women Program through Intramural Sports provides rape avoidance education to women. No single organization/office oversees or mandates preventive education efforts. Typically, education occurs either in the residence halls per mentor requests or during courses per instructor requests. None of the education programs currently offered is mandatory, and most have low program attendance. The approach to preventive education currently in place at MSU is not consistent with *Blueprint* recommendations.

With respect to the content and format of the prevention programs themselves, it appears that most programs follow best practice recommendations with respect to interactive participation and audience-presenter characteristics. However, it appears that most programs offered at MSU are conducted with mixed gender groups, which is *not* consistent with best practices recommendations (programs are more effective with single-sex audiences). It is unclear whether MSU students are exposed more than once to prevention education on SA and RV. It is also unclear whether programs go beyond attempts to increase knowledge to address attitude change. Evaluations of program impact are typically not conducted, and when they are they frequently fail to account for attitude change and are conducted immediately following the programs.

With respect to prevention and the physical environment of the campus, there are multiple efforts underway to assess safety. MSU currently has approximately 175 emergency call-boxes on campus. Call-boxes and vegetation are regularly assessed and maintained. Campus lighting is assessed by a lighting committee, as well as through the WACFPO environmental scan. Both call-box and lighting improvements are made as funds become available. Most buildings on campus are secured. The majority of residence halls are locked and require identification to enter after midnight. Overall, MSU meets the broad recommendations of the *Blueprint* regarding environmental factors. In addition, MSU also has a variety of night transportation

available for on-campus travel. However, students express concerns about the campus physical environment, including lack of lighting and police presence, inconvenience of the night transportation, and effectiveness of call-boxes.

Plan to Provide Faculty & Staff Training

Four organizations are currently involved with the provision of faculty and staff training on the MSU campus: DPPS, Safe Place, SACSE Program and Student Life. No single organization/office oversees or mandates training efforts. Based on the findings from this environmental scan, there is currently no training component included in the orientation activities for new faculty and staff. While the MSU Statement on Sexual Assault is made available to all faculty and staff, there is no accompanying training. Constituent feedback indicated the need for faculty and staff training, perhaps similar to the mandatory sexual harassment trainings. Furthermore, respondents stated the need for a centralized source of information (e.g., website or phone number) to ensure proper policies, protocols, and referrals are followed.

CHARGE 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 campus community regarding sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV).

To identify mechanisms for increasing synergy, information gathered for Charges 1 and 2 was reviewed. Briefly, the *CALCASA Blueprint* provides explicit directives for creating a campus-wide plan for responding to and preventing sexual assault (SA) including policies, protocols, victim services, prevention education, and faculty/staff training. As part of this plan, the *Blueprint* repeatedly references the need for systematic service provision, with either a program or person charged with overseeing such efforts. Recall from Charge 2 that there are eight major programs/units at MSU that provide services related to SA and relationship violence (RV), but that coordination and collaboration between the programs is dependent upon the interpersonal relationships among staff members. There is currently no external mandate or mechanism for accountability to ensure program coordination and cooperation. Information gathered for Charge 2 also found that constituents have limited knowledge of available services and that constituents feel there is no convenient way to learn about and access MSU services. Based on this information the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Creation of a new unit or new program within an existing unit at MSU to be charged with:

- **Coordinating existing program services.** This charge involves creating protocols for systematic, programmatic information exchange (e.g., for Clery Act reporting), incident response and follow-up, and outreach/advertising efforts.
- **Creating sexual assault and relationship violence policies and protocols.** This charge involves working with other units at MSU to develop and publicize a new zero-tolerance policy, to revise/update the existing Statement on SA, and develop protocols for cross-program/unit coordinated responses to SA and RV reports.
- **Coordinating media and advertising.** This charge involves advertising the *system* of services available and the broader campus policy regarding SA and RV.
- **Developing and maintaining a single point of access to a system of services.** This charge speaks to the need for a **single website and/or phone number** that links to a system of services available at MSU. This website and/or phone number would address the need for a single, easily accessible source of information regarding available resources and services. As a **website** this “one stop shopping” for services should provide links to all relevant programs’ websites, a comprehensive resource list, contact information, and description of both on- and off- campus services. A Task Force member independently developed a similar website outside the MSU system (<http://msuhelppsource.com/>) which could serve as a model for the development of a more comprehensive website within the MSU system. As a **single phone number**, it should provide

immediate referral to the campus program most appropriate for meeting individual needs. While a single phone number would streamline access to current resources, **the 24 hour crisis lines provided by the SACSE Program and Safe Place should be maintained separately** because of the specific needs they fulfill (i.e., crisis counseling and support), which this phone number would not provide. This website and/or phone number should be advertised on all campus resources pertaining to SA and RV. A single website and phone number could also be utilized for reporting physical environment concerns such as non-functioning green light phones, poor lighting, etc.

- **Implementing and maintaining new educational outreach efforts directed at students, faculty and staff.** This charge would involve development, implementation, administration, and evaluation of campus wide preventive education training for students, faculty, and staff (see Recommendation 4 and 5 under Charge 4 for details).

It should be noted that the above efforts reflect unmet needs on this campus and are not duplicative or redundant with existing programs/services.

In its deliberations, the Task Force noted that it would not be possible for a single staff person (either an existing staff member or a new hire) to accomplish the kind of broad-based coordination AND outreach activities that are needed at MSU. As such, the Task Force is recommending a new unit or new program within an existing unit to be created and charged with these various activities. The Task Force did not reach consensus on a recommended location within the university for such a new unit or new program within an existing unit. Our discussions highlighted the complexities of such a choice, and we urge the university administration to consider these factors when making implementation decisions. If the new unit or program is placed within one division (e.g., student affairs and services), it may create a perception that SA and RV are only important to the constituents of that division (e.g., students). Likewise, if the unit or program were placed within the Counseling Center, it may create the perception that victim response and mental health are most important when addressing SA and RV. Similarly, placement in the Women's Resource Center may create the perception that these are women's issues and not relevant to men. If the unit or program were housed within the University Physician at Olin Health Center, it may create the perception that SA and RV are physical health issues only. **Furthermore, it is critical that this new unit or program be situated at a level within the University that has the authority to not just recommend but to ENACT change.**

Careful consideration should be given to the level within the University structure and under which division(s) such a unit or program would best fit. This unit or program must be perceived by the campus community as legitimate and MUST have the authority to enact real change.

Recommendation 2: Creation of an on-going advisory committee on sexual assault and relationship violence.

In addition to a new unit or program that will focus on coordination and related activities, the Task Force recommends the creation of an on-going advisory committee that would collectively discuss and strategize around the coordinating and outreach efforts thus increasing the probability that all programs and constituents are represented. Furthermore, this could provide an opportunity for strategic planning around resource management. This committee would advise the new unit/program identified in Recommendation 1. The advisory committee should be comprised of faculty, staff, and students, including representation from all programs that provide services connected to SA and RV. While committees and councils currently exist (e.g., CRVCC), such groups have little power to create change. This advisory committee would

directly advise the unit/program with the power to create change and would create institutionalized opportunities for coordination and collaboration.

Recommendation 3: Re-Assess and Implement Funding Increases for Existing Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Programs As Needed.

While improving the coordination of services and increasing outreach as indicated in Recommendations 1 and 2, it is imperative that funding for such efforts *not* come at the expense of funding existing programs. Furthermore, existing programs should *not* lose their unique focus as each plays a critical role within the campus community. The Task Force recommends a careful review of the current funding levels of the existing SA and RV programs (in particular, but not limited to, the SACSE Program and Safe Place) because it is to be expected that there will be a *substantial increase* in service utilization of existing MSU programs when new educational/awareness, prevention, and coordination initiatives are implemented. Such increases in service utilization have occurred on other campuses (e.g., UIUC) that have undertaken similar efforts. Therefore it is critical that existing program funding is not cut to support the recommended coordination and education efforts. Indeed, the Task Force anticipates that existing programs will need additional resources to respond to increased demand. It is also important to note that a 2004 external evaluation of the SACSE Program found that this program is already drastically under-funded and understaffed vis-à-vis current estimates of SA incidence among MSU students. The Task Force recommends that earmarked institutional funds be made available to the SACSE Program similar to those as they are for Safe Place.

Recommendation 4: Coordination of Data Collection

As discussed in the review of best practices, evaluation/assessment of impact is vital for any educational, coordination, and improvement efforts. All constituents reported the need for additional data collection to better understand and assess constituent knowledge and needs. 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. If we do not collect that information now, we will not have a basis for comparison in the future. Such information can be directly applied to efforts to decrease SA and RV incidents.

Currently, various data collection relevant to SA and RV occurs across campus divisions and units (e.g., NCHA survey collected through Olin Health Center). Therefore, before instituting additional data collection, the Task Force recommends that existing data collection efforts be identified and coordinated. Gaps in current data collection efforts will be more visible once such work is completed. The Task Force recommends utilizing existing data collection mechanisms and adapting them to address gaps in data collection identified.

It should be noted that successful efforts to increase understanding and knowledge, change attitudes and behaviors, and shift the campus culture to zero tolerance will be accompanied by a temporary increase in the reporting of and response to SA and RV. This increase can be anticipated as the campus community understands the seriousness with which the university approaches these issues along with the corresponding increase in awareness and knowledge. An increased reporting of incidents should not be understood as a measure of failure but rather as a mark of success in the short term. Long term measures of impact and incidents will hopefully show a trend in positive directions.

CHARGE 4

Recommend, where applicable, additional cost effective best practices that have a high probability of reducing the occurrence of sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV) on campus. Particular focus should be placed on the areas of prevention, education, communication, and physical environment.

These recommendations for cost effective best practices are made based on information collected for Charges 1 and 2 regarding empirically evaluated prevention programs, compliance with the Clery Act, the CALCASA *Blueprint*, as well as feedback collected directly from MSU constituent groups.

Recommendation 5: Development of Ongoing, Formalized Student Education, With Attention to Issues of Diversity

Data collected from all sources indicate the importance of and need for a comprehensive educational program targeted at the general student population that is designed to increase knowledge, change attitudes, and change behavior. There was unanimous support from all constituent groups and Task Force members that such a program be instituted at MSU. The comprehensive review of empirical research found the University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign (UIUC) Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program to be the most effective evaluated prevention education program on a similar campus. The UIUC CARE program is described under Charge 1 in this report and in the Committee Report submitted to Dr. June on December 1, 2004 (Appendix F). Both the Committee and the Task Force find the UIUC CARE program to be an excellent starting point for increasing the prevention education efforts on this campus. The Task Force and the Committee also note that the CARE program alone is not enough to substantially impact SA and RV but instead view it as one component of a comprehensive prevention education plan.

The Task Force recognizes that implementing formalized student education at a university the size of MSU will involve sustained administrative effort (see also Charge 3, Recommendation 1). Therefore, we are recommending a three phase implementation process. The **first phase** involves a two-hour mandatory workshop for all incoming students (see Section A below). This workshop will address immediate information needs on campus and planning efforts for the second phase can proceed concurrently. In the **second phase**, we recommend implementing an elective first year course or seminar (see Section B below). The PRO seminar system provides a mechanism for implementing and evaluating the impact of such a course/seminar. The course/seminar will be empirically evaluated and if the results are promising, we recommend that the **third phase** of implementation move forward institutionalizing the course/seminar. Through concurrent implementation the University may continue creating educational innovations while addressing existing needs following known best practices. It is important to note that such an effort will require substantial staff support, including an evaluator to assess effectiveness.

A. Two-hour mandatory workshops for all incoming students:

Two-hour mandatory workshops would be based upon critical components from the UIUC CARE program. As part of this model, all incoming students would attend a peer-facilitated two hour workshop held in the residence halls. The residence halls are ideal sites for workshops given that 95% of first year students live in the halls. Exactly how the residence hall system is utilized and what role, if any, Residence Life plays in workshop delivery is yet to be determined. It is important to note that while UIUC states workshop attendance is mandatory, the University does not have a system in place to enforce attendance. They have been successful in maintaining high attendance rates (approximately 97%); however, it is unclear *how* they have been able to sustain such rates. It is uncertain whether such levels would be attainable on this campus; therefore, members of the Task Force feel it is imperative that either consequences for failure to attend or incentives to attend workshops be identified and implemented.

Peer facilitators will be trained in a semester-long course followed by a one year commitment to facilitate residence hall-based workshops. The semester-long training course for peer facilitators will need to be developed within an academic unit and approved by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Once approved, it is anticipated that the course could be cross-listed with other departments (e.g., psychology, women's studies, public health, etc). Enrolled students will spend the semester prior to facilitating the workshops learning the foundational and theoretical basis for understanding campus culture, "rape culture," sexual violence, RV, power, privilege and oppression. Students will also learn how to facilitate the workshop.

B. First Year Course or Seminar

Like the Committee convened last fall, the Task Force strongly endorses a required first year student course or seminar that would address issues of SA and RV with the goal of increasing the likelihood of academic and social success at the University.

The PRO seminar system provides a mechanism for piloting such a course/seminar. The existing PRO first year seminar system is an excellent mechanism allowing for a more intensive academic experience for all incoming students. Freshman seminars are "content" based (as opposed to skill based), faculty-led, and are limited to 25 students. A complete description of the process is available at: http://www.msu.edu/~apueas/freshmanseminar/info_for_faculty.htm.

A 14-hour course that includes content related to sexual and RV will go much further in helping students to understand social issues of power, oppression, and privilege that contribute to sexual and RV. Providing opportunities beyond the two-hour workshop for students to grapple with notions of respect, civility, consent, and community will challenge students' misperceptions about sexual and RV. Furthermore, this multiple exposure to materials (both the two-hour workshop and course/seminar) follows the best practices identified in the empirical literature. Specific models of seminars recommended to be piloted within the PRO system are found in the Committee Report (pp. 6-7 – Appendix F). After the piloting process has determined the most effective method of delivering information (i.e., a seminar/course exclusively addressing sexual and RV vs. information on sexual and RV presented as one component of a course covering various transitional issues impacting social and academic success), the course/seminar should be formalized and implemented in multiple

sections. The course/seminar should be continually evaluated for its effectiveness in impacting knowledge, attitudes, and ultimately behavior.

If the results of the evaluation demonstrate program effectiveness, the Task Force strongly urges that officials consider ways to make such a course/seminar a required experience for all first year students. While the PRO system may be appropriate for piloting, it may not be the best structural mechanism for implementing and sustaining a required course/ seminar, thus making it necessary to develop a new mechanism for requiring a first year educational experience. There may be considerable barriers in doing so. A required course must be approved by academic governance and would require a strong rationale given the numerous already existing parts of students' programs, some of which require 120 credits. There is also the issue of possible faculty resistance to awarding academic credit for courses that deal with "academic and social success skills." Implementation of a required seminar may need to explore mechanisms outside the academic course credit system. While the challenges of creating such a mechanism may be considerable, failure to consider how a required seminar or course could be implemented or the decision that such an effort is impossible seems inadvisable if the evaluation/assessment of the piloted courses in the PRO system demonstrate effective results.

To be consistent with current best practices, the curriculum for educational efforts should include:

- Curriculum/content focusing on increasing knowledge AND changing attitudes. Thus, definitions and statistics must be accompanied by an examination of myths, realities, and the cultural bases for SA and RV
- Content pertinent to diverse populations found within the campus community, including but not limited to LGBT-identified students, students from racial/ethnic minority groups, international students, and students with disabilities
- Opportunities for interactive participation
- Same gender audiences (or gender-based break out groups when appropriate)
- Evaluations including delayed, longitudinal outcome measures in order to accurately assess program impact over time

Additional opportunities for ongoing education should be available for students. While not mandatory, educational outreach should occur for the general student population with specific attention given to unique groupings of students such as those living in the residence halls, university apartments, or off-campus. Students who are members of sororities, fraternities or are student athletes should have ongoing educational opportunities specific to their social niche and needs within the campus community. Specific outreach should also be done with male students as they are the primary perpetrators of SA and RV. Such efforts should include information regarding accountability and involve men-to-men facilitation.

As identified in Charge 3, the Task Force recommends the formation of a new unit or new program within an existing unit be charged with developing, training, and sustaining this prevention education effort. The advisory committee/ coordinating council also identified in Charge 3 would further assist this process by sharing expertise in the development and training efforts. This prevention education program should not occur through any of the existing service programs/units such as MSU Safe Place, DPPS, Olin Health

Center, Student Judicial System, Residence Life, or the SACSE Program. Their missions include responding to and supporting members of the campus community who experience SA and RV. While each of these service programs/units also provides outreach and education to the campus community, none of the programs/units listed above currently have either adequate staffing or financial resources to coordinate a comprehensive educational program for students across campus without a substantial reinvestment of resources by the university. Thus, the Task Force recommends that the prevention education program be the responsibility of a new unit or program that would coordinate information, programs and services and that is adequately staffed with sufficient resources to carry out its intended functions as identified in Charge 3.

Recommendation 6: Development of Faculty and Staff Training/Education

Faculty and staff at the university, whether in their capacity as advisor, instructor, mentor, or trusted confidante may be the first individuals whom students approach for information or assistance related to SA and RV. Students often do not access information and/or services related to SA/RV until it is needed, thus, when need arises, students may not be aware of university policies, procedures, and services. As a result, they often turn to those who are believed to be knowledgeable for assistance, and it is critical that faculty and staff have accurate knowledge of the issues and resources available to best assist students. Faculty and staff do not need to be experts in SA/RV. However, they should be able to make appropriate referrals for anyone in need of information or services. Based on best practices, the Task Force recommends at minimum:

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

Furthermore, the Task Force emphasizes the importance of supplying all faculty and staff with:

- Web address and/or phone number for campus “one stop shopping” recommended in Charge 3
- Hard copy and web address for campus policies and procedures related to SA and RV
- Hard copy resource sheets that include myths/facts about SA/RV and lists of campus resources
- Assistance on initiatives to include information about SA/RV in course curricula

Faculty and staff are also victimized by SA and RV. Thus, education and training should include information not only relevant to students, but information related to their needs as members of the campus community.

As stated in Charge 3, the Task Force recommends the new unit or new program within an existing unit be responsible for implementing and conducting faculty and staff training.

Recommendation 7: Hold “Best Practices” Summit at MSU.

To facilitate the development of the new unit/program, coordination, outreach, and educational efforts, the Task Force members noted it would be beneficial to hold a Best Practices Summit at MSU. Such an event would involve any relevant members of the MSU community (e.g., students, faculty, staff) as well as those considered experts in the field of SA and RV prevention (e.g., CALCASA, Alan Berkowitz, staff from the UIUC CARE program) with the mission of strategizing around coordination, outreach, education, and prevention. Hosting such an event would bring increased attention to SA and RV as well as reenergize the

campus community to continue improving the response to and prevention of SA and RV. Furthermore, it would bring national visibility to MSU as a proactive model for other campuses when addressing SA and RV.

Recommendation 8: Development of Comprehensive University Policies/Procedures Related to Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence.

Most students, faculty and staff are unaware of university policies/procedures concerning SA and RV. Currently the university has a Statement on SA but not a comprehensive policy. There is no Statement or policy regarding RV. The student code of conduct includes provisions regarding sexual violence and DPPS provides legal information related to both. However, a visible set of policies/procedures that is widely disseminated through a variety of means and that has the clear support of the central administration will indicate to the campus community the University's zero tolerance for SA/RV. Policies and procedures should clearly articulate zero tolerance, appropriate channels for reporting and responding to incidents, and outline the ways in which perpetrators will be held accountable.

Protocols developed should result in a campus plan to ensure all relevant campus units are involved in responding to incidents of SA/RV. This includes but is not limited to service providers, media outlets, parental points of contact, and those responsible for maintaining Clery Act reports.

As stated in Charge 3, the Task Force recommends the new unit or new program within an existing unit be responsible for working with other units on campus to develop these policies and protocols.

Recommendation 9: An All-University Media Campaign

An all-university media campaign is a necessary strategy for conveying accurate information about SA and RV. The campaign should include information about the role of alcohol in assaults, should challenge common misperceptions about SA and RV, and should highlight campus resources. Public service announcements done by prominent/visible members of the campus community (such as coaches, athletes, Greek system officers, ASMSU student leaders, and prominent faculty and/or administrators), posters, bulletin boards in residence halls, ads in the State News, table tents in public food courts and residence cafeterias, and other means of conveying information on a large scale should be utilized. This effort would fall under the responsibility of the new unit/program outlined in Charge 3.

