



# **SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

---

**WORKING GROUP**

**March 25, 2020**

# OVERVIEW

“**Where Opportunity Meets Vision: A Student-Centered Vision for New Jersey Higher Education**” is New Jersey’s commitment to transform higher education through a vision for a Student Bill of Rights. This includes making sure every student in New Jersey feels safe and supported in their learning environment and that students have a voice in decisions impacting their education. In order to ensure students are safe from physical harm and feel included and welcome on campus, will take the collective work of all stakeholders. In New Jersey, one of our strengths is our diversity, but we need to make sure that students from all backgrounds feel they belong at our institutions.

In recognition that all stakeholders provide a vital role, the **Safe and Inclusive Learning Environment (SILE)** workgroup was established to provide best practices to support the State’s plan to strengthen higher education in New Jersey. A variety of stakeholders, including students, practitioners, faculty, and organizational leaders, convened to discuss how the State, institutions, and students can move forward in with actionable steps to developing and sustaining safe and inclusive learning environments. We hope the work put forward from this group will serve as a useful resource for institutions to help students thrive at our New Jersey institutions so they can focus on successfully completing their degree program.

The group focused on three specific charges outlined in the State higher education plan:

1. Promote the practice of data analysis through campus climate surveys.
2. Establish best practices for creating campus safety and inclusive environments.
3. Draft an implementation guide for colleges on the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault.

Over the course of six months from May through October 2019, the group researched and vetted best practices within the state and nation. As an outcome of this work, three deliverables were created to help guide the work moving forward. These products include:

## **DELIVERABLE: INVENTORY OF CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEYS**

In response to the promotion of data analysis via campus climate surveys, a guidebook has been developed to assist institutions in finding appropriate instruments to administer to students, faculty and staff. In addition, a step-by-step implementation guide is provided to help institutions better understand what resources may be needed and what they should consider during key decision points in implementation.

## **DELIVERABLE: A RESOURCE GUIDEBOOK FOR PROMOTING SAFE AND INCLUSIVE CAMPUSES**

In response to establishing best practices for creating safe and inclusive environments, a resource guidebook has been developed to assist institutions in supporting diversity, inclusion, and safety initiatives on campuses. The goal of the resource guidebook is to provide best practices, sample policies and key elements to consider when designing policies.

## **DELIVERABLE: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE**

In accordance to the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault, an implementation guide was developed to assist New Jersey institutions in the areas of: prevention and education, college procedural processes, community collaboration, and evaluation and assessment. As an example, the implementation guide could equip students and campus leadership in creating an environment where students are knowledgeable of their rights, and can easily access the appropriate information and resources.

## **CONCLUSION**

By utilizing these three deliverables, New Jersey institutions of higher education will be able to proactively work towards fostering diverse, inclusive, and safe environments for student learning and engagement. The deliverables are “building blocks” — and provide a variety of action students that institutions can utilize both immediately and in their long-range planning to assess and improve in the campus culture. Through this collaboration and continued conversation, we can work to make safe and inclusive learning environments that will help students persist and complete. The engine for being an economic and innovation leader in the United States will be for New Jersey to commit to foster and nurture learning environments where all students — regardless of race, ethnic origin, sex, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ability, and other identities, as well as their intersection — have the ability to be successful in college, preparing them for future success in the workforce.

# MEMBERS OF THE SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT WORKING GROUP

**Margaret McMenamin, Ph.D.**

President  
Union County College  
Chair

**Sarah McMahon, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor and Director  
Center on Violence Against Women and Children  
Rutgers University  
Chair

---

**Crystal Bedley**

Research Manager of the Office for Promotion of  
Women in Science  
Engineering, and Mathematics  
Rutgers University

**Emily Leskinen, Ph. D.**

Assistant Professor of Social Science  
Ramapo College

**Nancy Blattner, Ph.D.**

President  
Caldwell University

**Laura Luciano**

Associate Director of Office of Violence Prevention  
and Victim Assistance  
Rutgers University-Camden