Recommendation 10: Continue Ongoing Attention to the Physical Environment

Regular maintenance of the physical environment with attention paid to safety concerns is already an ongoing effort at the university. Data from residence hall surveys suggest overall students feel safe in residence halls, however as part of constituent feedback collected by the Task Force it was found that some members of the campus community have raised safety concerns about 24-hour access buildings, computer labs, science labs, and residence halls. Not only should these concerns regularly be addressed with corresponding improvements, but there should be a single point of entrée for reporting such concerns as described in Charge 3 through the use of the website or phone number. Most SAs that occur on college and university campuses are committed by acquaintances. Many of the concerns expressed over the physical environment are motivated out of a fear of stranger assault. These concerns are necessary to address because, in fact, stranger assault does occur. Additionally, even if stranger assaults are infrequent,

improvements to the physical environment increase a sense of safety and well-being. Such improvements are indicators to the campus community that the safety of people on the MSU campus is a priority.

CHARGE 5

Comment on what would be the markers/indicators of a successful campus-wide sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV) program.

First, it is critical to acknowledge what would NOT be a marker/indicator of a successful campus-wide sexual assault (SA) and relationship violence (RV) program. Specifically, after implementing a campus-wide effort, the University should NOT anticipate a decrease in reports or service utilization. Once the recommendations are implemented, it is to be expected that the campus will see both an increase in reports of SA and RV incidents and service utilization due to heightened awareness about the issue and available services. In the long term, a decrease in reports and service utilization are appropriate goals, however it is unknown how long such effects would take to occur post-recommendation implementation.

In the immediate, appropriate markers/indicators of a successful campus-wide SA and RV program include:

- Comprehensive University-wide policies regarding SA and RV. Upon dissemination and media efforts to publicize, we would expect to see an increase in knowledge and awareness of the policy among faculty, students, staff.
- Comprehensive University-wide protocols regarding SA and RV. Upon dissemination and media efforts to publicize, we would expect to see an increase in knowledge, awareness, and utilization of the protocols among faculty, students, staff.
- Available, accessible, comprehensive, and coordinated programs and services that address SA and RV. These programs must also address issues of diversity, such as the needs of LGBT students, international students, students with disabilities, and ethnic/minority students.
- Continual evaluation of services and programmatic changes occurring based on evaluation findings
- Service utilization and reports made by diverse members of the student population (that is, if the information is reaching diverse communities, then there should be an increase in service use and reporting across campus community members rather than among just one subset of the population).
- Comprehensive preventive education training for students that addresses social and behavioral factors.
- Evaluation of preventive education training for students.
- Comprehensive training for faculty and staff on University policies, protocols, and resources.
- Evaluation of training for faculty.

Eventually, the University should see:

- Shifts to zero tolerance attitudes toward SA and RV documented through repeated campus-wide assessments.
- Behavior change resulting in a decrease in SA and RV incidents.

References

California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault: Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the California Legislature. By the California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force. April 1, 2004.

Federal Register (1999). *Implementing the Regulations of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act*. (Vol 64, No. 210)

Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault (2004). *Spartan Life Handbook*. Michigan State University: Department of Student Life a Division of Student Affairs and Services.

Available at <http://www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/default.pdf>

Appendix A

**Comprehensive Literature Review on
Sexual & Relationship Violence Prevention Programs**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comprehensive Literature Review on Sexual & Relationship Violence Prevention Programs

Empirically Validated Best Practices for Prevention Programs

- Comprehensive efforts to change attitudes and increase knowledge. Increasing knowledge alone has no effect on negative attitudes and belief in myths about sexual and relationship violence. Therefore, in order to change attitudes *and* change behavior, it is critical that program material go beyond definitions and statistics to address myths and the cultural basis for sexual and relationship violence.
- Opportunity for interactive participation. Programs use different formats to convey information (e.g., video presentations, skits, panel discussions, etc), and it does not appear that any particular format is more effective than others. For whichever format is selected, it must include opportunities for interactive participation to be effective.
- Same-gender audience. Same-gender programs are *more effective* than mixed-gender programs in changing men's attitudes toward rape. Furthermore, mixed gender programs have mutually exclusive goals – for programs with men the goal is prevention, while with women it is avoidance. In teaching women how to avoid rape, the program may inadvertently teach some men *how* to rape. While mixed gender audience programs can be done, in order to prevent unintended negative consequences, they often require such a limitation in material presented that the goals of the program becomes unattainable.
- Multiple exposures to the material. The more times participants are exposed to information about rape, the more likely they are to not hold rape supportive attitudes. Repeated exposure results in a cumulative effect in attitude change and may sustain of positive changes observed from initial program exposure.
- Program evaluations must include delayed and repeated measures of outcomes. One-time evaluations conducted immediately after intervention programs provide biased results. Research suggests that respondents give socially desirable answers when tested immediately after the prevention program, giving a false indication of the program's effectiveness. These effects are not present when evaluations occur later. Therefore, in order to accurately reflect the impact of a program, the evaluation measures should be administered a significant time after the program, with repeated measures over time to assess the stability of the program effects.

Promising Practices for Prevention Programs

- Match audience-presenter characteristics (e.g., gender). Researchers suggest that the more similar a presenter is to the audience, the more likely the audience is to accept and perceive the information provided as credible. Although this positive effect of matched gender characteristics has not been empirically explored with rape prevention programs, it has been found that the use of a female facilitator with an all male audience actually had the *reverse effect* on participants, with participants reporting a greater likelihood of committing a rape or engaging in rape-supportive behaviors.
- Measure actual behavior changes. Currently, the vast majority of program evaluations only assess changes in attitude, presuming that attitude change will lead to behavior change. This has not been empirically proven. Therefore, researchers recommend, in order to determine the true effectiveness of a prevention program, assessments must include behavior changes (that is, actual changes in rape and relationship violence perpetrated by members of the campus community). To document such a decrease, it will be necessary to complete a campus-wide assessment of rape and relationship violence perpetration prior to intervention implementation.

Comprehensive Literature Review on Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Prevention

Scope & Purpose of Literature Review

The purpose of this comprehensive review was to identify empirically validated best practices for the prevention of sexual and relationship violence among college students. Literature in multiple disciplines was searched (psychology, sociology, public health, education, women's studies), which yielded 65 studies of empirically evaluated prevention programs. These programs focused primarily on broad-based prevention efforts targeting the general student population. The published literature on campus-based prevention programs addresses three areas: 1) Program Goals and Content, 2) Program Structure, and 3) Program Evaluation. It is important to note that the majority of literature found focused exclusively on sexual assault prevention programs, with the majority of relationship violence prevention programs developed for use among adolescents, not college students. Only one study was found that evaluated a campus-based relationship violence prevention program (Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999). Mahlstedt and Corcoran state that there is much overlap in the goals, content, structure, and evaluation concerns regarding sexual assault and relationship violence prevention programs. When applicable, information that differentiates relationship violence prevention from the sexual assault prevention research will be specified. This review will conclude with an in-depth description of the most effective empirically evaluated broad-based program at a similar institution: University of Illinois' Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program.

Program Goals & Content

Sexual assault prevention programs most commonly have the goals of behavior change, attitude change, and/or knowledge increase. Behavior change for men includes not perpetrating sexual assault because epidemiological data indicate that most incidents of sexual assault and relationship violence are perpetrated by males. For women, this includes improved communication and assertiveness, risk reduction, and resistance. For both men and women the goal of attitude change is to shift attitudes from victim blaming to victim empathy, from sexual assault as a normalized behavior to a criminal act, and finally to decrease acceptance of rape myths. When targeting attitude change, programs provide information to debunk myths about sexual assault/relationship violence (e.g., rapists are strangers hiding in bushes at night, women who stay in abusive relationships like being abused, women who are sexual assaulted/abused ask for it) through discussions of oppression, power and control, and

sexual/gender stereotypes. When focusing on increasing knowledge, programs provide information about definitions, prevalence, and laws regarding sexual assault and relationship violence (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999; Schewe, 2002). Sexual assault prevention programs most often focus on attitude change (Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Lonsway, 1996). Regarding the relationship violence prevention program, the primary goals were increased knowledge and attitude change (Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999).

Evaluations of effectiveness suggest that *increasing knowledge does not result in attitude change*. This means that while someone may understand that 1 in 4 women will be sexual assaulted, this individual may still believe that women “ask for it”. Working to increase knowledge alone is not sufficient to change attitudes. Furthermore, while programs have been shown to change attitudes toward sexual assault and relationship violence (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Berkowitz, 2004; Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999; Lonsway, 1996), attitude change is not the same as behavior change. Programs focus on attitudes because it is believed that attitude change leads to behavior change. Current research has not shown this to be the case, possibly because behavior change is rarely accounted for in assessments of program effectiveness (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Gidycz et al., 2001; Lonsway, 1996; Yeater & O’Donohue, 1999). Despite the lack of demonstrated causal relationship between attitude change and decreased sexual assault perpetration, based on general attitude-behavior research it is still considered useful to find out if programs have been successful in changing rape-supportive attitudes because attitude change may result in social climate change, specifically one less hostile to sexual assault and relationship violence victims (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). To summarize, while increasing knowledge is important, it is not sufficient to change attitudes. While changing attitudes is also important, it has not been linked directly to *preventing* sexual assault from occurring. However, this distinction between attitude and behavior speaks to a need for further evaluation of the role of attitude change in actual sexual assault prevention.

Program Structure

The current literature distinguishes four main characteristics of program structure: 1) audience gender, 2) presenter characteristics, 3) dosage, and 4) format.

Audience gender. Many researchers have advocated for the use of same-gender audiences (Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Bachar & Koss, 2001; Berkowitz, 2004). Programs on sexual assault and relationship violence have

unique information to convey to men as opposed to women. Specifically, given that men are the primary perpetrators of sexual and relationship violence and women are the primary targets, the focus of prevention/intervention programming with men is on preventing perpetration whereas with women the focus is typically on risk reduction/avoidance. Mixed-gender programs may not be able to simultaneously accomplish the goals of prevention and avoidance (Bachar & Koss, 2001). For example, a discussion of sexual assault avoidance during a mixed-gender program may actually unintentionally normalize and justify sexual assault for men while intending to communicate that sexual assault is unfortunately a common occurrence in the lives of women with limited success in holding perpetrators accountable (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993; Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999; Schewe, 2002). Furthermore, discussing ways to avoid sexual assault (e.g., not walking alone in remote poorly lit areas) may give perpetrators "ideas" for the best places or ways to sexually assault women with minimum risk of consequences. Because of this risk, mixed-gender programs may need to limit program content, which may decrease effectiveness (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993). In mixed-gender audiences men may also feel accused and threatened thereby increasing their resistance to the material. Ring and Kilmartin (1992) found that in male-only programs, participants reported being more willing to participate, feeling less defensive, and more open to asking questions. It has also been found that male-only programs are more effective in reducing rape-supportive attitudes (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). If gender separation is not possible or not desired, it is imperative that a safe, nonjudgmental environment be established that allows for open discussion and dialogue during which men can fully participate (Berkowitz, 2004).

Presenter Characteristics. Regarding presenter characteristics, it appears most important that presenters be perceived as credible. This credibility can be achieved through matching on demographic characteristics, specifically gender. Berkowitz (2004) suggests that it is preferable that all male presentations utilize male facilitators. While a female can facilitate to an all male audience if she is extremely skilled, this practice may reinforce the idea that sexual assault and relationship violence are women's issues, decreasing the probability that men will incorporate the presented material, particularly regarding male accountability. One study even found that the use of a female facilitator with an all male audience actually had the reverse effect on participants, with participants reporting a greater likelihood of committing a sexual assault or engaging in rape-supportive behaviors (Berg, Lonsway, &

Fitzgerald, 1999). Rather than a woman facilitating alone, Berkowitz (2004) advises having men and women co-facilitate, thereby modeling a respectful partnership.

Dosage. Researchers consistently emphasize the importance of repeated exposure to sexual assault and relationship violence prevention information. Given the pervasiveness of the myths regarding sexual assault and relationship violence, it is unrealistic to think long-term attitude or behavior changes will occur from a single intervention (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Anderson et al. (1998) suggest that a variety of programs should be offered throughout college. This repeated exposure may result in a cumulative effect in attitude change. Heppner et al. (1995) refer to these follow-ups as booster sessions intended to remind people of what they learned in the initial program (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Lonsway and Kathari (2000) suggest that repeated exposure to sexual assault education programs may increase positive outcomes or hinder the deterioration of positive changes observed.

Format. Programs use different formats to convey information (e.g., video presentations, skits, panel discussions, etc) and it does not appear that any particular format is more effective than others. What is clearly effective is including the opportunity for interactive participation within the selected program format. When programs do not invite the opportunity for interactive participation, effectiveness decreases. Therefore, whatever approach taken to convey information, it is critical that the program involve interactive engagement with the presented materials (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Berkowitz, 2004; Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Lonsway, 1996). It is important to note that in some instances, even with the use of interactive participation, the desired attitude change does not occur. Lonsway (1996) highlights that this is an area in need of future research exploring the process by which interaction with the material influences positive outcomes.

Program Evaluation

Typically, program evaluations consist of pre- and post- program assessments of knowledge and attitudes. Evaluations of programs vary based on the length of time between the program and the evaluation and the number of post-program evaluations. Research shows that evaluating programs' effectiveness immediately post-intervention does not accurately assess impact (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). While participants' knowledge and attitudes may appear to have changed immediately after the intervention, assessments as early as two weeks later have shown rebound effects where participants' knowledge and attitudes return to pre-intervention levels (Berg, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald,

1999). Some researchers argue that any positive changes identified immediately after the intervention program represent nothing more than experimental demand effects (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Gidycz et al., 2001). Therefore, researchers argue it is necessary to do post-intervention assessments at longer intervals after the intervention. Furthermore, to assess the stability of attitude changes, researchers argue that multiple evaluations of program effectiveness over long periods of time should occur (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Brecklin & Forde, 2001).

As identified in the program goals and content section, the vast majority of programs fail to assess actual behavior change as a result of prevention programs. Given that no causal link between attitude and behavior change has yet been established, it is critical to evaluate actual behavior change resulting from prevention programs. This means that as part of the pre-program assessment, the experiences of sexual assault and relationship violence must be assessed. As part of the multiple post-program evaluations, measures of actual sexual assault and relationship violence experiences should be reassessed. Through the measurement of behavioral experiences a clear picture of the programmatic impact on these behaviors can be obtained. It is important to note, however, that accurately assessing sexual assault and relationship violence is no simple task (Lonsway, 1996; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993). In some instances it may be beneficial to measure behavioral impact of these programs through other means. For example, Ring and Kilmartin (1992) suggest the measurement of willingness to participate in future acquaintance sexual assault workshops. Lenihan and colleagues (1992) suggest that help-seeking behaviors of sexual assault survivors may be an important outcome of sexual assault education. However, it is possible that increased help-seeking may give the false impression that there has been an increase in sexual assault perpetration spawned by the sexual assault education program (Lonsway, 1996). In an individual study of a first year campus acquaintance sexual assault prevention program, Lonsway and Kothari (2000) noted that the campus saw a spike in service utilization after the program was implemented, which all service providers agreed was due to greater awareness of services available rather than an increase in perpetration. While determining the most appropriate behavioral measures poses a challenge to evaluators, it is still a critical approach to determining programmatic impact above and beyond attitude change.

Most effective programs at similar institutions

According to this review of the existing research, the most effective empirically evaluated broad-based program at a similar institution appears to be the University of Illinois' Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program. The University of Illinois has a mandatory two-hour workshop for all incoming first year students. Trained student facilitators (typically two male and two female) provide a tightly scripted two-hour workshop that provides definitions, clarifies misinformation concerning sexual assault, and provides information on the continuum of sexual coercion, consent, and legal definitions. Additionally, the workshop includes information on the effects of sexual assault on a survivor, responding to survivors, victim blaming, and the role of drugs and alcohol through scenarios and discussions about the scenarios. Included in the session is 40 minutes where women and men split into same-gender groups to discuss the issues that are gender specific around risk reduction for women and men as supporters, consent, a values continuum, and vague date sexual assault scenarios for the men. The session concludes with a brief conversation regarding campus resources and activism.

Workshop facilitators at the University of Illinois take a semester long one credit course through the Community Health Department. The semester is spent exploring the social foundations that support rape culture and increasing understandings of oppression and how it relates to assault in addition to learning the specific skills needed to facilitate the workshops. This course covers various forms of violence against women beyond sexual assault including relationship violence and pornography.

Both the semester long facilitator training course and the two-hour educational workshop have been evaluated. The semester long facilitator training course showed decreases in rape myth acceptance at a two year follow-up, the longest follow up assessment found in the extant literature. Furthermore, it was found that students in the facilitator training course showed a decrease in rape-myth acceptance, reduction in adversarial sexual beliefs, and more support for feminism when compared to students that had taken a human sexuality course. At posttest, women also reported increased willingness to be more directive and assertive in their sexual communication (Lonsway et al., 1998). Regarding the two-hour mandatory workshop, questionnaire responses of participants revealed greater sexual assault knowledge, less support for cultural rape myths, and less rape-supportive judgments in a hypothetical case compared with students who had not been to the CARE program. But this change was

primarily found in those assessed immediately after the intervention, with no comparable impact observed in the context of the students who had been to the workshop months previously. Sexual assault knowledge however did show an effect for all CARE participants (both immediately following the intervention and months later). Interestingly, participants contacted four to six months after the workshop were significantly more likely to be willing to both volunteer and fund (through increased tuition fees) sexual assault prevention efforts than those that had not been through the workshop. This alternative behavioral measure suggests that while attitude change after the workshop is less stable, participants are still impacted by the program as manifested through a willingness to support efforts to stop violence against women (Lonsway & Kothari, 2000). This distinction between the overall effectiveness of the semester long course and the one time two-hour workshop highlight the point that repeated, long-term exposure to this material is necessary to counter a lifetime education in our rape culture. While this program is perceived as the most effective broad-based program at a similar institution, the two-hour workshop does not include information on relationship violence. An adaptation to the program or an additional workshop focusing on relationship violence would need to be created, perhaps as an adaptation from the materials presented in the semester long course.

References

- Anderson, L., Stoelb, M. P., Duggan, P., Hieger, B., Kling, K. H., & Payne, J. P. (1998). The effectiveness of two types of sexual assault prevention programs in changing the sexual assault-supportive attitudes of college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*, 131-142.
- Bachar, K. & Koss, M. P. (2001). From prevalence to prevention: Closing the gap between what we know about sexual assault and what we do. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, and R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Berg, D. R., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Sexual assault prevention education for men: The effectiveness of empathy-induction techniques. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(3), 219-234.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (October, 2004). Working with men to prevent violence against women: An Overview (Part One). *Applied Research Forum: National Electronic Network on Violence Against Women, 1-7*.
- Brecklin, L. R. & Forde, D. R. (2001). A meta-analysis of sexual assault education programs. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 303-321.
- Gidycz, C. A., Layman, M. J., Rich, C. L., Crothers, M., Gyls, J., Matorin, A., & Jacobs, C. D. (2001). An evaluation of an acquaintance sexual assault prevention program: Impact on attitudes, sexual aggression, and sexual victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(11), 1120-1138.
- Heppner, M. J., Humphrey, C. F., Hillnebrand-Gunn, T. L., & DeBord, K. A. (1995). The differential effects of sexual assault prevention programming on attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 508-518.
- Lenihan, G. O., Rawlins, M. E., Eberly, C. G., Buckley, R., & Masters, B. (1992). Gender differences in sexual assault supportive attitudes before and after a date sexual assault education intervention. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 331-338.
- Lonsway, K. A. (1996). Preventing acquaintance sexual assault through education: What do we know? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 229-265.
- Lonsway, K. A., Klaw, E. L., Berg, D. R., Waldo, C. R., Kothari, C., Mazurek, C. J., & Hegeman, K. E. (1998). Beyond no means no. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(1), 73-92.

- Lonsway, K. A. & Kothari, C. (2000). First year campus acquaintance sexual assault education: Evaluating the impact of a mandatory intervention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 220-232.
- Mahlstedt, D., & Corcoran, C. B. (1999). Preventing Dating Violence. In S. Davis, M. Crawford, and J. Sebrechts (Eds.), *Coming into her own: Educational success in girls and women*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ring, T. E., Kilmartin, C. (1992). Man to man about sexual assault: A sexual assault prevention program for men. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 82-84.
- Schewe, P., & O'Donohue, W. (1993). Sexual assault prevention: Methodological problems and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 13*, 667-682.
- Schewe, P. A. (2002) New directions for preventing interpersonal violence. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Yeater, E. A. & O'Donohue, W. (1999). Sexual assault prevention programs: Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions with women. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*, 739-771.

Appendix B

California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault

California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault

REPORT TO GOVERNOR SCHWARZENEGGER

AND

THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force

April 1, 2004

The preparation of this publication was financially assisted through Grant Award Number TF033Q1578 from the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES). The opinions, findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force and not necessarily those of OES, which reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish and use these materials and authorize others to do so.

This project was supported by Grant No. 2003-WF-BX-4206 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of DOJ.

Governor's California Campus Sexual Assault
Task Force Members

Gail Abarbanel
Director
Rape Treatment Center
Santa Monica-UCLA Medical Center

Jennifer M. Beeman
Director
Campus Violence Prevention Program
University of California, Davis

Linda Bowen
Chief, Sexual Assault Section
Criminal Justice Program Division
Governor's Office of Emergency Services

LaDoris H. Cordell
Vice Provost for Campus Relations and
Special Counselor to the President
Stanford University

Lee Farley, Ed.D.
Associate Dean of Students and
Director of EOPS
Fresno City College

William M. Green, M.D.
Clinical Professor of Emergency Medicine
University of California, Davis, Medical
Center

María Herrera-Sobek , Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity,
Equity, and Academic Policy; Professor
of Chicana and Chicano Studies; and
Luis Leal Endowed Chair
University of California, Santa Barbara

Alex Kelter, M.D.
Chief, Epidemiology and Prevention for
Injury Control (EPIC) Branch
California Department of Health Services

Alva Moreno
Executive Director
East Los Angeles Women's Center
Los Angeles

D. Carol Mosely
Coordinator
Rape Prevention Education Program
University of California, Santa Barbara

Thao P. Nguyen
Trauma Counselor and Prevention
Education Coordinator
Rape Trauma Services of San Mateo
County

Patty O'Ran
Assistant Director
Crime and Violence Prevention Center
California Attorney General's Office

Melora A. Sundt, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Research
Rossier School of Education
University of Southern California

Janice C. Takahashi
Counselor
San Joaquin Delta College

Kimberly A. Wible, J.D.
Chief of Police
San Francisco State University

Staff Facilitating the Work of the California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force

Marybeth Carter
Executive Director
California Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Sandy Ortman
Director of Special Programs
California Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Kristen Roe
Public Policy Consultant and
Project Coordinator, *California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault*

Erin Volk
Administrative Assistant
California Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Wendy Alexander
Principal, Wendy Alexander Writing and Editing Services and
Editor, *California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

A Campus Plan to Address Sexual Assault

The Clery Act: Policies and Compliance

Sexual Assault Prevention Education

Faculty and Staff Training

Campus Law Enforcement and Security

Campus Judicial Protocols, Policies and Training

Victim Services

Appendix A: Data

Appendix B: Sample Faculty and Staff Training Scheme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following report, the *California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault (Blueprint)*, presents legislative recommendations to the Governor of California and the California Legislature regarding changes that should be made in existing laws and enactment of new laws to enhance the sexual assault-related policies and practices of colleges and universities – both public and private – throughout the state. The *Blueprint* also contains considerations for campus administrators, including specific action steps that can be taken to improve individual campus responses to sexual assault.

These recommendations are the result of: (a) a comprehensive study of campus policies, prevention education and response programs, and victim services from a representative sample of 52 colleges and universities in California; (b) a review by the Governor-appointed California Campus Sexual Assault Task Force (Task Force) of all relevant state and federal legislation; and (c) thorough discussion of the information by the Task Force through public hearings and closed deliberations.

Sexual assault is a crime committed primarily against women and youth. Research over the past 20 years has consistently estimated the rate of sexual assault among traditional college-aged women as one in four.¹ Because of the prevalence of sexual violence among college women, it is essential that institutions of higher education establish comprehensive victim services programs, prevention education programs, judicial protocols, law enforcement and security responses, and training for faculty and staff. In addition, a number of state and federal laws outline a range of requirements for institutions of higher education regarding sexual assault crimes. In response, campus administrators must create protocols and policies to ensure compliance with these laws.

The Task Force encourages every institution of higher education in California to create a campus plan to address sexual assault. At a minimum, each plan should include a:

- Sexual assault policy that defines prohibited behavior and sanctions for violations
- Campus protocol for responding to reported sexual assaults
- Coordinated victim services delivery system utilizing campus and/or community-based resources
 - Campus plan to prevent sexual assaults
 - Set of policies and practices that address all campus community members (e.g., students, faculty, staff), as potential victims or perpetrators of sexual assault
 - Plan to provide faculty and staff training

Campus administration officials such as Presidents, Deans, Chancellors, and Provosts should spearhead efforts to develop such plans. And, while many of these activities are legislated through various California Education Code sections, the Task Force encourages the Legislature to make such activities compulsory rather than voluntary.

When addressing campus sexual assault, administrators should make use of both on- and off-campus resources, including local rape crisis centers, municipal law enforcement agencies,

district attorneys' offices, and forensic medical examination sites. This model allows campuses to draw upon the expertise and resources of a broader group and decreases the likelihood that limited financial or personnel resources may prohibit the provision of a basic level of response and services.

The Task Force makes the following recommendations to the California Legislature:

The Clery Act: Policies and Compliance

1. Enact legislation directing the chief executive officers of the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California community college systems to designate an official responsible for reviewing the annual report from each campus in their system for compliance with the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) prior to submission to U.S. Department of Education (DOE).
2. Enact legislation requiring each campus to provide training on the content of the report to campus security authorities and campus police or security staff.
3. Enact legislation requiring campuses to post the full text of their annual Clery Act report on a campus-sponsored website.
4. Direct the state auditor to receive guidance directly from DOE on how to determine compliance with the Clery Act.
5. Enact legislation revising California Education Code section 76380, which currently requires only certain campuses to create and post a campus safety plan, making the section applicable to all California institutions of higher education.

Sexual Assault Prevention Education

1. Require all institutions of higher education in California to implement the provisions of California Education Code section 67390.
2. Once the provisions of California Education Code section 67390 are made mandatory, support an evaluation and assessment to measure progress after two years and four years, and then re-examine the legislation to incorporate any necessary changes.
3. Enact legislation that provides funding for California community colleges to comply with Education Code section 67390.
4. Enact legislation that provides funding to support institutions of higher education in the development of sexual assault prevention education programs and implementation of activities required through Education Code section 67390.

Faculty and Staff Training

1. Enact legislation that provides funding for the development and delivery of faculty and staff training programs.

Campus Law Enforcement and Security

1. Enact legislation mandating that all campus law enforcement departments certified by Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) employ at all times at least two officers who have attended the POST Sexual Assault Investigators Course.
2. Enact legislation requiring campuses using a security force that has not been certified by POST to provide first responder training on sexual assault to all officers, following the training recommendations outlined in this report.
3. Enact legislation requiring all law enforcement and security first responders to receive training on cultural competence and sensitive responses to sexual assault victims beyond what is currently provided in the required POST training courses.

Enact legislation to provide funding to develop a POST instructional video for use by campus law enforcement officers, addressing the following issues: first responder protocol for sexual assaults, sections of the *Blueprint* that relate to campus law enforcement, and sex offender registration statutes as they pertain to campuses.

Campus Judicial Protocols, Policies and Training

1. Enact legislation requiring institutions of higher education to record and report the number of sexual assault complaints made, number of cases resolved through mediation, number of cases resolved through both informal hearings and formal hearings, and the final outcome of all cases, including appeals.
2. Enact legislation requiring the UC, CSU and California community college systems to develop training programs that include the elements outlined in this report for judicial officers with responsibility for hearing sexual misconduct complaints.

Victim Services

1. Enact legislation to expand California Education Code section 67385 by requiring all institutions of higher education to create a plan for the delivery of victim services as

outlined in this report, using resources from the campus, community or a combination thereof.

2. Enact legislation to ensure that sexual assault victims served by campus-based sexual assault programs are accorded the same confidential privilege as sexual assault victims served by “sexual assault victim counselors” per California Evidence Code section 1035.2 et seq.

INTRODUCTION

The late 1980s marked a transition in college and university responses to sexual assault. In particular, the previously unseen phenomenon of acquaintance rape was exposed through new research and the increased willingness of sexual assault victims to report their victimization.

Since then, innovative prevention education programs, comprehensive protocols and policies, campus-based victim services programs, and campus and community collaborations have strengthened higher education institutional responses to sexual assault. In addition, both federal and state legislation now require campus administrators to report sexual assault victimization rates, provide information to campus community members about available services and crime reporting options, and disseminate prevention and awareness education to the campus community.

Simultaneously, research has repeatedly measured the rate of the sexual victimization of college-aged women at one in four², and recent studies have begun to illuminate the emergence of related crimes – dating violence and stalking – as further threats to safety and security on America’s college and university campuses. Moreover, neither faculty nor staff are immune from this type of victimization.

Today, across the State of California, sexual assault policies, protocols and services at various colleges and universities – both public and private – vary greatly. And, while the California Education Code contains guidelines from the Legislature regarding campus sexual assault, funding for implementation of prevention education programs, victim services, and protocol and policy development as well as enforcement of mandated activities has not been allocated. In addition, until now, the state has not provided a comprehensive plan to assist California institutions of higher learning in their efforts. This report, the *California Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault (Blueprint)*, offers such a framework.

The *Blueprint* includes specific recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature regarding minimum standards for training of campus personnel, sexual assault prevention education, campus police/security protocols and training, judicial protocols and training, and victim services. The report also includes considerations for campus administrators regarding specific steps they should take to enhance the performance of their institutions in these areas.

The *Blueprint* fulfills the legislative mandates established in section 67385.3 of the California Education Code.³ As required, the report addresses sexual assault⁴ in the context of campus law enforcement policies and training, prevention education, programs, faculty and employee education, campus judicial policies, victim services, and the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act).⁵

Extent of the Problem

Studies have consistently shown that sexual assault primarily affects women and youth and that most perpetrators are friends, acquaintances, or someone known to the victim.

- In 1994, Robin Warshaw demonstrated that one in four college women had been the victim of a completed or attempted rape and that in fully 84 percent of the attacks, the victim knew the perpetrator.⁶
- The National Violence Against Women Survey of 1998 demonstrated that 83 percent of rape victims were under 25 years old when assaulted.⁷
- In 2000, Bonnie Fisher's *Sexual Victimization of College Women* survey estimated that colleges with 10,000 students might expect more than 350 rapes per year.⁸
- Additionally, half of all stalking victims are between the ages of 18 and 29 years⁹ and women ages 16 to 24 years experience the highest rate of domestic violence victimization.¹⁰

While sexual assault primarily affects young women, they are not the only targets. Men,¹¹ individuals with disabilities,¹² members of cultural and religious minority groups, and lesbian/gay/transgendered individuals also experience sexual assault and frequently do not report their victimization. In response, institutions of higher education should ensure that their programs, services and policies reflect the composition of their campus community and are responsive to the needs of a wide range of victims.

Sexual assault is a critical issue for all college and university campuses. Even though many officially report zero sexual assault crimes each year, sexual assault is known to be a historically underreported crime. As such, crime reports alone cannot provide the basis for determining the extent of the problem on any given campus. Community colleges, large residential campuses, and religiously affiliated institutions are equally obligated to proactively and comprehensively address sexual assault within their communities. No campus is immune from this problem.

Addressing campus sexual assault is the right thing to do, and not only because it is a crime. Supporting a comprehensive institutional approach to address sexual assault ensures that all members of the campus community have access to the education and employment they seek. If a student, staff or faculty member is sexually assaulted, the emotional, physical and psychological impact may interfere with his or her work and school performance. When appropriate services are provided to victims, such factors are mitigated and increase retention rates. Thus, institutions of higher education can best serve members of their community by ensuring timely access to appropriate services and creating an environment intolerant of sexual assault.

While the approach of each campus to addressing sexual assault will vary according to its needs and resources, the following report provides minimum standards for every college and university campus in California.

A CAMPUS PLAN TO ADDRESS SEXUAL ASSAULT

Every institution of higher education in California must develop and implement a plan to address the problem of sexual assault. At a minimum, the plan should include a:

- Campus sexual assault policy
- Campus protocol for responding to reported sexual assaults, including a coordinated system for reporting sexual assault (and other crime) statistics to internal and, where required, external audiences
- Coordinated victim services delivery system utilizing campus and/or community-based resources
 - Campus plan to prevent sexual assault
 - Plan to provide faculty and staff training

The plan also must designate financial and personnel resources for implementing the plan and establish immediate and long-range goals along with a mechanism for measuring progress over time. Campus plans to address sexual assault also must reflect the unique needs of each individual campus community, including the needs of minority groups, individuals with disabilities, and nontraditional college students.

Protocol and Policy Development

Every campus must create a sexual assault policy and protocol.

- A *campus sexual assault policy* establishes the institution's intent to proactively address sexual assault complaints, respond to the needs of victims (including students, faculty and staff) and hold perpetrators (including students, faculty and staff) accountable.
- A *campus sexual assault protocol* provides a detailed description of procedures that will be implemented in response to a sexual assault complaint. The protocol establishes a communication plan to ensure that relevant campus offices and departments are included in the response to an incident, evidence is properly collected and preserved, confidentiality of case information is maintained, and victims needs are addressed. The protocol also ensures that sharing of information with outside interests such as parents and the media is coordinated, and that appropriate reporting requirements of the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act are met (see the chapter on the Clery Act for additional information).

The following entities should be included in the protocol:

- Campus law enforcement or security
- Campus and/or community-based victim services providers

- Campus and/or community health services, counseling or mental health services, and local hospital or Sexual Assault Response Team (SART)
- Student affairs, including judicial affairs, residential services, campus ministries, and women's resource centers

Both the campus sexual assault policy and protocol must be actively publicized to the campus community. The Student Handbook, Faculty and Staff Handbook, campus website, class schedule, and orientation materials are appropriate venues.

Sexual Assault Victim Services Delivery System

Every campus plan to address sexual assault must include a strategy for delivering and coordinating a continuum of services to address victim needs. At a minimum, the victim services plan must ensure that:

- Victims have access to services provided by people with the requisite expertise in various aspects of sexual assault, including support for emotional, medical and legal needs.
- Services for victims are available at all times, including nonbusiness hours and academic breaks.
- Victims are informed about campus resources and community-based services (e.g., local rape crisis center), their programs and services, and the level of confidentiality they provide.
- Victims are assured that trained law enforcement or campus security officers are available and prepared to respond appropriately.
- Services are accessible and appropriate for all members of the campus community, including students, faculty, staff, minority groups, individuals with disabilities, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgendered individuals, nontraditional college students, commuting or parenting students, and friends and families of victims.

The plan should identify an individual or group on campus to oversee the victim services delivery system and conduct regular reviews of effectiveness. Funding for services should be consistent and adequate.

A Campus Strategy for Preventing Sexual Assault

The plan must designate an individual or group with responsibility for providing prevention education to the campus community. This may be an individual or a group of individuals from different areas of campus such as law enforcement/security, counseling, health services, or the women's center. In some cases, an off-campus agency such as the local rape crisis

center may be the most appropriate sexual assault prevention education provider. Some campuses may use a combination of both on- and off-campus resources.

The prevention education strategy used must address social, behavioral and environmental factors.

- Social factors include establishing community standards for behavior, defining consent, and addressing myths and attitudes that support sexual assault.
- Behavioral factors include working with men on initiating the prevention of sexually violent acts and working with women on awareness and safety issues (e.g., self-defense).
- Environmental factors include physical and capital improvements to increase safety (e.g., lighting, emergency-call boxes, maintenance of landscape vegetation, building locks, and appropriate equipment for campus law enforcement/security).

Role of Campus Officials in Creating the Campus Plan

Implementation of federal and state laws designed to improve campus responses to sexual assault requires multidisciplinary coordination,¹³ with serious consequences for noncompliance. Protocols to meet these legislative mandates can and should be incorporated into each campus plan to address sexual assault, and campus administration officials (e.g., Presidents, Deans, Chancellors, and Provosts) should spearhead efforts to develop the campus plan.

Campus administrators also must work to create an environment in which victims feel comfortable seeking assistance and services. This includes efforts to ensure that members of minority cultural or religious groups, individuals with disabilities, and male victims are confident that their unique needs will be respected and appropriately addressed. Administrators also must actively work to send a message to potential perpetrators, including students, faculty and staff, that violations of campus conduct codes will not be tolerated and that all reported cases will be thoroughly investigated.

Inclusion in Development of the Plan

Campuses are encouraged to make use of both on- and off-campus resources, and each campus plan to address sexual assault should reflect the unique resources and expertise of the campus and its surrounding community.

Campus plans to address sexual assault must be developed in collaboration with multidisciplinary working groups, including at a minimum:

- Campus law enforcement or security

- Campus victim services providers, including victim advocates, counselors, health care providers, and women's center staff
- Judicial affairs
- Campus affiliated housing
- Community rape crisis centers
- Local Sexual Assault Response Team (SART)
- Clery Act compliance resources

Representatives from the following groups can enhance the working group:

- Local law enforcement, district attorney, crime lab and forensic medical examination staff
- Campus ministries and local faith-based groups
- Campus ombudsperson
- Faculty and students
- Representatives of minority cultures or religious groups on campus.

Campus administrators should support the working group by:

- Clarifying that participation in the development of the campus plan is part of their job responsibilities
- Stressing the importance of each individual's participation
- Providing requested resources
- Publicly recognizing and supporting the efforts of working groups or subcommittees.

Individual campuses do not have to address sexual assault in isolation. All institutions of higher education – whether large or small, public or private – have access to resources throughout the campus and surrounding community to leverage in the development and delivery of the campus' plan to address sexual assault. Campus administrators are encouraged to engage in a planning process that draws upon these unique resources. This type of approach increases the likelihood that the broadest possible spectrum of services and resources will be built into the campus plan.

Once such a plan is established, administrators will be better positioned to implement the recommendations outlined in this report.

THE CLERY ACT: POLICIES AND COMPLIANCE

History

The passage of the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) in 1990 dramatically changed the ways in which colleges and universities report incidents of sexual assault by establishing new mandates regarding the annual publication of crime statistics and policy statements.¹⁴ Because victims do not disclose their experiences only to law enforcement officials, compliance with the act requires a coordinated effort between the offices most likely to hear a disclosure (e.g., campus administrators, victim services providers, campus law enforcement or security departments, etc.). Thus, every campus plan to address sexual assault must incorporate provisions to ensure compliance with the Clery Act.¹⁵

Requirements

The Clery Act requires institutions of higher education eligible to receive federal financial aid to publish an annual security report. Reports include certain crime statistics for the prior three-year period and a number of security policy statements required by the act. Campuses must publish their sexual assault policies, assure basic victim rights, detail the authority of campus law enforcement or security, and provide specific directions for reporting crimes. The annual report is made available to all current students, faculty and staff, and notice of the report's availability and directions for obtaining a copy must be provided to student, staff and faculty applicants.

In addition, the statistics portion of the annual report is submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (DOE), the entity responsible for monitoring compliance with the act.¹⁶ Colleges and universities must also issue timely warnings to alert the campus community about ongoing threats to safety posed by a reported crime and make available to the public a campus crime log containing a record of reported crimes.¹⁷

Compliance With the Act

Since the Clery Act was first passed, institutions of higher education have struggled to remain current on amendments to the law and have experienced difficulty with interpreting its provisions. Data gathered for this report from 52 colleges and universities in California suggest that some campuses are struggling to appropriately distribute their reports, include required policy statements, and report crimes consistent with the act's requirements (see Appendix A). On a national scale, a study measuring compliance with the Clery Act found

that only 36.5 percent of schools reported forcible and nonforcible crime statistics in a manner fully consistent with the legislation.¹⁸

In an effort to assist campuses, DOE has scheduled the release of a compliance handbook in spring 2004.¹⁹ Security on Campus, Inc. and the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies are collaborating with the department to develop the handbook, and a copy of the publication will be provided to each institution of higher education required to comply with the act. The handbook should provide valuable information for colleges and universities that are actively working to comply with the act.