**Michele Cascardi**

Associate Professor  
William Paterson University

**Rosa Perez Maldonado**

Assistant Dean  
Stockton University

**Julia Cusano**

Graduate Student  
Rutgers University

**Marilu Marcillo, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Saint Peter's University

**Jordan Draper, Ph.D.**

Dean of Students/Title IX Coordinator  
The College of New Jersey

**Joseph Marswillo**

Chief of Public Safety  
New Jersey Institute of Technology

**Leanna Fenneberg, Ph.D.**

Vice President for Student Affairs  
Rider University

**Marissa Marzano**

Communications Manager  
NJCASA

**Milton Fuentes, Ph.D.**

Professor  
Montclair State University

**Brian Mauro, Ph.D.**

Campus Executive  
Fairleigh Dickinson University

**Ronald Gray, Ph.D.**

Vice President Student Affairs and Dean of Students  
Felician University

**Frank Merckx**

Vice President and Dean of Students  
Drew University

**Joe Hines**

Director of Public Safety  
Union County College

**Pamela Pruitt, Ph.D.**

Director of the Center for Diversity and Inclusion Rider  
University

**Zaneta Rago, Ph.D.**

Director, Intercultural Center  
Monmouth University

**Sheetal Ranjan, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
William Paterson University  
Trustee at Bergen Community College

**Jean Semelfort**

Prevention Programs Manager  
Princeton University

**Simone Snyder**

Senior Program Coordinator,  
Center on Violence Against Women and Children  
Rutgers University

**Vance Stephens**

Financial Aid Officer Princeton  
Law Student at Rutgers University

**Alberta Tamika Quick**

Assistant Director of Equity and Diversity  
Programs Ramapo College

**Thank you to the New Jersey Office of the Attorney General for providing additional support to this Working Group and to Jennifer Perillo for providing copyediting for the final documents.**

---

**Disclaimer:**

The views expressed in this document belong to the Working Group and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the State of New Jersey. The content provided is intended to serve as a resource to help develop strategies to increase support for students at New Jersey's colleges and is provided in good faith. Due to time constraints, the Working Group notes the information may not be comprehensive and readers should take into account context for how the deliverable is used as well as further research that may be available after publication.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## **SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

- 1 Promoting the practice of data analysis through campus climate surveys.**
- 2 Establishing best practices for creating campus safety and inclusive environments.**
- 3 Drafting an implementation guide for colleges on the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault.**



# SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

## WORKING GROUP DELIVERABLE

The **Safe and Inclusive Learning Environment Working Group** will focus on developing best practices to enhance safety and support services on campus, and giving students a voice in these important campus matters. In particular, the group will be charged with:

- ➔ Promoting the practice of data analysis through campus climate surveys.
- ➔ Establishing best practices for creating campus safety and inclusive environments.
- ➔ Drafting an implementation guide for colleges on the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault.

### CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS:

Michele Cascardi, Ph.D. (Co-Lead) Julia Cusano, MSW (Co-Lead)

Crystal Bedley, MA

Leanna Fenneberg, Ph.D.

Emily Leskinen, Ph.D.

Rosa Perez Maldonado, MS

Sheetal Ranjan, Ph.D.

**March 25, 2020**



## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Step 1: Building capacity on campus .....	4
Engaging leadership on campus.....	4
Involving stakeholders across campus .....	5
Evaluation of campus resources.....	5
Step 2: Planning for a campus climate survey .....	6
Planning for data collection and analysis: .....	7
Step 3: Selecting a survey tool.....	7
Core domains to evaluate .....	8
Step 4: Determining a sampling approach .....	9
Census approach.....	9
Representative sample approach .....	9
Oversampling approach.....	10
Convenience sample approach .....	10
Survey response rates .....	11
Step 5: Determining when to administer the survey .....	12
Step 6: Preparing other materials needed to administer the survey.....	12
Institutional Review Board.....	12
Informed consent form.....	12
Protecting confidentiality .....	13
Managing potential risks .....	13
Step 7: Action planning and dissemination of findings .....	14
Data storage and sharing.....	15
Part Two: Review of Campus Climate Surveys .....	17
Introduction to Survey Review .....	17
(1) School Connectedness .....	17
(2) Campus Climate .....	17
(3) Institutional Response .....	18
(4) Student/Peer Response.....	19
(5) Campus Education/Prevention Programs and Awareness of Campus Resources .....	20
(6) Direct Experiences .....	21
(7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance (For Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys) or Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion (For Diversity and Inclusion Climate Surveys) .....	22
(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior .....	22
Overview of Campus Climate Instruments.....	23
Section 1A: Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables – Overview and by Core Domains .....	24

Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables – Overview.....	25
Overview.....	25
Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables –Core Domains .....	26
Section 1B: Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Surveys Detailed Review .....	31
(1) Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey (HEDS) .....	32
(2) 2016 University of Michigan (Student, Faculty, and Staff) Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion .....	34
(3) University of Chicago Campus Climate Survey: Diversity and Inclusion (2016).....	36
(4) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE) .....	38
Section 2A: Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Overview and Core Domains.....	41
Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Overview .....	42
Overview.....	42
Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Core Domains.....	43
Section 2B: Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Detailed Review .....	49
(1) Administrator-Research Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) .....	50
(2) #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey (#iSPEAK).....	53
(3) Association of American Universities Campus Climate Survey (AAU) .....	56
(4) Bureau of Justice Statistics Campus Climate Survey (BJS) .....	58
(5) Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium Faculty/Staff Survey of Campus Climate for Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey (HEDS) .....	61
Appendix A: Methodology of Survey Selection .....	66
Appendix B: List of Institutions and Surveys Used.....	69
Appendix C: Proprietary Surveys.....	72