In an effort to further monitor compliance among California's higher education institutions, the California Legislature passed Education Code section 67382. This legislation empowers the state auditor to report on or before January 1, 2004, and every three years thereafter, the results of an audit of a sample of no fewer than six campuses. The state auditor evaluates the accuracy of each campus' statistics and the procedures used by the institutions to identify, gather and track data for publishing, disseminating and reporting crime statistics. The report is submitted to the chairs of the Assembly Higher Education Committee and Senate Education Committee. Campuses to be audited are those required to comply with the Clery Act.

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Enact legislation directing the chief executive officers of the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU) and California community college systems to designate an official responsible for reviewing the annual report from each campus in their system for compliance with the Clery Act prior to submission to DOE. (This is a current practice of both CSU and UC.) The designated officials from each system will identify problems with reports and work with individual campuses to take corrective action before the reports are submitted to DOE. As the data gathered for this report shows, this practice has resulted in the inclusion of required policy statements at a higher rate than exhibited by the California community college and independent institution samples (see Appendix A).
2. Enact legislation requiring each campus to provide training on the content of the report to campus security authorities and campus police or security staff.
3. Enact legislation requiring campuses to post the full text of their annual Clery Act report on a campus-sponsored website. The report must include the three most recent years of crime reports and the required policy statements. While not mandated by the Clery Act, this practice should make the reports more readily accessible to the public.
4. Direct the state auditor to receive guidance directly from DOE on how to determine compliance with the Clery Act. The state auditor, in turn, must use the exact criteria as DOE, thereby ensuring consistency in monitoring efforts. When a campus is found to be out of compliance with the act, the state auditor should notify DOE so that the department can initiate an official investigation. At a minimum, the state auditor should conduct an annual

review of whether or not all campuses required to submit an annual report have complied. When a campus is found to have not submitted an annual report, a complaint must be filed with DOE. In addition, the state auditor should establish criteria for selecting campuses to audit, taking into consideration the audits most recently conducted by DOE. Campuses most recently audited by the federal government and not found to be in significant violation should not be reviewed by the state auditor for a specified number of years.

5. Enact legislation revising California Education Code section 76380, which currently requires only certain campuses to create and post a campus safety plan. The revision should make the section applicable to all California institutions of higher education and mandate that the information be posted on a campus-sponsored website. Ideally, the campus safety plan would be posted in conjunction with the annual Clery Report.

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION EDUCATION

Campus sexual assault prevention education activities take many forms, including public media campaigns aimed at raising awareness about the prevalence and dynamics of acquaintance rape, consciousness-raising groups for men to explore their role in supporting sexually exploitative behavior, and peer educator presented role-plays and workshops in residential buildings. Complementary means of preventing sexual assault on campuses include installing security systems, lighting, emergency phones, and surveillance cameras, and promoting self-defense courses to help women avert assaults.

There are a number of reasons why colleges and universities must provide sexual assault prevention education to members of their campus communities. As educational institutions, they assume a role in the development of individuals – fostering character and helping people understand their roles and responsibilities in society. In addition, sexual assault is a crime primarily committed against youth, the population traditionally served by many colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education also sponsor and support a number of social organizations frequently associated with high-profile sexual assault crimes, including fraternities, sororities and athletic teams, which garner significant media attention when incidents occur. And some faculty and staff members may choose to use their positions of authority to perpetrate sexual assault crimes.

The California Legislature addresses college and university sexual assault prevention education efforts through California Education Code section 67390. In this section, the Legislature recognizes that “college students are more vulnerable to rape than any other age group, the majority of reported victims and offenders of rape are of college age, and at most colleges and universities today, few students, faculty or staff are alerted to crucial information about sexual assaults, especially acquaintance rape.” The Legislature also acknowledges that “many people have misconceptions about [sexual assault] crimes that enhance their vulnerability to victimization.”

In recognition of these facts, the Legislature notes that “colleges should implement a variety of effective educational programs to inform all students and other college personnel about sexual assaults on campus.” Such programs “should be implemented to disseminate factual information about sexual assault, promote open discussion, encourage reporting, and provide information about prevention to faculty, staff and both male and female students.” The Legislature specifically encourages campuses to “emphasize to students the seriousness of the offenses of rape and sexual assault” and recognizes that “students need critical factual information about the prevalence of stranger and acquaintance rape, how and where it happens, its impact, and the relationship between alcohol and drug use and sexual assaults.”

Education Code section 67390 also recommends training for specific target populations on campus such as Greek organizations; new students; individuals living in and working in campus-sponsored housing; student services professional staff; campus police; and athletic coaches, administrators and athletes.

The legislation specifically notes that campuses must not simply go through the motions of developing policies and brochures. Instead, campuses are encouraged to disseminate information and materials “in a way that emphasizes their importance and stimulates the interest of students.” This includes utilizing a range of media such as campus newspapers and radio and television stations.

Historically, funding has not been provided to California colleges or universities to implement sexual assault prevention education programs responsive to the recommendations of the Legislature as established through Education Code 67390, nor to local rape crisis centers to assist campuses in their efforts. As a result, programming on California’s college and university campuses is rarely consistent or institutionalized. In fact, many campuses make no effort to provide sexual assault prevention education to their community members. Local rape crisis centers attempt to fill in the gaps where possible, but these centers do not always have adequate staff or funding for this purpose.

Considerations for Campus Administrators

Every California college and university must include in its campus plan to address sexual assault a plan to provide sexual assault prevention education to the entire campus community, including students, faculty and staff. Every campus prevention education plan must – at a minimum – follow the provisions of Education Code section 67390. The campus sexual assault prevention education plan should clarify financial support and responsible personnel, along with a mechanism for evaluating effectiveness. Representatives from various campus communities should be consulted during the development of the plan, including members of religious and cultural minority groups, individuals with disabilities, and nontraditional college students.

Every campus should consider using resources from the campus, surrounding community, or a combination thereof. Community-based resources such as rape crisis centers can provide expertise in sexual assault prevention education programming and address gaps in campus-based services. When campuses choose to form a partnership with their local rape crisis center, representatives from the center must be invited to participate in the planning process.

Campus sexual assault prevention education plans should incorporate a range of strategies, including primary, secondary and tertiary prevention measures as well as a broad range of media and educational techniques. Sexual assault prevention initiatives must not be limited to environmental safety factors such as installation of enhanced security mechanisms, or risk-avoidance techniques such as self-defense courses for women. Such initiatives do not address the root causes of sexual assault.^{xx}

In an effort to strengthen programming, students should be encouraged to participate in the development and delivery of sexual assault prevention education programs aimed at them. Faculty and staff should also be involved in the development and delivery of programs targeting their peer groups. When members of the target audience take an active role, this increases the relevancy of the programming and motivates greater buy-in from peers.

Representatives from various groups on campus should also be consulted on the development of programs and invited to participate in the delivery of sexual assault programming, including cultural minorities, individuals with disabilities, athletes, fraternity and sorority members, older students, commuter students, parenting students, international students, and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered individuals. Male students, faculty and staff should play a significant role in developing and delivering sexual assault prevention education.

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Require all institutions of higher education in California to implement the provisions of California Education Code section 67390.
2. Once the provisions of California Education Code section 67390 are made mandatory, support an evaluation and assessment to measure progress after two years and four years, and then re-examine the legislation to incorporate any necessary changes.
3. Enact legislation that provides funding for California community colleges to comply with Education Code section 67390.
4. Enact legislation that provides funding to support institutions of higher education in the development of sexual assault prevention education programs and implementation of activities required through Education Code section 67390.

FACULTY AND STAFF TRAINING

College and university campuses are microcosms of the larger communities in which they reside. As such, campuses experience the same social problems faced by all communities, including sexual assault. Students, staff and faculty alike are potential perpetrators of sexual assault. Moreover, all three groups are also at risk for sexual victimization. However, prevention education and training on institutional policies can prepare campus community members for these realities. In addition, training on campus sexual assault policies clearly conveys the institution's expectations about acceptable behavior for all members of the campus community.

An appropriate place to begin is with training for faculty and staff. These individuals have relationships with students who may view them as trusted resources within the campus community. In turn, professors, teaching assistants, janitors, and administrative support staff must be prepared to appropriately respond to disclosures of sexual victimization. When employees are thus empowered, necessary resources and services can be mobilized without delay.

Unfortunately, a recent study found that “few campuses provide sexual assault response and/or sensitivity training to those most likely to first hear of sexual assaults on their campus: friends and fellow students, campus law enforcement/security officers, and faculty members.”^{xxi} Data gathered for this report illustrates similar shortfalls among California's higher education institutions. Only one campus out of the 52 surveyed reported that all faculty and staff receive some level of training regarding sexual assault (see Appendix A).

Faculty and staff not only provide resources for victims, but are also vulnerable to assaults themselves. A national victimization study sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice reported that approximately 51,000 employees are raped or sexually assaulted each year.^{xxii} Informing staff members about available resources is a proactive way of ensuring their prompt access to treatment and services. In addition, faculty and staff are potential perpetrators of sexual assault crimes and should receive clear guidance about institutional responses to assaults perpetrated by such individuals.

As is emphasized throughout this report, creating a campuswide plan lays the groundwork for a consistent, uniform approach. Developing a plan for training faculty and staff is no exception. The plan should take into account the different job functions and roles of all personnel on campus as well as their relative likelihood of coming into direct contact with a sexual assault victim. Content of training courses and frequency of delivery should vary by occupation. For example, a facilities manager and a clerk in the registrar's office should receive basic training on how to refer a victim, while a director of housing or campus nurse should be prepared to engage more fully in the campus sexual assault response system.

All faculty and staff should be informed about and have easy access to campus sexual assault policies and protocols. These resources should be readily available when an incident occurs and when students turn to these individuals for help.

Considerations for Campus Administrators

Campus administrators must include in their plan to address sexual assault a mandatory training program for all faculty and staff, not just those who work directly with victims. The training plan must include a mandatory training session for *all new faculty and staff* during orientation activities and ongoing training tailored to individual job duties. Training must be accessible to non-English speaking staff, and the training curriculum must reflect the cultural composition of the target audience. At a minimum, the training plan should:

- Include a training component in orientation activities for all new faculty and staff.
- Include follow-up training for all staff and faculty, varying the content, duration and frequency for each profession.
- Introduce all faculty and staff to the campus plan to address sexual assault.
- Emphasize that faculty and staff are not expected to be experts in sexual assault, but that everyone should be prepared to make appropriate referrals.
- Provide every employee with a copy of the campus' sexual assault protocol and policy, including written information about how to connect victims with appropriate resources.
- Address faculty and staff as potential victims of sexual assault, resources for victims, and potential perpetrators.
- Include a cultural sensitivity and competence component.
- Train all employees about their reporting obligations under the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act).
- Identify an individual or office to spearhead, monitor and enforce the campuswide training initiative.
- Support faculty initiatives to include information about sexual assault in academic curricula across all disciplines and academic departments.

(See Appendix B for a sample training scheme.)

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Enact legislation that provides funding for the development and delivery of faculty and staff training programs.

CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SECURITY

Campus law enforcement and security departments play a significant role in institutional responses to sexual assault. Whether the force is comprised of fully sworn peace officers or hired security guards, the department's response to sexual assault reports must be based in protocol, supported by training, and sensitive to victim needs.

To achieve this, every campus plan to address sexual assault must include first responder and investigation protocols for campus law enforcement or security. Whether a department receives one report every three years or one every week, protocols outlining response and investigation procedures are critical.

- Protocols and policies provide the necessary foundation for a uniform and proficient response.
- Uniform procedures increase the likelihood that victims and perpetrators are interviewed appropriately and key evidence preserved.
- When cases are turned over to a municipal law enforcement department for investigation or district attorney for prosecution, implementation of uniform procedures following a protocol can increase the strength of case information.

California institutions of higher education employ a range of law enforcement and security forces with varying levels of authority and training requirements. While all University of California and California State University campuses employ fully sworn peace officers,^{xxiii} California community colleges and independent institutions either employ a security force, contract for security services, contract with a local law enforcement entity, or refer crimes to local municipal law enforcement.^{xxiv}

Training requirements for campus law enforcement and security departments vary by the level of authority of each force.^{xxv} However, every campus law enforcement and security department must be prepared to respond to sexual assault complaints. Therefore, every campus plan to address sexual assault must include both a first responder and investigation protocol for campus law enforcement or security, and both types of protocols must be reinforced through ongoing training.

Protocols for Departments That Do Not Investigate Sexual Assault Reports

Some campus law enforcement or security departments do not investigate sexual assault reports. When the campus is not the primary investigative agency for sexual assault, administrators must implement a written policy and protocol establishing procedures for the following:

- Notifying the appropriate investigative law enforcement agency
- Providing written information to the victim about contacting appropriate campus and community rape crisis support services and calling the agency if the victim requests this
- Informing the victim about forensic medical examination services and how to access these services
- Interacting with other offices on campus such as judicial affairs, housing, student health center, counseling center, and campus ministries
- Complying with the federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) and other applicable, mandatory reporting requirements, including both child abuse and adult sexual assault
- Maintaining appropriate levels of confidentiality
- Following up with the victim.

Protocols for Departments That Investigate Sexual Assault Reports

Every campus with a law enforcement or security department with responsibility for investigating sexual assaults must develop a protocol that includes the following:

- Procedure for notifying and mobilizing all critical campus units in the event of a sexual assault
- Requirement to notify victims of the right to have an advocate and a support person present during interviews^{xxvi}
- Procedure for contacting a qualified support person for the victim and accused (e.g., a rape crisis advocate/counselor or other specially trained individual)
- Procedure for connecting the victim and accused with medical and forensic evidence services
- Steps for complying with legal reporting requirements, including those mandated by the Clery Act and other applicable mandatory reporting requirements, including both child abuse and adult sexual assault
- Resource information for both on- and off-campus service providers for victims and accused
- Protocol for transporting the victim and the accused to off-campus offices (e.g., local law enforcement, forensic examination site, etc.)
- Procedure for obtaining alternative living arrangements for victim, if requested
- Procedure to ensure confidentiality, including those protections offered pursuant to California Penal Code section 293
- Protocol for releasing information to the media and issuing timely warnings to the campus community, pursuant to confidentiality policies and the Clery Act
- Responsibilities of both on- and off-campus law enforcement entities
- Procedures for working with the local district attorney's office
- Description of campus disciplinary protocol and possible sanctions
- Protocol for working with victims who choose not to officially report an incident, but still wish to seek medical and/or emotional support services

- Case management for both the victim and accused
- Procedures for regularly evaluating and updating the protocol
- Training plan for relevant entities regarding implementation of the protocol

When developing protocols, applicable federal and state laws must be addressed, including the following:

- The Clery Act,^{xxvii} along with a timely warning protocol that includes the threat to the campus community for acquaintance rape and procedures for updating and maintaining the daily log
- The Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act,^{xxviii} a federal law that provides for the tracking of convicted, registered sex offenders enrolled as students at institutions of higher education, or who work or volunteer on campus^{xxix}
- California Education Code section 67385,^{xxx} concerning written procedures to ensure that sexual assault victims receive treatment and information
- California Education Code section 67380, which in part requires a compilation of statistics on reported crimes that are committed on campus and that involve violence, hate violence, theft or destruction of property, illegal drugs, or alcohol intoxication
- California Education Code section 67381,^{xxxi} which requires campuses to enter into written agreements with local law enforcement agencies that clarify operational responsibilities for investigations of Part 1 violent crimes occurring on campus
- Labor Code section 230 and 230.1, which provide protections for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence

Protocols and policies for all types of campus-based law enforcement and security departments must address the progression of both on- and off-campus processes, which may occur simultaneously and independently from one another. These may include campus judicial and community criminal and/or civil processes, campus-sponsored housing or campus-sponsored organization review, or civil suit against the university for failure to protect.

Campus law enforcement and security departments must have a clear protocol for situations when the victim chooses not to officially report a crime. In such cases, authorities must be prepared to refer victims to appropriate support services and respect requests for confidentiality and anonymity.

All campuses are encouraged to develop a relationship with and/or assign a campus liaison to participate in the community's sexual assault response team (SART), the entity responsible for coordinating forensic, medical, legal, and support services in instances of sexual assault.

Training Recommendations

All campus police agencies and security departments must provide first responder training to all employees, including officers, guards and dispatchers. The current state Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) Guidelines for Sexual Assault Investigation should be utilized, including the Sexual Assault Investigation Considerations List. In addition, every sworn police agency must send at least two officers to the POST Sexual Assault Investigative Course.

Campuses that employ security departments may not exclude themselves from this recommendation. The training curriculum for security departments should address protocol procedures for initial contact with the victim and accused, evidence preservation procedures, steps for contacting the law enforcement entity responsible for handling sexual assault cases, and available resources and appropriate victim referrals.

Every campus must develop and implement an in-house training program to address its own unique protocols and policies.

- Training must be mandatory for all newly hired officers and reinforced through annual sessions to maintain proficiency and provide updates on policy revisions and new laws.
- The training curriculum must be developed and implemented in collaboration with experts in sexual assault, including victim advocates.

At a minimum, the training curriculum should include the following:

- Campus plan to address sexual, campus sexual assault policy, and campus sexual assault protocol
- Law enforcement or security department sexual assault response and investigation protocols
- Description of available campus and community services for victims
- Overview of sexual assault myths and facts, dynamics of sexual assault, applicable laws, appropriate interview techniques with the victim and accused, cultural competence, and confidentiality.

Written materials containing contact information for on- and off-campus sexual assault resources must be made available to all law enforcement and security officers for distribution to victims and accused perpetrators.

All campus law enforcement/security departments must post the following information on their department website:^{xxxiii}

- “What to do if sexually assaulted,” including specific instructions outlining options, from initial reporting to available support services to campus and community judicial systems
- Agency names and phone numbers for referrals, including the community rape crisis center (and where possible, details about what happens when a victim calls for assistance)

- At least one confidential resource, either on campus or in the community, so that victims can explore options without having to commit to a course of action (ideally available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year)
- Available support services for victims who choose not to report the crime
- Description of instances when parental notification is mandated (for minors) and when timely warnings to the campus community are required
- Alternative reporting options for the crime (e.g., anonymous, third-party or confidential reports)
- Definitions of sexual assault and consent
- List of victims' rights as provided through the Clery Act and the "Victim's Bill of Rights" as provided for in the California Constitution, Article 1, section 28(a)
- Website link to or copy of the campus' sexual assault policy and protocol

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Enact legislation mandating that all campus law enforcement departments certified by POST employ at all times at least two officers who have attended the POST Sexual Assault Investigators Course.
2. Enact legislation requiring campuses using a security force that has not been certified by POST to provide first responder training on sexual assault to all officers, following the training recommendations outlined in this report.
3. Enact legislation requiring all law enforcement and security first responders to receive training on cultural competence and sensitive responses to sexual assault victims beyond what is currently provided in the required POST training courses.
4. Enact legislation to provide funding to develop a POST instructional video for use by campus law enforcement officers, addressing the following issues: first responder protocol for sexual assaults, sections of the *Campus Blueprint to Address Sexual Assault* that relate to campus law enforcement, and sex offender registration statutes as they pertain to campuses.

CAMPUS JUDICIAL PROTOCOLS, POLICIES AND TRAINING

Campus judicial^{xxxiii} systems address behavior that violates the campus code of conduct, interferes with the educational mission of the institution, or adversely affects individual members of the campus community. In order to sustain and strengthen their communities, campus judicial systems also work to promote a climate of safety and mutual respect. Sanctions are issued to protect individuals, protect the campus community, and provide an educational opportunity for the accused.

In most cases of sexual assault, the reported behavior is a criminal offense as well as a violation of the institution's code of conduct.^{xxxiv} Campus judicial systems operate independently from state and federal criminal justice systems. Typically, their sanctions apply a lesser burden of proof than that required by either state or federal criminal systems, and these sanctions do not restrict basic liberties. As a result, a campus may decide to pursue an allegation of sexual assault that the criminal justice system might dismiss.

Individual victims may choose not to report to municipal or campus law enforcement/security and instead pursue a remedy only through the campus judicial system. For these reasons, a campus judicial system's response to a sexual assault complaint may be a victim's only avenue for seeking justice. Therefore, campuses must actively work to ensure that their judicial systems are fair, unbiased and responsive to the needs and rights of both victims and those accused of sexual assault.

Federal legislation requires institutions of higher education to respond promptly and guarantee victims certain rights when reports of sexual assault are filed.^{xxxv} These rights are as follows:

- The accuser and accused have the same opportunity to have others present.
- Both parties shall be informed of the outcome and sanctions of any disciplinary proceeding, including appeals, with respect to an alleged sexual offense.^{xxxvi}
- Survivors shall be informed of their options to notify law enforcement.
- Survivors shall be notified of counseling services.
- Survivors shall be notified of options for changing academic and living situations.

In addition, Title IX requires institutions to provide a timely response and remedy to reports of sexual assault and harassment.^{xxxvii} Judicial codes and protocols must be designed to ensure that such responses routinely occur.

Considerations for Campus Administrators

Every campus must incorporate the following elements into its judicial protocols, policies and training practices. All campuses must:

- Establish sexual assault as a specific violation of the campus code of conduct. This creates greater awareness about the institution's expectations regarding the conduct of students, staff and faculty and reaffirms that such behavior is unacceptable within the campus community.^{xxxviii}
- Establish a specific protocol for the investigation and adjudication of sexual misconduct complaints.
- Include the "Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights" in the campus protocol for adjudicating sexual misconduct complaints.
- Never require mediation as a means of resolution for a sexual misconduct complaint. Mediation assumes a sharing of power and in the case of a sexual assault, an imbalance of power has already been established.
- Establish a policy that enables campus administrators to grant "immunity" from lesser violations of the code of conduct for violations that occurred in relation to the reported sexual assault. For example, this policy would allow a college to refrain from taking action against a sexual assault victim who had engaged in a violation of the campus alcohol policy at the time of the sexual assault.^{xxxix}
- Neither prohibit consensual sexual activity nor provide sanctions for consensual sexual activity.^{xl}
- Establish the right of both the victim and the accused, if an allegation of sexual misconduct is initially handled through an informal hearing process, to at anytime request an end to that process in favor of a formal hearing.
- Prohibit the presentation of irrelevant information about the victim's prior sexual activity, including any prior consensual sexual history between the accuser and the accused.
- Allow victims to make a victim impact statement and affirm the value of victim input as a critical factor in determining sanctions if culpability of the accused has been established.
- Establish the victim's right to appeal to another body or individual if a sexual misconduct complaint is deemed unworthy of a hearing.
- Provide conflict of interest provisions.

Institutions of higher education must incorporate a range of sanctions for sexual misconduct into their judicial protocols.

- Sanctioning guidelines must include a range of options so that the final determination reflects the severity and nature of the specific violation.
- Sanctions must reflect the nature of the misconduct, disciplinary history of the accused, the impact on the victim, and the impact on the community.
- Sanctions must help facilitate a victim's reclamation of his or her academic life.

Individuals with responsibility for hearing sexual misconduct complaints must receive training on how to hear such cases prior to their first case and should have their training reinforced annually.^{xli} Training topics should include the following:

- The institution's sexual misconduct judicial protocol^{xlii}
- Myths and misconceptions about sexual assault that may lead to inaccurate assumptions by hearing officers about the actions of both the victim and accused
- Statistics about sexual assault, especially acquaintance rape
- Overview of emotional responses and behaviors of victims
- Strategies for remaining objective
- Accurate information about false reports
- The role of alcohol and other drugs as tools used by perpetrators to facilitate sexual assaults

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Enact legislation requiring institutions of higher education to record and report the number of sexual assault complaints made, number of cases resolved through mediation, number of cases resolved through both informal hearings and formal hearings, and the final outcome of all cases, including appeals. Sanctions for all cases must be reported and the information made public to the extent allowed by federal and state law.
2. Enact legislation requiring the University of California, California State University, and California community college systems to develop training programs that include the elements outlined in this report for judicial officers with responsibility for hearing sexual misconduct complaints.

VICTIM SERVICES

Providing or ensuring access to specialized services for victims must be a priority of every campus plan to address sexual assault. While some colleges and universities may choose to support their own sexual assault victim services program on campus, others may establish referral relationships with a local rape crisis center. Either way, every campus plan must include a range of services and be accessible to victims, including students, faculty and staff, at all times.

Limited financial or personnel resources to support a campus-based sexual assault services program should not be seen as an insurmountable obstacle, especially when local qualified service providers are invited to participate in the campus victim services plan. Rape crisis centers throughout California provide a full range of victim services that meet or exceed the standards established by the State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Services. In addition, rape crisis centers have an obligation to serve members of the community who seek assistance, and their services – although also sometimes limited by available funding – are reliable, professional and open to all members of the surrounding community. By developing a formal relationship with their local rape crisis center, campuses can help facilitate the quick mobilization of services for campus sexual assault victims.

Campuses providing a limited range of services for sexual assault victims may also consider establishing a formal referral relationship with their local rape crisis center. The center may be able to provide more comprehensive or long-term services to victims than the resources or expertise of the campus allow. In some instances, the local rape crisis center may agree to provide services to members of the campus community during the night, when many campus-based programs are closed.

Campuses seeking to collaborate with a local rape crisis center should enter into a formal agreement, which should:

- Establish a formal point of contact at the campus and the rape crisis center through which information flows.
- Include plans for regular meetings between the two entities.

When a campus chooses to establish a formal referral relationship with a local rape crisis center, the campus must make a commitment to actively advertising the availability of services to the campus community. This involves publicizing contact information about the local rape crisis center using various campus venues, including websites, pamphlets, sexual assault protocols and policies, and the annual report required by the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act).

Making referrals to the local service provider also must be an explicit part of the campus' sexual assault response protocol. This is especially true for the campus law enforcement or security department, campus counseling center, student health center, campus ministries, judicial affairs

office, and women's center. Relevant staff should receive training on how to connect victims directly with the local rape crisis center, and pamphlets and brochures from the local service provider should be available at these campus locations.

Those institutions with campus-based victim services must also incorporate the referral process into their campus protocols and provide training to relevant entities on campus about how to connect victims with local service providers.

Considerations for Campus Administrators

Every campus plan to address sexual assault must include the provision of or referral to a qualified victim services agency providing the following services:

- Crisis counseling for victims, family and friends
- Provision of or referral to services 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year
- Information about reporting options, medical and legal procedures, and other services available in the community and on campus
- Confidentiality (Victims should be able to access information and services without being obliged to report the incident or compelled to speak with law enforcement officials. Campus plans should allow for confidential services while continuing to meet reporting requirements of the Clery Act.)
- Case management including advocacy and accompaniment services
- Ongoing counseling, including individual and group therapy
- Referrals, information and counseling for friends and families of victims
- Education for the campus community about available services and options

When designing victim services and advocacy programs, campuses must take into consideration the needs of particular victims, with special emphasis on the demographic make-up of the campus community. This includes ensuring that services are accessible to and appropriate for the following types of victims: students, faculty, staff, men, individuals with disabilities, cultural and religious minorities, lesbian/gay/transgendered individuals, commuting or parenting students, older students, and others.

Every campus must post detailed information about its sexual assault victim services plan on webpages for the following campus entities:

- Campus police
- Campus judicial affairs
- Campus health center
- Campus counseling center
- Campus ministries
- Campus women's center

Recommendations to the Legislature

1. Enact legislation to expand California Education Code section 67385 by requiring all institutions of higher education to create a plan for the delivery of victim services as outlined in this report, using resources from the campus, community or a combination thereof. The amendment must also apply to all California community colleges.

2. Enact legislation to ensure that sexual assault victims served by campus-based sexual assault programs are accorded the same confidential privilege as sexual assault victims served by “sexual assault victim counselors” per California Evidence Code section 1035.2 et seq.

¹ Robin Warshaw, *I Never Called it Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*, New York: Harper Perennial, 1994, p. 11.

¹ Ibid.

¹ During the summer of 2002, the California Legislature passed and Governor Davis signed into law Assembly Bill 2583, sponsored by Assemblywoman Judy Chu (49th Assembly District).

¹ At its most basic level, sexual assault refers to any form of nonconsensual sexual activity.

¹ The category of victim services was not statutorily mandated, but was added by the Task Force.

¹ Warshaw, *I Never Called it Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*.

¹ Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes, *Prevalence, Incident, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, November 1998, p. 6.

¹ Bonnie S. Fisher, Francis T. Cullen and Michael G. Turner, *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, December 2000, p. 18.

¹ Tjaden and Thoennes, *Prevalence, Incident, and Consequences of Violence Against Women*, p. 38.

¹ “Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends and Girlfriends,” *Bureau of Justice Statistics Factbook*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, March 1998, p. 13.

¹ Most rapes of males are committed by men who are heterosexual in their consensual sexual preference and self-identity. Stephen Donaldson, “Rape of Males,” *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, Wayne R. Dynes, ed., New York: Garland, 1990, p. 1095.

¹ Women with disabilities are raped and abused at a rate at least twice that of the general population of women. Dick Sobsey, *Violence and Abuse in the Lives of People with Disabilities: The End of Silent Acceptance*, Baltimore, Maryland: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co., Inc., 1984, p. 35.

¹ For example, the Clery Act; California Education Code section 67380, which mandates the preparation, posting and distribution of a campus safety plan; California Education Code section 67385, which requires that all public higher education institutions and Hastings College of the Law develop written procedures or protocols to ensure that victims of sexual assault receive treatment and information; and California Education Code section 67381, which requires all public and some independent higher education institutions to enter into formal agreements with local law enforcement agencies regarding the investigation of certain crimes.

¹ 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f), originally passed as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990. A 1998 amendment to the law renamed the act in memory of Jeanne Clery, who in 1986 was raped and murdered in her dorm room while a student at Lehigh University.

¹ Noncompliance with the Clery Act, as determined by the U.S. Department of Education, results in a \$25,000 fine.

¹ “Clery Act Annual Report Checklist,” www.securityoncampus.org/schools/cleryact/cleryact.html.

¹ www.securityoncampus.org/schools/cleryact/checklist.html.

¹ Heather K. Karjane, Bonnie S. Fisher and Frances T. Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America’s Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, Final Report, NIJ Grant #1999-WA-VX-0008, Newton, Massachusetts: Education Development Center, Inc., 2000, p. viii.

¹ “Congress Provides Funding for Clery Act Compliance Handbook,” Student Press Law Center News Flash, www.splc.org, February 14, 2003.

¹ “Institutions of higher education unintentionally condone victim-blaming when they circulate materials that focus primarily on the individual victim’s responsibility to avoid sexual assault without balancing this risk management information with prevention education targeted toward men which stresses the perpetrator’s responsibility for committing the crime.” Karjane, Fisher and Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America’s Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, p. xi.

¹ Karjane, Fisher and Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America’s Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, p. ix.

¹ Greg Warchol, *Workplace Violence, 1992-1996: National Crime Victimization Survey Special Report*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998, p. 1.

¹ University of California (UC) campuses per Penal Code section 830.2 (b) and Education Code section 92600; California State University (CSU) campuses per Penal Code section 830.2 (c) and Education Code section 89560.

¹ Penal Code sections 830.32 (a), 830.4 and 830.7 (b); Education Code section 72330; Business and Professions Code section 7582.

¹ Fully sworn officers must meet training requirements established by state Police Officer Standards and Training (POST), while security officers are regulated by the Department of Justice through the Business and Professions Code.

¹ California Penal Code section 679.04 (a).

¹ 20 U.S.C § 1092(f).

¹ Public Law 106-386 section 1601.

¹ “Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act,” www.securityoncampus.org/congress/cscpa/.

¹ Applies to UC and CSU campuses, the California community college system, and Hastings College of the Law.

¹ Known and cited as the Kristin Smart Campus Safety Act of 1998.

¹ Sometimes victims are uncomfortable contacting law enforcement for assistance before they are aware of all their options. Posting information on a webpage is an inexpensive and simple way for campus law enforcement and security departments to inform victims about alternative choices.

¹ Some campuses use the term “discipline,” while others use “judicial.” This chapter uses the term “judicial.”

¹ Some institutions use the term “sexual misconduct” to cover a broad range of unwanted sexual behaviors. This chapter uses the terms “sexual assault” and “sexual misconduct” interchangeably.

¹ Campuses are required to guarantee specific rights to victims as established by the “Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights,” Public Law 102-325 section 486 (c).

¹ Compliance with this statute does not constitute a violation of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (20 U.S.C. § 1232g). Victims may not be required to keep the results confidential.

¹ The case of *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Schools*, 503 U.S. 60 (1992) determined that sexual assault and harassment are forms of discrimination protected under Title IX.

¹ “Judicial Affairs Representatives” booklet, *Campus Violence Prevention Resource Guides*, Sacramento: California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA), 2003, p. 21.

¹ This recommendation addresses a common fear that may discourage victims from reporting an incident to the campus judicial system.

¹ This recommendation addresses a common fear that may discourage victims from reporting an incident to the campus judicial system.

¹ If sexual misconduct complaints are rarely heard, training should also be provided prior to the handling of each case.

¹ Consider using case examples to illustrate appropriate implementation of the institution’s protocol.

¹ Since the tenth and newest campus, UC Merced, is scheduled to open in fall 2004, it was not included in the survey sample.

¹ The CSU system is comprised of 23 campuses.

¹ The California community college system is organized into 109 community colleges within 72 districts. (www.cccco.edu). CALCASA was unable to include all campuses in this system due to limited resources.

¹ This section defines “independent institutions of higher education” as those nonpublic, higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees or both; are formed as nonprofit corporations; and are accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

¹ 34 C.F.R. § 668.46(b)(11) et seq.

¹ Two campuses with college-sponsored residential programs did not include the policy statement. Two campuses without college-sponsored residential programs included the policy statement

¹ One campus addressed living accommodations, but not academic accommodations, and was not counted as one of the six campuses that included the policy statement.

¹ In summary, seven out of nine UC campuses included five out of five required policy statements. One UC campus did not include three of five required policy statements, while another campus omitted only one of five required policy statements.

¹ All 23 CSU campuses included five out of five required policy statements.

¹ This includes the one California community college campus in the sample that investigates sexual assault cases.

¹ This includes the two out of the 10 independent campuses in the sample that investigate sexual assault cases.

¹ The two campuses that have not sent an officer to training include one campus that does not employ a sworn force and does not handle sexual assault investigations; and one campus that employs a sworn force and handles sexual assault investigations.

¹ This includes the one California community college campus in the sample that handles sexual assault investigations.

¹ These are the two campuses in this sample that handle sexual assault investigations.

¹ Of those, 11 have a campus-based program, and two have a formal relationship with a community agency to provide victim services. Nine CSU campuses reported that they do not support a sexual assault victim services program. One CSU campus declined to provide information for the study.

¹ Defined as one or more departments working with campus law enforcement/security to provide prevention education, response and judicial services.

¹ Policy that contains a philosophical statement about the institution's response to sexual assault, sanctions for sexual misconduct violations, plans for the response system, and process for handling cases.

¹ This information is required to be included in each campus' annual report in compliance with the Clery Act.

¹ Includes both victim services and criminal or civil justice entities.

Appendix C

**Michigan State University
Statement on Sexual and Relationship Violence**

Michigan State University Statement on Sexual Assault

Information and Programs on Sexual Assault

Introduction

Federal law requires institutions of higher education to develop and distribute a statement describing the institution's programs that are aimed at the prevention of sexual offenses and the procedures for a victim to follow once a sexual offense has occurred.

Through programs to prevent sexual assault⁽¹⁾ and to support victims of sexual assault, Michigan State University strives to create an environment free of sexual assault, sexual harassment and other forms of sexual victimization.

Educational Opportunities

Michigan State University provides a variety of preventive/educational activities to promote awareness of rape, acquaintance rape and other sex offenses, including: professional and peer presentations in living units, classes, co-curricular groups, orientation sessions and community sessions; written and video resources; and self-defense classes. These programs are developed and delivered by many University departments and student organizations. For example, workshops on self-defense and sexual assault awareness are offered throughout the year by the Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education Program (located in the Counseling Center), 207 Student Services, 355-8270; the Women's Resource Center, 353-1635; and the Self-Defense for Women Program at IM-Sports West, 355-5250. A one-credit course in women's self-defense (PES 106L) is also offered regularly. These preventive/educational activities are coordinated through the Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education Program.

Information about personal safety, including the State Walk night-time walking service, the Nite Line bus service and the special Green and White bus lines, is included in *Spartan Life* student handbook. Also, the University's Department of Police and Public Safety issues publications which provide information on campus safety, including strategies that can be employed to decrease the chance of becoming a victim of sexual assault.

University Policies

Article 2.00 of the University's General Student Regulations prohibits sexual assault, including rape, date rape and acquaintance rape. It says:

Physical security and an environment free of harassment are necessary for individuals if they are to successfully pursue their educational endeavors and fulfill responsibilities; therefore, no student shall:

- 2.01 cause or threaten physical harm to another, or endanger the physical safety of another.
- 2.02 continuously or persistently intimidate another individual so as to coerce that individual into some action or avoidance of action.

These regulations apply on the land governed by the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University or when students or student groups are engaged in University-sponsored or student group-sponsored activities off campus. The General Student Regulations are included in *Spartan Life*.

University Ordinance 22.00 states: "No person shall accost, molest, or harass any person upon the lands governed by the Board [of Trustees of Michigan State University]." University Ordinances are available at the Information Desk in the Main Library and at the following web site:

<http://www.msu.edu/dig/DOCUMENTS/ordinance95.htm#ord27>

MSU also has a Policy on Sexual Harassment, which is applicable to all members of the University community. It is included in *Spartan Life*, and lists sexual assault as an example of sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is defined in the Policy on Sexual Harassment as unwelcome sexual advances, unwelcome requests for sexual favors or other unwelcome behavior of a sexual nature when:

1. submission to such behavior is made, explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual's employment or status in a course, program or activity;
2. submission to or rejection of such behavior is used as a basis for a decision affecting an individual's employment or participation in a course, program or activity; or
3. such behavior is so severe, persistent or pervasive that a reasonable person would find that it:
 - a. alters the terms or conditions of a person's employment or educational experience, or
 - b. unreasonably interferes with an individual's work or performance in a course, program or activity,

thus creating a hostile or abusive working or educational environment. Since sexual harassment is a form of unlawful gender discrimination, violation of the Policy on Sexual Harassment is also a violation of the University's Anti-Discrimination Policy. Students found through University disciplinary proceedings to have violated applicable conduct codes may suffer a variety of sanctions, including a requirement to move out of University housing or suspension from the University. In some instances, students accused of sexual assault may be suspended on an interim basis.⁽²⁾

Michigan Law

Michigan, like all other states, has laws that criminalize various forms of sexual assault. These laws provide severe penalties for those convicted of these crimes. Married persons can be charged with these crimes. In a criminal prosecution it is no longer required to show resistance on the part of the victim as an element of the crime, nor does the testimony of the victim need corroboration.

The University may proceed with its own disciplinary hearing and action whether or not a criminal prosecution occurs. The University need not await the disposition of any criminal prosecution.

Medical Help/Counseling

During its regular service hours, Michigan State University's Olin Health Center provides medical services and assistance with the preservation of physical evidence to MSU students who are victims of sexual assaults. Sparrow Hospital provides emergency service.

Victims of sexual assault are encouraged to seek assistance from members of the University Counseling Center Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education Program staff, who can assist them in accessing available University and community resources, including those listed at the end of this Policy. This assistance may include accompanying the victim to the hospital and/or to interviews with the police and other authorities; assistance during judicial/legal proceedings; immediate emotional support; and on-going individual and group counseling.

Reporting Procedures and Resources

An individual who is the victim of a sexual assault should immediately report the incident to the Michigan State University Department of Police and Public Safety or to the respective law enforcement agency which has jurisdiction if the assault occurred in an off-campus location.

A victim of a sexual assault is encouraged to preserve whatever evidence may be available by not bathing, showering or douching. A change of clothes should be taken to the hospital because clothing may be kept as evidence. If clothes have already been removed, they should be taken in a paper bag.