## Introduction

In March 2019, Secretary of Higher Education Zakiya Smith Ellis and Governor Phil Murphy unveiled a [state plan for higher education](#), which included a vision for a Student Bill of Rights. This student-centered Bill of Rights stated: “Every student in New Jersey should feel safe and supported in their learning environment. This means colleges must work to ensure students are not only safe from physical harm, but also included and welcome on campus.” Following this, the New Jersey Office of the Secretary of Higher Education convened a working group focused on developing materials to guide higher education institutions toward safe and inclusive campuses. This working group, “Safe and Inclusive Learning Environments” had several charges, one of which focused specifically on providing resources for campuses to implement climate surveys. Climate survey results can inform institutional policies, programs, and practices for safe and inclusive campuses.

Campus climate surveys are commonly used to characterize the attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and experiences of students, faculty, staff, and administrators concerning the safety and inclusivity of the campus environment. There are many different aspects of safety and inclusivity that may be evaluated, ranging from broad campus climate considerations, sexual misconduct and other forms of interpersonal violence (domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual harassment), and more specific measures evaluating distinct experiences based on social identities (sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, race, ethnicity, religion/spirituality, disability status, veteran status, among other protected classes and identities). This report focuses on broad diversity and inclusion campus climate surveys as well as those specific to sexual misconduct (including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual harassment).

This guide is intended to help campuses successfully select and implement campus climate surveys. First, a series of steps are provided to guide an institution in conducting a campus climate survey. The aim was to provide enough information to help institutions determine which questions to ask, what resources may be needed, and practical considerations for conducting a survey and evaluating results. Second, campus climate surveys were reviewed to assist institutions in selecting a survey that best meets their campus needs.

The working group identified eight **core domains** of campus climate based on existing campus climate surveys. Each core domain is distinct, and, importantly, evaluates how students, faculty, and staff think and feel about their institution and the community. Measurement of these areas can provide valuable information to help an institution evaluate strengths and opportunities to enhance safety and inclusion on campus. Each of the eight core domains identified are described briefly here. For more detail, see “Definitions of Core Domains,” beginning on page 18.

1. **Campus Climate:** perception of campus environment
2. **School Connectedness:** sense of belonging on campus

3. **Institutional Response:** perception of and direct experiences with campus response to sexual misconduct and matters of diversity and inclusion (e.g., discrimination, harassment)
4. **Student/Peer Response:** perception of and direct experiences with peer response to disclosures of sexual misconduct and matters of diversity and inclusion (e.g., discrimination, harassment)
5. **Campus Education/Prevention Programs and Awareness of Campus Resources:** efforts to educate the campus community
6. **Direct Experiences:** self-reports of personal experiences as a victim or perpetrator of sexual misconduct, discrimination, harassment, bias, or insensitive comments
7. **Consent and Attitudes Toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance** (for sexual misconduct) and **Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion** (for diversity and inclusion)
8. **Bystander Attitudes and Behavior:** attitudes and actions to interrupt situations posing risk for sexual misconduct

## A Seven-step Guide to Implementation of a Campus Climate Survey

### Step 1: Building capacity on campus

#### Engaging leadership on campus

Engaging college campus leaders is a critical first step in comprehensive approaches to addressing campus climates regarding diversity, inclusion and sexual violence.<sup>1,2</sup> The involvement of those in leadership positions on college campuses not only contributes to available knowledge of campus sexual violence and issues of diversity and inclusion but also ensures that these participants will be active members in community change efforts.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the involvement of campus leaders signals this work as a priority, offers legitimacy to the project, and may encourage the participation of other members of the community.<sup>4</sup>

The process of engaging leadership may include:

---

<sup>1</sup> Banyard, Victoria L. "Improving College Campus-based Prevention of Violence against Women: A Strategic Plan for Research Built on Multipronged Practices and Policies." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 15, no. 4 (2014): 339-351.

<sup>2</sup> Lichty, Lauren F., Rebecca Campbell, and Jayne Schuiteman. "Developing a University-wide institutional Response to Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence." *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community* 36, no. 1-2 (2008): 5-22.