If the assailant is a Michigan State University student, the incident should also be reported to the Judicial Affairs Office. Judicial procedures outlined in Article 4 of "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" will be followed in adjudicating sexual assault cases. These procedures permit both the complainant (victim) and respondent (accused) to be accompanied by a member of the student body, faculty or staff of the University during a disciplinary hearing. If criminal charges are pending, the respondent may be accompanied to the hearing by an attorney. In that event, the complainant may also have an attorney present at the disciplinary hearing. Both the complainant and respondent are entitled to be informed of the outcome of the disciplinary hearing.

If the assailant is an employee of the University, the incident should be reported to the employee's supervisor or to the Director of the Office of Affirmative Action Compliance and Monitoring. An employee who commits a sexual assault may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including discharge.

A student who believes she or he has been the victim of an alleged sexual assault and would like assistance in changing her or his academic situation because of the assault should contact the University Ombudsman. If a student who believes he or she has been the victim of a sexual assault wishes to change his or her University housing situation, he or she should contact his or her residence hall director. In each case, assistance will be provided to the extent other options are reasonably available.

MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee

The Michigan State University Department of Police and Public Safety has adopted the **MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee**, which states:

Sexual assaults, including date/acquaintance rape, are a very serious concern of the University. If you feel you are the victim of a sexual assault on campus, your MSU Police Department will guarantee you the following:

1. We will meet with you privately, at a place of your choice in this area, to take a complaint report.
2. We will not release your name to the public or to the press.
3. Our officers will not prejudice you, and you will not be blamed for what occurred.
4. We will treat you and your particular case with courtesy, sensitivity, dignity, understanding and professionalism.
5. If you feel more comfortable talking with a female or male officer, we will do our best to accommodate your request.
6. We will assist you in arranging for any hospital treatment or other medical needs.
7. We will assist you in privately contacting counseling, safety, advising and other available resources.
8. We will fully investigate your case, and will help you to achieve the best outcome. This may involve the arrest and full prosecution of the suspect responsible. You will be kept up-to-date on the progress of the investigation and/or prosecution.
9. We will continue to be available for you, to answer your questions, to explain the systems and processes involved (prosecutor, courts, etc.), and to be a listening ear if you wish.
10. We will consider your case seriously regardless of your gender or sexual orientation, and regardless of the gender or sexual orientation of the suspect.

If you feel you are a sexual assault victim, call the MSU Police Department at 355-2221, and say you want to privately make a sexual assault complaint. You may call any time of day or night.

If we fail to achieve any part of the above guarantee, the Chief of Police, Dr. Bruce Benson, will meet with you personally to address any problems. The MSU Police want to help you make the MSU campus safe for students, faculty, staff and visitors.

MSU Safe Place

The University has a relationship violence shelter on campus, called the MSU Safe Place. The MSU Safe Place program reflects the University's commitment to help provide an environment free from relationship violence (emotional, physical and sexual abuse) for students, staff, faculty, retirees and their partners. MSU Safe Place works in conjunction with the Council Against Domestic Assault (CADA) to provide many programs. For preventive educational programs, general support, an advocate, counseling or other such matters, call 355-1100. For immediate 24-hour crisis support and shelter (at CADA or MSU Safe Place), call 372-5572.

On- and Off-Campus Resources
Twenty-Four Hour Services and Resources

Sexual Assault Crisis and Safety Education Program,
MSU Counseling Center
207 Student Services,
East Lansing, MI 48824
355-8270, TTY 353-7278
24-Hour Crisis Service, 372-6666

MSU Police and Public Safety Department
7 Red Cedar Drive,
East Lansing, MI 48824
355-2221, TTY 353-3169 or 911
East Lansing Police Department, 351-4220 or 911
Lansing Police Department, 483-4600 or 911
Meridian Police and Fire, 332-6526 or 911
Listening Ear
423 Albert Street,
East Lansing, MI 48823
337-1717

Sparrow Sexual Assault Clinic
Sparrow Hospital
1215 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48912
483-3729

Saint Lawrence Hospital Emergency
1210 West Saginaw,
Lansing, MI 48915
377-0304

Ingham Regional Medical Center Emergency Department
401 Greenlawn,
Lansing, MI 48910
334-2286

MSU Safe Place (Domestic Violence Resources: Community education, advocacy, counseling and other support services, free and confidential)
G-64 Wilson Hall,
East Lansing, MI 48825
Business line, 355-1100
24-Hour Assistance/Shelter, 372-5572

Weekday Services and Resources

Olin Health Center
Michigan State University
East Circle Drive,
East Lansing, MI 48824
355-4510

Women's Resource Center
Michigan State University
332 Union Building,
East Lansing, MI 48824
353-1635

Willow Plaza
(Group therapy for girls 13-18 who have been sexually assaulted)
306 West Willow,
Lansing, MI 48906
484-9292

Judicial Affairs Office
Michigan State University
101 Student Services,
East Lansing, MI 48824
432-2471

Ombudsman
Michigan State University
129 North Kedzie, East Lansing, MI 48824
353-8830

Self-Defense for Women
Intramural Sports and Recreative Services
Michigan State University
204 IM-West, East Lansing, MI 488243
55-5250

Movement Arts/SafeSense Incorporated
P.O. Box 4775,
East Lansing, MI 48823
485-3868

(1) For purposes of this policy, sexual assault means any physical act of a sexual nature directed against another person, forcibly and/or against that person's will, or not forcibly or against that person's will when the victim is incapable of giving consent because of her or his temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity or because of his or her youth. This definition is based upon Appendix E to the Department of Education regulations implementing the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act.

(2) See Section 4.3.7 of "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" which reads: When the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, at his/her discretion, believes there is reasonable cause that a student's continued presence at Michigan State University constitutes a clear and present danger to the health or safety of persons or property, the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services or his/her designee may temporarily suspend a student pending final resolution of the matter. The interim suspension shall not preclude, predetermine, or render irrelevant subsequent disciplinary action or procedures; nor shall an interim suspension create a presumption of guilt.

Appendix D

**Michigan State University
Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Services Charts**

DPPS Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>DPPS is represented on a myriad of committees dealing with developing response to relationship and sexual violence such as: STOP Grant (dealing with Personal Protection Orders), CARE (Capitol Area Response Effort), CAFVCC (Capitol Area Family Violence Coordinating Council), CRVCC (Campus Relationship Violence Coordinating Council), CASART (Capitol Area Sexual Assault Response Team), and MSU Safety Cluster.</p> <p>All officers receive initial training on sexual and relationship violence when they attend the police academy. Officers are provided with the latest updates (e.g., law changes) in training for their individual response during the course of their work duties. DPPS also partners with Safe Place and other organizations to provide in-service training regarding sexual and relationship violence for all officers.</p> <p>The MSU DPPS has also adopted the MSU Police Sexual Assault Response Guarantee, which states:</p> <p>Sexual assaults, including date/acquaintance rape, are a very serious concern of the University. If you feel you are the victim of a sexual assault on campus, your MSU Police Department will guarantee you the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will meet with you privately, at a place of your choice in this area, to take a complaint report. 2. We will not release your name to the public or to the press. 3. Our officers will not prejudge you, and you will not be blamed for what occurred. 4. We will treat you and your particular case with courtesy, sensitivity, dignity, understanding and professionalism. 5. If you feel more comfortable talking with a female or male officer, we will do our best to accommodate your request. 6. We will assist you in arranging for any hospital treatment or other medical needs. 7. We will assist you in privately contacting counseling, safety, advising and other available resources. 8. We will fully investigate your case, and will help you to achieve the best outcome. This may involve the arrest and full prosecution of the suspect responsible. You will be kept up-to-date on the progress of the investigation and/or prosecution. 9. We will continue to be available for you, to answer your questions, to explain the systems and processes involved (prosecutor, courts, etc.), and to be a listening ear if you wish. 	<p>Arrest</p> <p>Policy of always referring sexual assault and relationship violence cases to the prosecution (with a note made regarding victim's preference for proceeding with prosecution).</p> <p>DPPS also will encourage judicial intervention when appropriate.</p>	<p>DPPS is extensively involved the education efforts regarding sexual and relationship violence (e.g., see Residence Hall Service chart).</p> <p>During programs, they provide statistical information regarding sexual and relationship violence, information on how they respond to calls regarding sexual assault reports, personal safety tips, and reference material for individuals needing further assistance.</p>	<p><u>Attendance and Audience</u> DPPS brings programming to the residence halls, Greek organizations, and other community organizations.</p> <p>Anywhere from 5 to 75 people may attend. These programs are done upon request, and any group or organization can request a program.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> No formal evaluations of these programs are conducted.</p>

Olin Health Education Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>The HIV Education, Counseling & Testing program does HIV testing and counseling, and provides referrals to the Olin clinics for STD testing and counseling for victims. Through this program, initial counseling and general information is also provided.</p>	None	<p><u>Sexual & Relationship Health Presentations</u> Discussion-oriented educational programs can be requested by any member of the MSU community. Presentations are tailored specifically based on the goals of the individual requesting the program, but typically cover: a) laws, b) male responsibility, c) how to reduce risk. These discussions of sexual and relationship violence are embedded in discussions of healthy relationships which would also cover the importance of clear communication, relationship styles, etc.</p>	<p><u>Audience & Attendance</u> Presentations are typically done for residence halls, student organizations, caucuses, or at health fairs (in the form of information booths). Attendance is not mandatory. Approximately 20 presentations are done per semester.</p> <p><u>Presenters</u> Special attention is paid to presenter characteristics with the goal the audience perceiving the presenter as credible. Typically it is either a paid staff Health Educator or a trained undergraduate.</p>
		<p><u>In Your Face Theatre Troupe</u> Eleven skits are performed at each presentation covering healthy sexual communication, coercive sexual behavior, HIV counseling and testing, STD and STI behavior and consequences, healthy alternatives for sexual expression, alcohol drugs and sexual expression, sexual orientation, communicating with health clinicians about sexuality, pregnancy, sexual diversity, and sensual experiences. The troupe is based on the idea of educational entertainment with the goal of providing quality information in a fun and interactive format. This program is based on Western Michigan's theatre troupe program and began at MSU in 1993.</p>	<p><u>Audience & Attendance</u> Presentations are typically done in the residence halls. Attendance is not mandatory. Typically will conduct 10 presentations per semester.</p> <p><u>Presenters</u> Trained undergraduate students, the number varies each year. Currently there are nine involved in each performance.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> (Both for Health Presentations & Theatre Troupe) Evaluations typically address basic like/dislike for the program, what else participants would like to learn, etc. Evaluations do not assess program impact regarding knowledge, attitude, or behavior.</p>

Residence Halls Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
Mentors are trained to refer victims to the appropriate organizations for support and other services.	Mentors, Aides and senior staff are trained to be neutral towards accused perpetrators and offer support and resources to them, just as they would victims.	<u>Mentor/ Residence Hall Staff Training</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentors, Assistant Hall Directors, and new Directors are trained in Relationship Violence during the Fall Training. It is a 110 minute mandatory comprehensive training session in August that covers relationship violence and sexual assault. DPPS training, including contacting Police for emergencies including sexual assault. 	<u>Audience & Attendance</u> Mandatory comprehensive training session for all undergraduate student staff (~390 staff)
		<u>Residence Life Department Initiatives for Residents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channel 12 has been airing a wide variety of safety and sexual assault prevention tips. Safety and sexual assault safety table outside of the Brody Dining Hall entry and exit areas on September 30. There was information from DPPS, Safe Place, Counseling Center, Olin, and various other resources. There are handouts on the table for students to take. Emmons Hall - Bulletin boards on safety and sexual assault every floor coordinated by Mentor staff Armstrong Hall staff initiated a flyer campaign throughout the hall reminding students about various safety statistics and strategies. 	<u>Audience & Attendance</u> These informational efforts are intended for residents of residence halls. It is difficult to determine exact exposure because it is unknown whether or not students see tables, bulletin boards, flyers, etc.
		<u>Individual Hall Initiatives for Residents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Olin Health Center In Your Face Theatre Troupe has performed in various residence halls. Self Defense Programs Date Rape Drug Conversations. Safety Week including topics such as self defense, DPPS visits, Healing Hearts (decorate hearts for those who have been victims of domestic violence), Safe Place information, Smarties and Dum Dums (talking about smart choices), Gotcha (noting things on rounds that are not safe such as open doors with no one in the room, propped doors, etc.), and many bulletin boards on safety. Domestic Violence Programs. Female Stereotypes program. Safe Place Program on healthy and not healthy relationships. 	<u>Audience, Attendance & Presenters</u> These programs are typically initiated by mentors, not at a departmental level (e.g., by Residence Life), and often involve mentors requesting outside speakers. Information regarding audience, attendance, and presenters is maintained by the department/organization putting on the program (e.g., Olin Health Center, Safe Place).
			<u>Evaluations</u> If conducted, would be done by the organization doing the presentation.

Safe Place Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>Services are exclusive to relationship violence</p> <p>(a) <u>Shelter</u>: 30-day, 12-bed facility for survivors and minor aged children.</p> <p>(b) <u>Support services</u>: examples include counseling, support groups, transportation, childcare and support to friends and family members of those battered.</p> <p>(c) <u>Advocacy</u>: examples include walking survivors to and from class or work if they are being stalked; court accompaniment; contacting the Ombudsmen if grades are affected; meeting with other representatives who work with a survivor to make sure their needs (legal, housing, financial, emotional, etc.) are being met.</p> <p>(d) <u>Scholarships</u>: available to individuals whose educational efforts were disrupted or terminated due to domestic violence, and now they are able to continue their education at MSU.</p> <p>All services are free. The priority for receiving services is for those campus-affiliated (students, staff, faculty, or partners of those affiliated), but services are provided to non-MSU affiliated when staffing and shelter beds make this possible. Safe Place is the only shelter program associated with a university in the country.</p>	<p><u>Student Accountable in Community (SAC) program</u></p> <p>SAC does not address sexual assault OR relationship violence. SAC is a unique program on campus that helps hold students accountable when they use privilege-based intimidation or are threatening in any way towards others (racism, sexism, homophobia, or incivility or threats to others). When dating or other violence or assaults occur, the legal or campus judicial system is utilized, along with referrals to campus or community counseling or other intervention programs.</p> <p>MSU Safe Place helps run SAC with the Department of Student Life. This is a program for students who are inappropriate, abusive or in any way threatening to other students, staff, faculty or anyone in the campus or surrounding community.</p> <p>Four sessions of SAC help students learn to be accountable for their actions. After an intake is completed, participants learn in a group or individual session to take a full account of what they have done; understand the full consequences of their actions on others; and accept responsibility for all of their actions, both positive and negative.</p> <p>Faculty, students and residence hall or other campus staff can refer students to SAC at any time. Students must pay a small fee to complete SAC, similar to those who are required to attend the alcohol program that MSU offers. Students can go through SAC voluntarily, or through a judicially mandated referral.</p> <p>This program resulted from collaborating with the campus judicial system at Michigan State University, through Student Life. But for other behaviors that are not acceptable, SAC would be an appropriate referral.</p>	<p>Safe Place runs 5 domestic violence education programs:</p> <p><u>Exploring personal values</u> <u>Who is to Blame for Abuse?</u></p> <p>These programs help participants learn about relationship violence dynamics, myths and facts, cultural response, area resources and healthy and unhealthy behaviors through interactive activities. Discussion occurs on the role each person plays in our culture on condemning, condoning or ignoring violence that occurs around us. Examination of peer culture related to intervention will occur if time allows.</p> <p><u>Bullying</u></p> <p>Using the power and control wheel as a basis for discussion, bullying behavior is examined through different stages: elementary school male to male bullying; middle school male to female sexual harassment; high school male to female dating violence and male to male abuse related to gender expectations and confining cultural norms; and dating and marital domestic violence. Discussion will then focus on the type of violence most likely to happen within the environment of the specific program.</p> <p><u>Anger, Assertiveness and Abuse</u></p> <p>Differentiations will be made in terms of various topics, and definitions of many concepts defined, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) anger management versus partner abuse; (2) re-defining anger and selfishness, specifically within women's roles in our society and as it related to being victimized by relationship violence; (3) assertiveness versus tactics of manipulation or threatening behavior that infringes on other's rights. <p><u>Elimination of Victim-Blaming Responses</u></p> <p>This program is targeted to professionals who may encounter domestic violence victims (e.g., mental health workers, medical personnel, Residence Hall staff, and other MSU staff and community professionals). The focus is to identify and explore the natural tendency to blame victims for being battered. Discussions take place on why abuse occurs, particularly why men abuse women, why battered women often stay in abusive relationships, tactics used by abusers to target vulnerable women, how the co-dependency model is not applicable in most domestic violence cases, and how our community response often fails to adequately protect those victimized by this type of violence.</p>	<p>[For all Programs] <u>Attendance & Audience</u></p> <p>Only a few residence hall mentors or faculty request a program each year.</p> <p><u>Residence Hall Presentations</u></p> <p>Most programs are requested in October with approximately one to six programs per week for that month. Since residence hall presentations are not mandatory, the hall programs typically average 8 -10 students (ranging from 1 to 25).</p> <p><u>Class Presentations</u></p> <p>About three or four occur per year, typically in Women's Studies, Criminal Justice, Social Work or Psychology classes. While classes have a guaranteed audience many students in large (200-300 size) classes leave with any guest speaker. So approximately 80 to 100 students in a class that has 250 registered, for instance, are offered this program information.</p> <p><u>Presenters</u></p> <p>(a) Paid staff (<i>staff to student programming</i>): full time staff facilitate some of the programs;</p> <p>(b) Intern staff (<i>student to student programming</i>): MSU Safe Place undergraduate and graduate interns work 15 to 40 hours per week after receiving a great deal of training and observing other community education programs. Interns are often paired with full time staff until more experience is gained.</p> <p>(c) Volunteer staff (<i>student to student programming</i>, since 98% of Safe Place volunteers are MSU students): the more seasoned volunteers also facilitate community education programs.</p> <p><u>Evaluations</u></p> <p>Evaluations measure whether there has been an increase in knowledge about domestic violence dynamics and resources on campus.</p>

Sexual Assault Crisis & Safety Education Program Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>Services are exclusive to sexual assault</p> <p>(a) <u>Support Services</u>: This includes counseling for both victims and significant others, a 24 hours-a-day/ 7-days-a-week hotline, and support groups.</p> <p>(b) <u>Advocacy</u>: This includes medical, legal, academic, and personal advocacy. For example, this advocacy involves working with the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners at Sparrow Hospital, accompanying survivor's to court or to the police station to file a report, and generally ensuring survivors needs are being met.</p> <p>(c) <u>CaSART</u>: The sexual assault program is involved in the development of a coordinated community response for both the campus and broader community.</p> <p>All services are free. Services are provided to campus-affiliated individuals (students, staff, faculty, or partners/family of those affiliated).</p>	None	<p>Outreach: This includes educational programming and information sharing through table presentations of materials</p> <p>Topics typically covered in programs include: definition of sexual assault, prevalence statistics, myths and facts (acquaintance vs. stranger), available resources and information on the healing process. Other issues covered include: learning how to identify signs of abusive relationships, learning that forced or unwanted sexual contact could be sexual assault, learning how to protect themselves and others from drugs being put in their drinks, learning how to provide supportive intervention to friends that are abused, assaulted or stalked, learning how to create a culture that holds assailants accountable for their abusive behavior, and learning where to go for help and available volunteer opportunities.</p>	<p><u>Audience & Attendance</u></p> <p><u>Presentations</u> The number of presentations has been approximately 10 per semester. The number of people who attend these presentations varies widely (Fall 2001 several thousand people attended one presentation).</p> <p><u>Tables</u> The estimated number of people who attend resource fairs with tables is quite high (mean = 4,668; range = 1,000-8,275), but it is not known how many people stopped by the table for information.</p> <p><u>Presenters</u> In previous years the educational outreach coordinator conducted all presentations, however this position no longer exists within the program. Program volunteers are now trained to facilitate presentations with other staff members such as the counselor attending at times to assist answering audience questions.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> Impact of these programs is not evaluated.</p>

Student Life Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>Through the judicial process, Student Life offers adjudication services for faculty, staff, and students who allege that an MSU student violated a University policy which includes sexual and relationship violence.</p>	<p><u>Student Accountable in Community (SAC) program</u> SAC does not address sexual assault OR relationship violence, but it is an accountability model program designed to address various forms of privilege-based abuse (racism, sexism, homophobia, or just incivility or threats to others).</p> <p>MSU Safe Place and the Department of Student Life collaborate to offer this educational program for students who are inappropriate, abusive or in any way threatening to other students, staff, faculty or anyone in the campus or surrounding community. SAC is unique in that it holds students accountable for the impact of privilege-based intimidation or threats.</p> <p>The program includes four sessions that help students learn to be accountable for their actions. After an intake is completed, participants learn in a group or individual session to take a full account of what they have done; understand the full consequences of their actions on others; and accept responsibility for all of their actions, both positive and negative.</p> <p>Participants pay a \$50 program fee to complete SAC. Students can attend SAC voluntarily, but most participants are referred through the judicial process.</p> <p>This program resulted from collaboration between Michigan State University's Safe Place and the Department of Student Life. Referrals to SAC are not recommended when there are severe instances of dating/domestic violence or sexual abuse, because the program is designed to be an early intervention. Sexual assault and other forms of physical violence require more intense and lengthy interventions than SAC can offer.</p> <hr/> <p>Those found responsible for sexual assault through the University's judicial process are typically expelled from University Housing indefinitely, and suspended from school for at least one calendar year. Additionally, the student is often required to seek professional counseling as a condition of re-enrollment. In extreme cases, the Vice President of Student Affairs can summarily suspend a student while the judicial process is still in progress. Called an "interim suspension", such an action would prohibit the alleged violator from being on campus, except to participate in the judicial process.</p>	<p>Collaborate with other offices such as Residence Life, Safe Place, and the Counseling Center to offer training programs</p>	<p><u>Audience</u> Trainings are conducted for those who serve in prevention/intervention roles (e.g., for Resident Mentors, judicial boards).</p> <p><u>Evaluations</u> Currently no evaluations are done on trainings regarding impact on knowledge, attitude, or behavior.</p>

Women's Resource Center Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
<p>Women's Resource Center (WRC) staff refer survivors to Safe Place and the Sexual Assault program when appropriate.</p> <p>The WRC also assists with the Residence Life Relationship Violence training for Mentors (see Residence Halls chart for details)</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Resource sheets are available to students that provide basic information about sexual and relationship violence as well as campus resources.</p> <p>An extensive video library is available to all students and faculty.</p> <p>In the past, WRC ran the Safety Cluster monthly meetings. This group discussed individual departments' efforts to address sexual and relationship violence.</p> <p>Out of the Safety Cluster emerged the Safe Spring Break program. Every year prior spring break the residence hall cafeterias are used to provide information on topics relevant to spring break (e.g., sexual violence, responsible drinking, etc) in a fun yet useful manner.</p>	<p>Information available to students and faculty, but unknown how many students take or utilize information provided.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> No evaluation has been conducted on any of the services provided to determine impact on knowledge, attitude, or behavior.</p>

Intramural Sports Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence Services and Prevention

Services for Victims	Work with Perpetrators	Prevention/ Education	
		Description	Implementation & Evaluation
None	None	<p><u>Self-Defense for Women Program</u> Two-hour workshops are intended to provide practical information regarding sexual assault prevention/avoidance. Participants learn skills for verbal, nonverbal, psychological and physical techniques for defusing potentially violent encounters.</p> <p>The workshops are free and open to all students. Open workshops are offered and they are available upon request.</p>	<p><u>Attendance and Audience</u> Workshops are open to both male and female students</p> <p>The program typically conducts 23 programs with 350 participants per semester.</p> <p><u>Presenters</u> Trained, paid student facilitators</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> Participants provide feedback, but there is no formal evaluation</p>

Appendix E

Physical Environment Scan Findings

Physical Environment Scan

In order to assess the campus physical environment, Deputy Chief of Police Michael Rice, Dr. Kathy Lindahl, Assistant Vice President for Finance and Operations and WACFPO member, and State Walk volunteers from Alpha Phi Omega were contacted. Deputy Chief of Police Rice provided an overview of the Green Light System and lighting on campus. Dr. Lindahl provided information regarding the WACFPO environmental scan. Volunteers from Alpha Phi Omega provided information regarding State Walk. Using the MSU website information was also obtained regarding transportation available for students at night. Students living in the University Residence Halls offered perspectives on that transportation. A summary of the findings from those efforts is provided below.

Green Light System

Background. The green light system is made up of call boxes that, when activated, directly link to the East Lansing 911 call center. The phones are available to assist any individual in need of emergency assistance. The green light system has been in place at MSU for more than 40 years. No information was available regarding what prompted the institution of the green light phone system. There are approximately 175 green light phones on campus. Green light phones are designated by a green star on campus maps, with green stars in parking ramp/structures representing more than one phone inside the structure (e.g., one phone on each level of the parking structure).

Use. There is no existing record to assess the utilization of the green light system. The green light phone network is overseen by Telecom in conjunction with SBC. Because the phone network is a private system, monitoring cannot be done or cannot be feasibly done at this point in time.

Maintenance. The phones are tested a minimum of once a month (on average once every 2-3 weeks) by student employees under the supervision of full time employees. This is an onsite test, during which the 911 call button on the call box is activated by an employee, and another employee is present in the East Lansing 911 call center monitoring that the call is received. All calls go directly to the 911 call center which MSU shares with the East Lansing Police Department. When repairs on the phones are needed, Telecom completes them on a priority basis. Basic repairs are generally completed in less than two days, with major repairs (e.g., wiring related problems) taking longer.

Equipment & Cost. The green light system currently utilizes two models of call box: the yellow Ramtec and the Code Blue (model variation is due to vendor changes). The yellow Ramtec boxes, which are mounted on the street poles, are approximately \$800.00 each. The independent standing towers (Code Blue) cost between \$6,000 and \$14,000 dollars each, depending on the costs associated with utility wiring. The green light phone network is composed of approximately 155 phone lines and 175 phones. There are fewer phone lines than phones because many parking ramps have more than one phone sharing a single phone line. At the end of each year typically 2-3 new phones are purchased to replace old phones. This is done based on the availability of funding. The average cost is \$19.20 per phone line. Annually roughly \$80,000 is spent on lines, materials, student labor, and repairs.

Perspectives. Currently, two perspectives regarding the green light phone system exist within the Department of Police and Public Safety. One perspective is that more phones should be installed on major walkways at more regular intervals so that one phone can be seen from another. The second perspective is that since the majority of individuals carries cell phones, or at any given time is in the company of individuals that carry cell phones, the green light phone system is no longer needed. The general observation of MSU police officers is that green light phones are not used because the vast majority of emergency calls are made with cell phones; however there is no data to verify this.

Lighting

Standards & Evaluation Lighting for the campus adheres to a "recommended lighting standard," comparable to a "park standard." There are no official guidelines pertaining to lighting levels. Campus lighting is evaluated by the

Lighting Committee. The Lighting Committee is composed of the Physical Plant's Chief Electrical Engineer, Chief of Engineering and Architecture, a representative from the Grounds Department, Director of Campus Planning, and Deputy Chief of Police Michael Rice. A minimum of once a year, but typically twice a year, a campus walk-through is conducted by the Lighting Committee. This is typically conducted during the summer. Since the Lighting Committee is typically all male, they are frequently accompanied by a female police officer and/or a representative of WACFPO committee, to provide female input. Lighting is also upgraded and installed as part of larger university projects. For example, as part of the Shaw parking ramp project, all of the lighting in the area surrounding the parking ramp was replaced and upgraded.

In addition to the Lighting Committee, Campus police are encouraged to look for needed physical repairs and have a form for requesting repairs that contains a specific section on lighting. Additionally, there is an individual affiliated with the physical plant on call after hours that frequently checks lights at night. Campus community members also frequently call repair concerns into the campus police and to the physical plant.

Types. Three types of lighting are used on campus, 1) lighting mercury vapor (the dimmest, a bluish light), 2) sodium vapor (a yellow light), and 3) metal halide (full spectrum and brightest, white light). The newest parking structures and various other new and newly remodeled locations contain Metal Halide lights. Due to expense, it has not been feasible to put metal halide lights all over campus. There are also several areas on campus which currently have poor lighting due to wiring problems that are unable to be corrected or cost too much to fix.

Funding. All of the proceeds from campus parking tickets are used for safety upgrades in the campus community, which includes lighting and green light phones. Needs are prioritized and completed in accordance with the money available. Maintenance is first priority for funding. Second priority is upgrades, which potentially includes new green light phones funded through exemplary funds or through allocations from the office of the Vice President of Finance.

WACFPO Environmental Scan

The environmental scan is conducted twice annually. Four to six people including a representative from DPPS conduct the scan. During the fall a driving tour is done and during the spring a walking tour is conducted. A different area is focused on every year.

The environmental scan includes the evaluation of a wide variety of safety aspects from lighting to the placement of bike racks. For example, Spartan Village was the focus of the most recent scan and the committee noted burned out lights, the presence and effectiveness of entrance lighting, bushes in relation to building entrances, the quality and safety of sidewalks, provided suggestions for the placement of green light/ emergency phones etc.

The results of the environmental scan are recorded in a grid format that notes the day, the location, the unit responsible, the area of concern, and a notation of when the task will be completed. Along with recording and reviewing the information gathered, pertinent information is forwarded to the related departments including a request for a timeline for the completion of each task. In this way the WACFPO is striving to make sure that the results of their scans are shared and acted on. Approximately 75% of the recommendations are typically acted upon, with funding cited as the most common reason changes were not made.

MSU State Walk

It is believed that State Walk was started roughly ten years ago. It was funded in the past by the Residence Hall Association (RHA), the student government affiliated with the residence halls. The demand decreased and the funding was withdrawn. Alpha Phi Omega (APO), a service fraternity has been running the program on a volunteer basis for approximately 4 years. Because it is now run on a volunteer basis by Alpha Phi Omega (APO), there are no guaranteed hours, training or a high frequency of usage. Volunteers estimate they provide less than one walk per night on average. This limited utilization is most likely due to a lack of awareness of the service. Since there is no

money allocated to State Walk by the university or other affiliated organizations, APO cannot afford to generate publicity for the State walk due to their limited budget. Currently there is no affiliation or contact between State Walk and the Department of police and public safety (DPPS), however, APO plans to continue to the State Walk and desires to establish a relationship with the MSU Police Department.

MSU CATA Bus System

Overview. The CATA bus serves all the main areas and locations of campus. During the day buses are available every 7 to 15 minutes depending on the location until approximately 7 pm after which evening service begins. During the evening service, buses are available every 15 minutes until approximately midnight after which buses are available every 30 minutes until approximately 2 am. After 2 am students can call the Night Owl from any campus facility phone or use one of MSU's green light phones in the yellow boxes to request a ride from one campus location to another. A small bus will arrive at your curb within 20 minutes of your call. Available Monday through Friday from 2 am - 7 am and on weekends from 2 am to 9 am. For students, CATA bus services costs fifty cents per ride on campus. Students can also purchase passes: \$14.00 for a monthly pass, \$45.00 for a semester (on & off campus) pass, and \$70.00 for a year (Aug-May) campus only pass.

Perspectives based on 10 residents of University Housing. The effectiveness and use of the service as a way of traveling safely around campus at night is hampered by limited availability and long intervals between bus service. It is inconvenient to wait for the bus and unnerving to stand at a bus stop for long intervals at night. Additionally all scheduled bus service for the MSU campus stops running at 2:11am, after which the Night Owl service is available. The use of the Night Owl service is hampered by the fact that it must be called and that there is a potential wait time of 20 minutes, furthermore it only services on campus traveling and does not assist those coming back to campus from off-campus locations. Student comments related to the bus service indicate they do not utilize the service because it is inconvenient and walking is frequently faster. Waiting for the scheduled bus or Night Owl service, and then riding the bus frequently takes longer than walking, because one must wait for the bus and the bus route adds on travel time. Thus many students choose to walk because it is "faster" and "easier" despite of their concerns about personal safety.

Appendix F

**Committee Evaluation of best practices and
Recommendations for Sexual Assault Awareness
And Prevention Education at MSU**

Report

**Committee Evaluation of best practices and
Recommendations for Sexual Assault Awareness
And Prevention Education at MSU**

Committee members:

Patricia Lowrie (co-convener), Director, Women's Resource Center
 Charlene Patterson (co-convener), Director, Counseling Center
 Bethany Andorfer, Student, Womyn's Council
 Kim Droater, Student, Womyn's Council
 Tara Eastin, Osteopathic Medical Student, volunteer, Sexual Assault Program
 Ann Flescher, Assistant Director, Counseling Center
 Paul Goldblatt, Director, Department of Residence Life
 Carmen Lane, Volunteer Coordinator, Sexual Assault Program
 Dennis Martell, Coordinator, Olin Health Education
 Holly Rosen, Director, MSU Safe Place
 Jayne Schuiteman, Acting Director, Program in Women, Gender, and Social Justice, and
 Women's Resource Center
 Marya Soulski, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work
 Toby TenEyck, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology/NFSTC

Consulting Members:

Barb Walkington, Therapist, Counseling Center/Sexual Assault Program
 Marybeth Heeder, Academic Orientation Program Coordinator

Introduction

The committee was charged by Dr. Lee June to assess the University of Illinois workshop model and identify other best practices at peer institutions around the country. Based on the assessment of best practices and given the specific needs of Michigan State University, the committee was also asked to make recommendations for sexual assault awareness and prevention education for students at the university.

Best Practices at other institutions

The University of Illinois requires a two-hour workshop made mandatory for all incoming first year students at the institution facilitated through the Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program. Trained student facilitators provide a tightly scripted two-hour workshop that provides definitions, clarifies

misinformation concerning sexual assault, and provides information on the continuum of sexual coercion, consent, and legal definitions. Additionally, the workshop includes information on the effects of sexual assault on a survivor, responding to survivors, victim blaming, and the role of drugs and alcohol through scenarios and discussions about the scenarios. Included in the session is 40 minutes where women and men split into same sex groups to discuss the issues that are gender specific around prevention and risk reduction for women and men as supporters, consent, a values continuum, and vague date rape scenarios for the men. The session concludes with a brief conversation regarding campus resources and activism.

Workshop facilitators at the University of Illinois take a semester long one credit course through the Community Health Department. The semester is spent exploring the social foundations that support a rape culture and increasing understandings of oppression and how it relates to assault in addition to learning the specific skills needed to facilitate the workshops.

The committee also identified efforts underway at other peer institutions. Central Michigan University does a mandatory 80 minute theatrical performance called "No Zebras." The performance includes vignettes depicting various aspects of acquaintance assault performed by trained peer advocates and concludes with Q/A. The session is done early in fall semester when students first arrive on campus. During summer training, residence hall staff go through a two-hour workshop about the program and it was reported that many mentors go with their entire floor to the performance.

In a polling via a list serve of over 100 colleges and universities who are recipients of the Department of Justice "crimes against women on college campuses" grants, 1999-present, only three institutions that chose to respond – Wayne State University in Detroit, Fairfield University in Connecticut, and Jamestown College in North Dakota had mandatory programs for incoming students. At Jamestown College, material regarding sexual violence was incorporated into an already existing freshmen course requirement. The required course previously dealt with a variety of topics such as study and ethical living skills, and alcohol use/abuse. In 2000, an hour long session on sexual violence was added as part of the curriculum. The one hour session focuses on sexual assault and relationship violence with less time devoted to stalking and sexual harassment. In order to make the course mandatory, incoming students are auto registered into the freshmen seminar and completion is a condition of graduation.

Wayne State University has an online learning module that has been incorporated into a mandatory class for all first year students. The module contains videos, interactive quizzes, and a short writing assignment. The module includes information on sexual assault, relationship violence and sexual harassment.

Fairfield University requires all incoming first year students to take a semester long seminar through First Year Programs. The program is in its fourteenth year and includes both large lectures and smaller classes to which all first year students (approximately 850 per year) are assigned. Attendance at lectures is monitored using a scantron device and attendance at all classes is taken weekly (attendance sheets are submitted weekly to the First Year Programs office). Lectures are done by national speakers and classes are conducted by advanced undergraduate trained facilitators in conjunction with staff resource persons. Four of the sessions (two lectures and two classes) are devoted to sexual assault, stalking, harassment, relationships and misconduct. Any students who fail to attend lectures or classes must make up the sessions through supplemental programs facilitated through the Wellness and Prevention Office. Thus, at Fairfield University, sexual assault and other forms of gendered violence are among a number of different topics that are addressed in the semester long seminar, all of which are considered to be contemporary issues facing incoming students. Fairfield University did not report on assessment/evaluation efforts.

In a similar polling of Association of University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD) done via a list serve, eight directors responded and of those eight, they reported no mandatory educational efforts related to sexual assault and relationship violence. Most institutions offer some sort of educational outreach to students, but the committee found very little evidence of mandatory efforts/practices, particularly those practices that were also subject to impact/outcome assessments measures. The committee expects that more institutions around the country do have mandatory educational efforts. However, given the timeline for the committee's work, an exhaustive search for all mandatory programs at colleges and universities around the country was not conducted.

The above presentation of best practices is clearly limited and cannot necessarily be characterized as "best" as there are serious limitations in each approach. Many other institutions have sexual violence education and prevention programmatic efforts. Those programs are not presented as our purpose in gleaning the above information was to consider institutions where such efforts were mandatory for all incoming first year students. Additionally, while most of the above programs are evaluated for effectiveness, they have been made mandatory only recently and do not have a long history of assessment data readily available.

Recommendations for Sexual Violence Education and Prevention at Michigan State University

The committee recommends the following five recommendations:

- **14-hour PRO freshman seminars should be piloted next fall semester, 2005. Two different approaches will be utilized – one in which sexual violence is the primary topic for content and one in which sexual violence will be part of a broader set of health related issues. Both will be assessed for their effectiveness.**
- **Two-hour mandatory workshops should be implemented modeled on the University of Illinois model which trains student peer facilitators in a semester long course followed with a one year commitment to facilitate residence hall workshops. The residence hall system could be utilized since 95% of first year students live in the halls.**
- **An all-university media campaign should be implemented immediately. The campaign would provide accurate information about sexual violence, the role of alcohol in assaults, and challenge common misperceptions about sexual assault and relationship violence.**
- **Immediate efforts should be made to increase the visibility and accessibility of existing programs/units on campus that deal with sexual and relationship violence. Those include: The Sexual Assault Program in the Counseling Center, MSU Safe Place, the Women's Resource Center, Olin Health Center, Self-defense for Women Program in IM sports. While each of those programs do their own promotional efforts, a coordinated approach with the assistance of University Relations, would be more comprehensive.**
- **Ultimately, the committee strongly recommends that the University adopt and require a first year course that deals with sexual and relationship violence within the broader context of transitional issues connected to academic and social success at Michigan State University.**

Rationale for the Above Recommendations:

This committee was charged with two tasks: 1) Consideration of the University of Illinois model for workshops on sexual violence made mandatory for all incoming first year students and other similar approaches that might be taking place at peer institutions. 2) Make recommendations regarding what can be implemented at MSU in a relatively short period of time. We believe the above recommendations offer the best approach to implementing efforts that will have an impact on students' awareness regarding sexual assault, particularly date/acquaintance rape and relationship violence in the short term. While a media campaign and enhanced efforts to highlight existing programs and services are somewhat passive efforts, they can be implemented immediately.

The committee was unanimous in its belief that a two-hour workshop alone is NOT sufficient to fully educate incoming students about healthy dating relationships, sexual assault, and relationship violence. However, in light of our charge to make recommendations that could be implemented in a relatively short time frame, this approach seemed most reasonable. Peer facilitators will need to be recruited and trained making implementation for next fall somewhat difficult. However, given spring and summer semesters, even a smaller scale effort may be realistic for the fall with full implementation of the required semester long course for facilitators and mandatory workshops for incoming students to follow. The mechanism for workshop delivery should clearly be linked to the residence halls given that 95% of all first year students live on campus. However, exactly how the residence hall system is utilized and what role if any Residence Life plays in workshop delivery is yet to be determined. Clearly many details regarding implementation must be considered. The committee was also clear regarding the need to make a mandatory workshop that has institutionalized consequences built in to hold students accountable if they should fail to attend. Mechanisms already exist to place a hold on future registration when students do not pay campus parking tickets, return library books, or pay fees at Olin Health Center. Use of the same mechanism should be considered for completion of the workshop. Existing technology that requires a student to swipe their ID card should be utilized to determine attendance. Those not attending the workshop sometime in fall semester would not be able to register for future class schedules.