<sup>3</sup> Chavis, David M. "Building Community Capacity to Prevent Violence through Coalitions and Partnerships." *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 6, no. 2 (1995): 234-245.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

- Meeting with representatives of senior university leadership prior to engaging in any assessment activities in order to obtain institutional support.
- Identifying and engaging key stakeholders, partners, and decision-makers on campus. University stakeholders may include those who represent the areas of expertise on campus in regards to diversity and inclusion and interpersonal violence and may include representatives from Dean of Students, Title IX Coordinator, on-campus women's center or victim services center, cultural center(s), student conduct, human resources, athletics, faculty in related disciplines, and other related offices.
- Including students as potential key stakeholders, with careful consideration given to how to best engage students in the development process so their involvement is serious and deliberate and they are not merely token representatives.
- Discussing an overview of the project and potential challenges, such as anticipating any parental concerns, and describing how the data would be shared, including any troubling findings.
- Obtaining a commitment from university leaders to the campus climate assessment process and their intention to use the information to develop an action plan for continuous improvement for a safe and inclusive community.

### **Involving stakeholders across campus**

One way to continually gather stakeholder input across campus is to form an advisory board. An advisory board can be an essential component of the campus climate assessment process, as it engages a diverse group of individuals on campus with the shared purpose of addressing matters of diversity and inclusion and sexual assault. A successful advisory board may have these features:

- engages individuals across divisions and disciplines;
- provides guidance on which climate survey questions are salient to the university setting and necessary for inclusion;
- makes decisions about the content and methodology of assessments;
- helps to identify gaps in resources at the conclusion of the resource audit; and
- reviews findings and prepares reports based on campus climate assessment results.

For more information on advisory boards, see *Guide To Campus Climate Surveys* and follow the link for *Lessons Learned (Chapter 2)* at <https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/research-and-evaluation/understanding-and>

### **Evaluation of campus resources**

In order for colleges and universities to most effectively address issues of diversity and inclusion and campus sexual violence, it is recommended that institutions first conduct a

**resource audit** of available resources regarding both domains. A resource audit will include systematic assessment and documentation of the current infrastructure for promoting diversity and inclusion and responding to and preventing sexual violence on campus.<sup>5</sup>

For more information on the process of conducting a resource audit, see [Guide To Campus Climate Surveys](#).

## Step 2: Planning for a campus climate survey

Three common models for administering campus climate surveys include working with the university's institutional research unit, outsourcing these tasks to a consultant, and/or creating a research team (comprised of either faculty/staff from the institution, from other institutions, or both). Table 1 outlines the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

**Table 1. Three Models for Administering Campus Climate Surveys**

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Institutional Research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Skilled at administering, analyzing, and reporting survey data</li> <li>- Can offer deep understanding of the institution</li> <li>- Knowledgeable about how to align climate surveys with other data collection efforts</li> <li>- Low cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May not have the capacity to complete the work</li> <li>- Administration efforts may be thwarted by faculty, staff, and/or students who are experiencing survey fatigue</li> <li>- Ideological/political differences within and between campus units may hinder process</li> </ul>
<b>Consultant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expertise in the area</li> <li>- Can offer comparable data with other institutions</li> <li>- Resource rich</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited understanding of the institution</li> <li>- May be perceived as untrustworthy by faculty, staff, and students</li> <li>- Expensive</li> </ul>
<b>Research Team</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expertise in the area</li> <li>- Can develop innovative/novel approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May lengthen the time to complete work</li> <li>- Potentially expensive. Internal costs include faculty release time and</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Stith, Sandra, Irene Pruitt, Jemeg Dees, Michael Fronce, Narkia Green, Anurag Som, and David Linkh. "Implementing Community-based Prevention Programming: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Primary Prevention* 27, no. 6 (2006): 599-617.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can foster buy-in from a range of units across the institution</li> <li>- Can offer deep understanding of the institution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>overload. External costs include hiring contractors</li> <li>- May be difficult to coordinate administratively</li> <li>- May provoke questions regarding data integrity for a decentralized approach</li> <li>- Ideological/political differences within and between campus units may hinder process</li> </ul>
--	---	---

### Planning for data collection and analysis:

Some important questions to consider when evaluating the institution's infrastructure, capacity, and necessary human and material resources for conducting a campus climate survey:

- Does the institution have expertise among faculty and staff? If not, are there resources to contract with external consultants?
- Which faculty and staff are available to support survey selection, implementation, data analysis, report writing, and dissemination? How will they be compensated for their work (release time? overtime or overload?)?
- Will you survey everyone or a sample? Do you want to know results of the survey for particular groups? If so, which groups (e.g., women, students of color, disabled persons, etc.)?
- How do you incentivize survey takers? (e.g., gift cards? raffle prizes?)
- How much funding can be committed? How many staff hours can be committed?
- How will the institution protect the participants' confidentiality? (Reach out to your institution's IRB to coordinate.) How will the data be safely stored?
- What is the best timing of administration based on factors including the academic calendar, other scheduled institutional surveys, etc. to maximize response rate and minimize survey fatigue?

For more information on how to administer climate surveys, see *Climate Surveys: Useful Tools to Help Colleges and Universities in Their Efforts to Reduce and Prevent Sexual Assault* at <https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/page/file/910426/download>

### Step 3: Selecting a survey tool

It is important to select measures that have been carefully researched as this increases the validity of the results and may allow for benchmarking/comparisons to other

institutions. Surveys that have been carefully researched usually have one or more of the following features:

- publication in a peer-reviewed academic journal;
- a development team of researchers with expertise in the subject matter and university administrators involved with campus climate;
- testing of the survey in representative samples of university populations;
- evidence of reliability (the results are consistent within survey domains or across time) and validity so survey results can be trusted;
- demonstrated evidence that students, faculty, or staff take the survey, referred to as response or participation rate; and/or
- widespread use by universities nationwide.

In Part Two of this report, four campus climate surveys measuring various facets of diversity and inclusion and five campus climate surveys measuring sexual misconduct, recommended by the Safe and Inclusive Learning Environments Working Group, are presented.

### **Core domains to evaluate**

Each institution will have a unique set of goals for its climate survey based on a variety of institutional factors. Many surveys exist that have been evaluated by the scientific community and judged to be reliable, valid, and trustworthy. Additionally, surveys include similar core domains. Diversity and inclusion campus climate surveys, have not been as well-researched and validated as sexual violence campus climate surveys. However, development of surveys on diversity and inclusion has proliferated over recent years.

Core domains for sexual misconduct and diversity and inclusion campus climate surveys often include general campus climate; school connectedness; direct experience with sexual violence, dating violence, and stalking; campus education/prevention programs and awareness of campus resources; institutional response; student/peer response; bystander attitudes and behaviors; and attitudes toward sexual misconduct/attitudes toward discrimination, diversity, and inclusion.

For more information on these domains, see [Part Two: Review of Campus Climate Surveys](#).

### **Facilitating a campus audit**

In addition to facilitating climate surveys designed to understand the attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and experiences of campus constituents related to diversity and inclusion and sexual misconduct, it may also be beneficial for a campus to facilitate an intentional internal audit of existing efforts to promote a safe and inclusive environment. Benchmarked against national standards of best practice, results from a campus audit can inform future priorities and needs for campus efforts to enhance the campus climate.



While the scope of this project did not allow us to thoroughly review such instruments across various inclusion domains, national resources are available. Examples of for these specific identities include the [Campus Pride Index](#), which evaluates LGBTQ+-inclusive policies, programs, and practices and the [Campus Interfaith Inventory](#) facilitated by the Interfaith Youth Core.

#### **Step 4: Determining a sampling approach**

Deciding who will take part in the campus climate survey determines how valid the results will be and whether the results will inform policy, programs, and practice in helpful ways. There is not a single “right” way to determine a sample. Rather, an institution must consider the pros and cons of various approaches and select a method that will produce the most useful information given the institutional priorities and needs.

The first decision is whom to invite to take part in the survey. Some surveys may focus on students, others on faculty and staff, and others on all campus constituents. Once an institution has settled on its target population, the institution must choose a sampling approach so that the sample will resemble the target population.

##### **Census approach**

With a census approach, all individuals in the target population are invited to participate in the survey; no sample is taken. The most significant advantage of the census approach is that it includes all individuals in the target population and exposes an entire campus community to survey contents, thereby raising awareness about campus climate concerns and reaching the broadest array of participants. However, it may be difficult to motivate an entire campus community to participate in a campus climate survey, leading to a low response rate. As a result, the sample may not represent the target population well, and results of the survey may not be trusted.