Because the committee was very clear in its belief that a two-hour workshop alone is not sufficient to bring about real transformation in students' awareness of and rejection of a "rape prone campus culture," the last bullet point in the list of recommendations strongly urges the University to adopt and require a first year seminar course that look at these and broader issues related to health, safety and well-being that would promote greater academic and social success while at MSU. As a first step towards that goal, the first recommendation provides an opportunity to pilot just such a course. The already existing PRO first year seminar system is an excellent mechanism allowing for a more intensive academic experience for all incoming students. A 14-hour course which includes content related to sexual and relationship violence will go much further in helping students to understand social issues of power, oppression, and privilege which make sexual and relationship violence a reality. More opportunities to grapple with notions of respect, civility, consent, and community will challenge students' misperceptions about violence, understanding the dynamics of healthy dating relationships, the role of alcohol in choice making, etc.

The courses should be designed and implemented in multiple sections next fall. The courses should be assessed for their effectiveness and at the same time, the committee strongly urges that officials consider ways to make such a seminar a required course for all first year students. In order to do so, significant changes would have to occur in the PRO system or a new mechanism for requiring a first year seminar

would need to be explored. However, a failure to do so is to settle for something far short of what will make a real difference for students at Michigan State University.

The remainder of this report provides a brief outline of the seminar content/curriculum for the two models being proposed for piloting within the PRO system as well as a more detailed outline for the workshop model including the semester course required of peer facilitators. The report concludes with an implementation timeline as well as key issues that must be addressed for implementation to occur.

PRO-coded Freshman Seminar

Model 1 – Content/Curriculum centered on theoretical and practical understandings of sexual assault, relationship violence, and prevention education

The seminar curriculum will start in fairly broad terms considering such issues as community and what is meant by the term. Students will be asked to consider their own sense of identity as it is related to their membership within different campus communities (i.e. choosing to join a fraternity/sorority, residence hall/floor community, student group membership, etc.). Students will also be led through conversations dealing with community building and the development of campus culture. Conversations will also occur regarding power and privilege.

Following broader issues outlined above, the seminar curriculum will move towards more sexual violence specific issues. They will include the following:

- Definitions regarding sexual violence
- What is meant by the notion of “rape culture” and how that concept fits into understandings of campus culture
- Power/privilege and its abuse in understanding sexual violence
- Myths and facts associated with sexual violence including common misperception about stranger rape vs. date/acquaintance rape.
- Consent
- The role of alcohol and other drugs in sexual violence
- Specific gender issues that differ for women, men and transgender identified individuals regarding sexual violence
- Impact of sexual violence on survivors
- Resources within the campus community and how to support survivors
- Empowerment for those who have been victimized
- Empathy building for survivors
- Legal issues and accountability both within the criminal justice system and with the University’s judicial system

Following the above sexual violence specific content, the seminar curriculum will move back to broader issues. Using understandings gained regarding sexual violence, in contrast, students will explore the dynamics of healthy relationships, responsible individual behavior, and what it will take to create a campus culture that has a Zero Tolerance for sexual violence. Students will be asked to consider their individual responsibilities within their smaller communities and the campus community as a whole in transforming the campus culture.

Model 2 – Content/Curriculum centered more broadly on health and civility

This class will be an interactive experience that challenges the student to critically examine ‘what is health, community and civility and how to achieve it’. Students will be asked to consider their own sense of identity within different campus communities and how this identity shapes their attitudes and behavior as members of a larger community and impacts their social and academic success. Students will be led through conversations dealing with community building and the development of campus culture with conversations occurring on such topics as power, privilege, accountability, bystander behavior and transitions.

The student will also explore the topics of healthy sexuality/relationships, nutrition, mental health, alcohol and other drugs, fitness, stress, illness and injury and how they impact their academic and social success. They will have an opportunity to experience personal health assessments and examine contemporary data as well as explore ‘why we don’t always do what we should’. This class is a prerequisite for those who like to have the freedom to find his or her way to academic and social success. The curriculum will include the following topics and objectives:

- Define the basic tenets of a healthy and civil community,
- Explore and challenge elements of campus culture that lead to assuring and/or loss of civility,
- Address data based issues of student health, safety, and transitions,
- Provide a safe and confidential environment in which issues can be discussed,
- Provide tools to assess their own health and safety
- Develop protective and harm reduction behaviors,
- Develop critical thinking skills in relation to health, safety and transitions
- Provide resources and access,
- Develop an integrated philosophy of health, community and civility.

While specifics of the above curriculum models have not been discussed, it is anticipated that both seminars will be interactive, require critical and self-reflective thinking. Students will be expected to complete readings and do assignments regarding seminar topics and will be encouraged though not required to do journaling over the 7 weeks. The web based ANGEL system should also be utilized for out of class threaded discussions (which could be done anonymously) via the discussion board, possible real time chats, access to web based readings and sites that are relevant to the seminar.

The above described models described the content for the PRO 14 hour freshman seminars. The following section of the report describes the content that would be included in the 2 hour workshop that is also being proposed as an intermediate step to implementation of required seminars.

Two-hour workshops and accompanying facilitator preparation course

The two-hour mandatory workshop for all incoming first year students would include the following components:

- Definitions of sexual assault and relationship violence
- Myths and facts regarding sexual assault and relationship violence
- “Rape culture” – what is it? How does such a culture on college/university campuses condone and contribute to sexual violence? How can the culture be challenged in ways that would encourage and build a healthy sense of community?

- Consent – what is it? How is it obtained? How is it given?
- Legal information
- Impact of violence on survivors and responding to survivors
- Role of alcohol and other drugs in assault
- Breakout opportunities for gender specific issues/discussion
- Campus resources and opportunities for activism

Facilitator training and preparation:

Currently within the PRO system, faculty and instructors teach freshman seminars. Individuals interested and available will need to be recruited to teach the two models as part of the piloting process. Faculty and qualified staff instructors will be provided with a syllabus, reading material, assignments, etc. so that they will be well prepared to teach the two models. When multiple sections of the same model are offered, it will be important that different instructors use the same syllabus and materials in order to ensure consistency for the purposes of evaluation.

Assuming a mandatory seven week, 14 hour seminar is adopted by fall semester, 2007, it is proposed that peer student facilitation teams (minimum of two and possibly more depending on the size of sections) will teach those seminars. We recommend following the University of Illinois model utilizing the system used by Olin Health Center in the training of their Health Advocates. Peer facilitators will spend a semester prior to teaching the seminars enrolled in a course that will teach them the foundational and theoretical basis for understanding campus culture, “rape culture” sexual violence, relationship violence, power, privilege and oppression. They will also learn how to teach the seminar.

The 2 hour workshops will be conducted by peer student facilitators. Facilitators will initially (in the short term for spring semester) be trained on a shortened schedule as we anticipate recruiting facilitators from already existing pools which include the volunteers at MSU Safe Place and at the Sexual Program in the Counseling Center. Additionally, we will put out a call for other interested students not associated with either program. While students will not be going through a semester long course to prepare them for facilitating workshops in spring '05, we anticipate because the knowledge already commanded by the group that shorter term training will suffice. That group of facilitators will be trained sufficiently to begin conducting workshops by early April coinciding with Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Additionally, in late February, in anticipation of spring break, facilitator trainers will conduct workshops that trainees will be expected to attend as part of their facilitator training. They will observe skilled staff facilitate workshops and will be provided opportunities to conduct brief portions under supervision as part of their training. Subsequent training for peer student facilitators will involve the same semester long course discussed above for peer student facilitators of the 14 hour seminars. The theoretical basis for understanding assault and its dynamics will be identical. However, the last part of the course that deals specifically with content delivery will vary for the 2 hour workshop. Following the recommended timeline, the semester course will first focus on the delivery of the 2 hour workshop and as we prepare to move to mandatory 14 hour seminars, that portion of the course will shift accordingly.

Timeline for implementation:

Spring semester, 2005

- Hire needed staff – minimally, overall effort coordinator. This must be a first priority as the coordinator will be responsible for implementing along with connected units, the recruitment, training, and scheduling of two-hour workshops to begin in spring semester, 2005 (see next bullet point).
- Recruit and train workshop facilitators to begin piloting on a limited and voluntary basis, the two-hour workshops designed for incoming students. Facilitators can be recruited from three pools – current Sexual Assault Program volunteers, current MSU Safe Place volunteers, and other interested students via advertising/promotion.
- Develop and launch the University-wide media campaign
- Work with University Relations and other units to develop a strategy that would make existing programs/efforts more visible and accessible to students in the campus community
- Develop detailed syllabi and content for the 2 models in the PRO system

Summer semester, 2005

- Develop syllabus and training model for the facilitator semester long course. Make structural decisions regarding departmental involvement for offering and delivery

Fall semester, 2005

- Promote, pilot and assess voluntary two-hour workshops
- Pilot and assess sections both models of the PRO freshman seminars

Spring semester, 2006

- Offer semester long course for workshop facilitators
- Continue promoting and offering two-hour workshops on a voluntary basis
- Continue to offer and assess both models of the PRO freshman seminars

Fall semester, 2006

- Implement mandatory two-hour workshops for all incoming first year students living in the residence halls.
- Continue to expand the number of sections of PRO freshman seminars offered based on most effective model.

Spring semester, 2007

- Revise the semester long-course such that facilitators will be prepared to teach a 14 hour-long required first year student seminar based on the PRO most effective model

Fall semester, 2007

- **All first year incoming students will be required to complete a seven week, 14 hour first year seminar based on most effective PRO model taught by peer facilitators**

Key issues for implementation:

- **The timeline for implementation of the recommendations is critical if the recommended programs are to have an impact on a campus climate moving in the direction of Zero Tolerance for any form of sexual assault. A mandatory program for all first year students is also a critical component for changing campus culture.**
- **Adequate staffing must be provided if the timelines are to be adhered to and program implementation is to be successful. While areas of responsibility can be delegated to units/programs where there is a natural fit, an overall coordinator for the efforts should be hired. That person would oversee all overall aspects of implementation. Because the coordinator should be involved in all planning and implementation from the beginning, the person should be hired spring semester, 2005 as a first priority.**
- **Adequate budget must be provided for all aspects of the recommendations that are ultimately adopted (see attached detailed budget projections).**
- **Evaluation of each component adopted must be included. Those responsible for evaluation should have a background in the area to provide the necessary expertise and evaluation tools.**

Conclusions:

If Michigan State University truly wants to see a decrease in the number of assaults and incidents of relationship violence both on campus and in the surrounding East Lansing off-campus community (where fraternity, sorority, and student rentals houses/apartments abound i.e. where members of the University community reside), the University must also be serious about educational efforts that challenge cultural beliefs that condone and support a rape culture. Educational efforts must be systemic in order to make substantial changes in student belief systems. They must also be systematic and institutionalized. Voluntary programming in the residence halls, through the Sexual Assault Program in the Counseling Center, MSU Safe Place, Olin Health Center, the Women's Resource Center, and the Self-Defense Program in IM Sports are all important and should be better promoted to increase accessibility and impact. However, those programs only reach a small percentage of the student population. Additionally, those programs are not able to do sufficient outreach to male students – an absolutely critical component for changing behavior and beliefs around dating and relationship. Ideally, such education would begin at home when children are young long before they come to MSU. However, we know such efforts occur in some families and some K-12 schools, but the vast majority of students come to MSU with new found independence, a desire to fit in, make new friends and perhaps establish more intimate relationships without the skills to negotiate those new experiences in safe and healthy ways. Efforts to enhance those transitional skills to the university will ultimately result in a campus community where all members take responsibility for making this a desirable community for all. Such efforts will also increase civility, promote greater health and well-being and the greater likelihood of success at MSU.

Phase One: Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Workshop Proposed Budget				
Item Name	Unit Cost	Total Units	Total Cost	Comments
Program Administrator*	Recommended Qualifications: master's degree, 4 - 6 yrs. experience in sexual assault awareness/prevention education and advocacy preferred.	\$45,000 (salary) + \$18,757 (benefits)	\$63,378	Program Administrator will be responsible for managing all aspects of the program.
Program Evaluator*	1/4 time Graduate Assistant position (level 1): \$785 monthly stipend + \$6,600 fringe loading rate	10 months @ \$785 + \$6,600	\$14,450	Program Evaluator will be responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the workshops.
Workshop Facilitators	2 Facilitators at \$20 each for 2-hour workshop	185 Workshops	\$7,400	185 workshops with an average attendance of 40 students. A 1:20 facilitator/student ratio would be maintained.
Copy Costs	.05 per copy	30,000	\$1,500	Printing of ad flyers, workshop handouts, etc.
Supplies			\$10,000	All supplies and IMC support costs
Administrative Support			\$5,000	Copying, scheduling of workshops
		Total	\$101,728	

*Actual staffing and administrative support costs are dependent on the program model that is implemented. Salaries and benefits are based on 2004 - 2005 pay levels and benefit costs

Phase Two: PRO-coded Freshman Seminar Proposed Budget				
Item Name	Unit Cost	Total Units	Total Cost	Comments
Program Administrator*	Recommended Qualifications: master's degree, 4 - 6 yrs. experience in sexual assault awareness/prevention education and advocacy preferred.	\$45,000 (salary) + \$18,924 (benefits)	\$63,924	Program Administrator will be responsible for managing all aspects of the program.
Program Evaluator*	1/4 time Graduate Assistant position (level 1): \$785 monthly stipend + \$6,600 fringe costs	10 months @ \$785 + \$6,600	\$14,450	Program Evaluator will be responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the classes.
Class Instruction	2 Facilitators at \$10 per class hour each	5180	\$51,800	185 sections @ 40 students per section. 7 week sessions with 2-hours classes each week. A 1:20 facilitator/student ratio would be maintained.
Copy Costs	.05 per copy	150,000	\$7,500	Printing of syllabi, handouts, etc. Average of 20 copies per student.
Supplies			\$5,000	
Administrative Support			\$10,000	Copying, classroom assignments/reservations, grade entry.
		Total	\$152,674	

*Actual staffing and administrative support costs are dependent on the program model that is implemented. Salaries and benefits are based on 2004 - 2005 pay levels and benefit costs

Note: Program Administrator and Program Evaluator personnel costs are a continuation of the positions created in Phase One of the implementation process, not additional positions.

¹ Robin Warshaw, *I Never Called it Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*, New York: Harper Perennial, 1994, p. 11.

² Ibid.

³ During the summer of 2002, the California Legislature passed and Governor Davis signed into law Assembly Bill 2583, sponsored by Assemblywoman Judy Chu (49th Assembly District).

⁴ At its most basic level, sexual assault refers to any form of nonconsensual sexual activity.

⁵ The category of victim services was not statutorily mandated, but was added by the Task Force.

⁶ Warshaw, *I Never Called it Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*.

⁷ Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes, *Prevalence, Incident, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, November 1998, p. 6.

⁸ Bonnie S. Fisher, Francis T. Cullen and Michael G. Turner, *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, December 2000, p. 18.

⁹ Tjaden and Thoennes, *Prevalence, Incident, and Consequences of Violence Against Women*, p. 38.

¹⁰ "Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends and Girlfriends," *Bureau of Justice Statistics Factbook*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, March 1998, p. 13.

¹¹ Most rapes of males are committed by men who are heterosexual in their consensual sexual preference and self-identity. Stephen Donaldson, "Rape of Males," *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, Wayne R. Dynes, ed., New York: Garland, 1990, p. 1095.

¹² Women with disabilities are raped and abused at a rate at least twice that of the general population of women. Dick Sobsey, *Violence and Abuse in the Lives of People with Disabilities: The End of Silent Acceptance*, Baltimore, Maryland: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co., Inc., 1984, p. 35.

¹³ For example, the Clery Act; California Education Code section 67380, which mandates the preparation, posting and distribution of a campus safety plan; California Education Code section 67385, which requires that all public higher education institutions and Hastings College of the Law develop written procedures or protocols to ensure that victims of sexual assault receive treatment and information; and California Education Code section 67381, which requires all public and some independent higher education institutions to enter into formal agreements with local law enforcement agencies regarding the investigation of certain crimes.

¹⁴ 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f), originally passed as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990. A 1998 amendment to the law renamed the act in memory of Jeanne Clery, who in 1986 was raped and murdered in her dorm room while a student at Lehigh University.

¹⁵ Noncompliance with the Clery Act, as determined by the U.S. Department of Education, results in a \$25,000 fine.

¹⁶ "Clery Act Annual Report Checklist," www.securityoncampus.org/schools/cleryact/cleryact.html.

¹⁷ www.securityoncampus.org/schools/cleryact/checklist.html.

¹⁸ Heather K. Karjane, Bonnie S. Fisher and Frances T. Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America's Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, Final Report, NIJ Grant #1999-WA-VX-0008, Newton, Massachusetts: Education Development Center, Inc., 2000, p. viii.

¹⁹ "Congress Provides Funding for Clery Act Compliance Handbook," Student Press Law Center News Flash, www.splc.org, February 14, 2003.

^{xx} "Institutions of higher education unintentionally condone victim-blaming when they circulate materials that focus primarily on the individual victim's responsibility to avoid sexual assault without balancing this risk management information with prevention education targeted toward men which stresses the perpetrator's responsibility for committing the crime." Karjane, Fisher and Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America's Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, p. xi.

^{xxi} Karjane, Fisher and Cullen, *Campus Sexual Assault: How America's Institutions of Higher Education Respond*, p. ix.

^{xxii} Greg Warchol, *Workplace Violence, 1992-1996: National Crime Victimization Survey Special Report*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998, p. 1.

^{xxiii} University of California (UC) campuses per Penal Code section 830.2 (b) and Education Code section 92600; California State University (CSU) campuses per Penal Code section 830.2 (c) and Education Code section 89560.

^{xxiv} Penal Code sections 830.32 (a), 830.4 and 830.7 (b); Education Code section 72330; Business and Professions Code section 7582.

^{xxv} Fully sworn officers must meet training requirements established by state Police Officer Standards and Training (POST), while security officers are regulated by the Department of Justice through the Business and Professions Code.

^{xxvi} California Penal Code section 679.04 (a).

^{xxvii} 20 U.S.C § 1092(f).

^{xxviii} Public Law 106-386 section 1601.

^{xxix} “Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act,” www.securityoncampus.org/congress/cscpa/.

^{xxx} Applies to UC and CSU campuses, the California community college system, and Hastings College of the Law.

^{xxxi} Known and cited as the Kristin Smart Campus Safety Act of 1998.

^{xxxii} Sometimes victims are uncomfortable contacting law enforcement for assistance before they are aware of all their options. Posting information on a webpage is an inexpensive and simple way for campus law enforcement and security departments to inform victims about alternative choices.

^{xxxiii} Some campuses use the term “discipline,” while others use “judicial.” This chapter uses the term “judicial.”

^{xxxiv} Some institutions use the term “sexual misconduct” to cover a broad range of unwanted sexual behaviors. This chapter uses the terms “sexual assault” and “sexual misconduct” interchangeably.

^{xxxv} Campuses are required to guarantee specific rights to victims as established by the “Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights,” Public Law 102-325 section 486 (c).

^{xxxvi} Compliance with this statute does not constitute a violation of the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (20 U.S.C. § 1232g). Victims may not be required to keep the results confidential.

^{xxxvii} The case of *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Schools*, 503 U.S. 60 (1992) determined that sexual assault and harassment are forms of discrimination protected under Title IX.

^{xxxviii} “Judicial Affairs Representatives” booklet, *Campus Violence Prevention Resource Guides*, Sacramento: California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA), 2003, p. 21.

^{xxxix} This recommendation addresses a common fear that may discourage victims from reporting an incident to the campus judicial system.

^{xl} This recommendation addresses a common fear that may discourage victims from reporting an incident to the campus judicial system.

^{xli} If sexual misconduct complaints are rarely heard, training should also be provided prior to the handling of each case.

^{xlii} Consider using case examples to illustrate appropriate implementation of the institution’s protocol.