##### **Representative sample approach**

With a representative sample approach, a subgroup of the target population is selected for participation. A selection method is chosen to ensure that all individuals in the target population have an equal chance of being selected for participation. Thus, the sample will be representative of or resemble the campus community. A major reason for selecting a sample of the target population is to preserve the advantages of the census approach (unbiased and generalizable results) while increasing response rate through the use of aggressive outreach and incentives (which are possible because fewer individuals are included than with the census approach). Consequently, there can be more resources allocated to recruitment for participation. When deciding how to sample, there are a number of characteristics of the campus community to consider, including:

- Biological sex
- Gender identification
- Graduate or undergraduate students
- Full- or part-time students

- Living on-campus, off-campus, or commuting
- Matriculated or not matriculated
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Year in college
- Transfer student or not
- Affiliated with sports or Greek organizations

The most important consideration is which characteristics of the campus community will provide the most valuable information about the target population's experiences. The list above is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Each institution must determine the characteristics of its campus community that will provide the most useful data about the target population's attitudes and experiences with diversity and inclusion and sexual misconduct. For example, a sample that is overwhelmingly male may not provide useful information about victims' experiences of sexual misconduct. A sample that consists of predominantly commuter or online students may not be as familiar with campus climate or policies. Each campus needs to engage in careful and thoughtful consideration of the characteristics of its community. Review of institutional research data on student, faculty, and staff characteristics can be a helpful starting point.

### **Oversampling approach**

There may be times when an institution is particularly interested in the attitudes or experiences of specific groups of students. For example, there may be concerns specific to LGBTQ+ students, veterans, or students from historically marginalized racial or ethnic groups, particularly related to harassment, discrimination, and sexual victimization on campus. If there are concerns that may be more relevant or visible to specific groups, then oversampling these groups may provide an institution with a broader understanding of these issues and an opportunity to better characterize and respond to students' experiences.

### **Convenience sample approach**

Convenience sampling utilizes subjects who are conveniently available to the researcher(s). This is the least valid way to obtain a sample because it may not resemble the campus community or target population. In other words, it may be biased and unrepresentative of students, faculty, staff, or administrators at the institution. However, it is also the easiest way to obtain a sample. Using this approach, individuals self-select to take the survey. A significant concern with this approach is the motives, reasons, or biases of those who elect to participate are unknown and may lead to erroneous conclusions about campus climate and experiences of sexual misconduct, harassment, discrimination, and other aspects of diversity and inclusion. This approach may leave out students who have low institutional trust and thus may be hesitant to respond to this type of survey.

## Survey response rates

Perhaps the most important aspect of sampling is the response rate. The response rate is an estimate of the number of individuals who took the survey compared to everyone who was given the opportunity to respond. The higher the response rate, the more likely the survey results will reflect the sample, and thus breadth of campus experiences. When response rate is low, survey results may be skewed or biased in unknown ways based on the reasons why some elected to complete the survey and others chose not to. There are many ways to increase response rate. A few are listed here:

- **Marketing and advertising.** Publicizing the survey and gaining buy-in from groups on campus can go a long way in encouraging participation. Sports coaches, campus leaders (students, faculty, and staff), course instructors, and social media can all be extremely useful in generating interest and enthusiasm for survey participation.
- **Senior leadership buy-in.** When senior leadership support the survey, there may be additional means to encourage participation, such as using registration holds until participation is complete.
- **Incentives.** Monetary or other material rewards can motivate participation. However, the total amount of rewards to dispense is directly related to the sample size and complexity of logistics. Rewarding each individual who completes the survey can be expensive, require considerable human capital to execute, and may compromise participant confidentiality and anonymity.
- **Accessibility.** Ensure the survey is widely accessible to broad representation within the student population, as well as populations of faculty or staff if they are included. This may include targeted outreach efforts, as well as special considerations for students with disabilities and English language learners.

There are several ways participants can prove survey completion, and survey researchers on campus will be able to assist with this aspect of survey design.

	Human Capital High	Human Capital Low
Resources for Rewards High	Individual rewards Distributed in person	Individual rewards Digital distribution or deposit to student, faculty, staff accounts
Resources for Rewards Low	Raffle or lottery Distributed in-person	Raffle or lottery Digital distribution or deposit to student, faculty, staff accounts

### **Step 5: Determining when to administer the survey**

Depending on what climate survey you choose to administer, there may be specific recommendations about survey frequency. Once a survey has been administered data must be analyzed, results summarized and distributed, action items and initiatives generated, and changes can be implemented. For this reason, institutions may find that annual surveys do not yield enough time to address issues that arose in prior surveys. Campuses will need to decide what frequency of administration makes sense for them. Campuses may want to vary the focus of surveys over time to address various campus needs. For example, a campus may decide to distribute a general campus diversity and inclusion climate survey every few years, and, in the years between, distribute a climate survey that addresses specific aspects of identity promoting equity, safety, and inclusion (e.g., sexual misconduct, bias). This approach allows campuses to collect data across a variety of needs within timeframes that maximize the value of the data collected and its campus usability.

### **Step 6: Preparing other materials needed to administer the survey**

#### **Institutional Review Board**

All colleges/universities have a formal Institutional Review Board (IRB) process. A detailed explanation of your institution's IRB process should be found on your campus's website. Allow ample time to review and submit documentation. Consider building additional time into the survey administrative timeline for unexpected questions and additional verifications. Before beginning this process, make sure to have the following questions answered:

- What is the main purpose of the study?
- Who will be the primary contact responsible for the survey and project?
- What are the survey questions you want to answer?
- When do you plan to administer the survey?
- How will you protect the privacy of participants?
- How does the survey connect to your assessment plan (specifically core domains)?
- What is the timeline for administering the survey?
- Will participating in this survey place your participants at high risk?
- How will the researcher(s) use the data collected?
- Will you have a draft of the survey items ready for IRB review?

#### **Informed consent form**

Before any individual agrees to participate in your study, an informed consent should be presented, explained, and signed by the participant. Your informed consent should

- Explain the purpose of the study
- Outline the timeline for participation in the research and its procedures
- Present the potential risks
- Inform participants about their right to withdraw from the research once participation has begun
- Outline the benefits of participation
- Describe the limits of confidentiality
- Outline incentives for participation
- List the contact information of the person participants can contact if they have questions about the study and/or participants' rights

### **Protecting confidentiality**

Researchers' primary responsibility is to protect participants' privacy. All members of the research team should be trained in collecting, handling, and securing participants' personal data and should insure that the data will not be shared outside of the research environment. Primarily, participants' information should be restricted to the researcher and any research assistants on a need-to-know basis. According to your institution's IRB guidelines, information should be safeguarded to avoid breaches of confidentiality where personal information is disclosed to anyone outside of the research team. This helps to ensure that individuals are protected against psychological, social, and legal harm. All data must be adequately stored and only handled by individuals involved in the research study. If identifying information is collected (e.g., university ID numbers, etc.), it should be stored separately from participants' survey responses, in a location where few people have access to it. Data should be deidentified or anonymous.

### **Managing potential risks**

Surveys asking about personal experiences about violence, discrimination, and harassment have the potential to upset survey respondents. The good news is that research indicates the risks of disclosing sensitive personal information on surveys is low. Many survey respondents find it helpful to have a place to report their experiences, especially when they know the survey is confidential and/or anonymous. However, there may be survey respondents who find answering sensitive questions upsetting. Risk can be managed in a few ways:

- The informed consent form explains that the survey may be upsetting.
- Survey respondents may discontinue the survey at any time.
- Survey respondents may skip survey items they do not want to answer.
- Resources are provided at the end of the survey for managing distress. For example, include a list of University offices that can provide educational and psychological support, such as:

- Dean of Students Office
- Health and Wellness
- Counseling Services
- Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Center
- Disability Services
- Military and Veteran Services
- Human Resources (faculty and staff)
- University Chaplain
- African American, Latinx, LGBTQ+, and Jewish Student Centers
- International Students Office
- Affinity groups

*Sample language regarding risk for an informed consent form:*

**Potential Risks.** You may find some of the questions on the surveys, or parts of the online program, will make you feel uncomfortable. Please remember that you can withdraw from participation at any time and can choose not to participate in any part of the study without negative consequences.

*Sample language regarding voluntariness for an informed consent form:*

**Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal.** Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can withdraw from participation at any time and can choose not to participate in any part of the study without penalty. Specifically, you do not have to answer particular questions if you do not wish to do so. Similarly, you can stop viewing the online program at any time.

Your consent is also optional and voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your present or future relationship with your institution. If you withdraw from the study at any time, your information will be removed from the study results.

### **Step 7: Action planning and dissemination of findings**

It is critical to conduct a climate survey with the intent to foster a safe and supportive environment. Students, faculty, and staff must believe that the survey intent fosters this institutional quest to create and maintain a safe and supportive environment. The administration can help get this message out through partnerships with student organizations (e.g., athletics, Greek life, student government). Proactive messaging has a number of advantages. It

- helps students, faculty, and staff see the value in participating;
- encourages participation in future surveys;
- affirms to students, faculty, and staff that campus leadership takes sexual misconduct, diversity, and inclusion seriously; and
- demonstrates diligence and commitment by all members of the campus community to ensure safety and inclusion.

Once data have been collected, a data analyst will be required to clean, analyze, and summarize the data. An institution should determine that it has sufficient in-house expertise for data analysis and report writing, and, if so, how it will access the expertise:

- Is data analysis a part of the individual's job description?
- If it is not part of the job description, how will the analyst be engaged in the process (e.g., through university service, honoraria or additive pay, course credit release, publication)?

The most vital activity after the survey is to share the results with the university community. This will demonstrate the institution's authentic and genuine interest in the voices of those on campus and willingness to take action based on those voices. Campuses should consider multiple methods of releasing the survey results in a manner that is both transparent and easily understandable to students, faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as the public. There are a range of communication options, including

- formal reports;
- key written, online, and verbal briefings for different campus constituencies;
- media releases;
- social media presentations; and
- action plans for education and resources based on results.

It is critical that colleges and universities develop a thoughtful strategy when considering best methods for presenting this information to their multiple audiences. Some questions to consider include:

- What are the main take-home messages?
- When is the best time to release this information?

It is best to disseminate information to the campus and general community as soon as possible after the data are analyzed.

Institutions may also anticipate questions from parents, guardians, and other members of the community. It is important for institutions to prepare for questions from these individuals in collaboration with university admissions, communications, and student affairs.

### **Data storage and sharing**

It is important to clarify who will have access to the data and where it will be stored to protect the privacy of participants and integrity of the data. Data should be stored on encrypted hard drives or data services with access restricted to authorized individuals who have knowledge of human subject protections. An example of this approach is demonstrated through CITI training at <https://about.citiprogram.org/en/homepage/>.

For institutions that benchmark against other campuses or databases or wish to deposit data into a central depository for aggregated data analysis, formal data sharing agreements will be required. At a minimum, agreements should specify the following:

- Data will be deidentified so the identity of individual survey responses cannot be linked to a specific individual;
- The format and structure of the data file and data dictionary will be standardized across all participating institutions for seamless data merging and analysis;
- Specific parameters for how the data will be used and with whom it will be shared will be defined; and
- The length of time the data will be stored before being destroyed will be specified.



## **Part Two: Review of Campus Climate Surveys**

### **Introduction to Survey Review**

This section provides a comprehensive review of surveys evaluated by the working group that measure campus climate related to diversity and inclusion and sexual misconduct. The goal of this section is to guide institutions in selecting a survey that may be best for their campus. Using a rigorous and thoughtful approach, the working group identified nine easy to use and scientifically supported surveys for in-depth review. This report also provides some guidance for institutions seeking to shorten or customize surveys to meet individual institutional needs.

### **Definition of Core Domains**

This review organizes campus climate surveys by specific core domains of climate. Sample items are listed from the nine surveys included in the detailed review. It is important to note that some of the surveys reviewed also include measures developed by other scholars and researchers in the field. Citations to these measures can be found in each of the nine surveys reviewed. Although campus climate surveys typically measure multiple core domains, an institution may choose not to use all of the core domains included on a single survey. Also, because core domains may have different names depending on the survey, we provide a description of each core domain, as well as alternative terms that may be used.

#### **(1) School Connectedness**

This refers to one's overall sense of belonging, being treated fairly and with respect, feeling valued, and feeling close to people on campus. Sample items may include:

- I feel valued as an individual at this school.
- I feel close to people at this school.
- I am happy to be a student at this school.
- I feel included as an individual at this school.

This core domain is also referred to as General Campus Climate, Campus Connectedness, or Sense of Belonging

#### **(2) Campus Climate**

Campus climate refers to one's perceptions of safety and of the institutional attitude towards general issues of diversity and inclusion on campus, including sexism, racism, homophobia, tolerance of disabilities and accommodations, as well as other items related to one's feelings of inclusion (e.g., veteran status, immigration status, status as a first-generation student). Climate also refers to perceptions of institutional attitude and

response specifically related to sexual misconduct, including sexual assault/violence, domestic violence, intimate partner/dating violence, stalking, harassment, and other forms of violence on campus. Surveys tend to capture one of the three domains listed below:

- Diversity and inclusion (including harassment and discrimination)
- Sexual misconduct: sexual assault/violence, harassment, domestic violence, intimate partner/dating violence, stalking
- Specific measures of identity-based experiences (e.g., racial climate, LGBTQ+ climate, religious climate)

It is important to note that surveys tend not to measure campus climate for both diversity and inclusion and sexual misconduct in a single survey. An institution may consider surveying different aspects of campus climate each year. For example, in one year it may focus on broad issues of diversity and inclusion, the following year sexual misconduct, and the year after a specific form of identity-based experience.

Sample items for diversity and inclusion may include:

- This school creates a safe environment where diverse views are expressed.
- I feel comfortable at this school expressing my views as a person of religious affinity.
- This school creates a safe environment for people of varied sexual orientations to thrive and succeed.
- My views are valued and are reflected in decision-making at this school.
- I feel respected at this institution.

Sample items for sexual misconduct may include:

- Sexual harassment is not tolerated at this school.
- Sexual assault is not tolerated at this school.
- This school does a good job of providing needed services to victims of sexual misconduct.

### **(3) Institutional Response**

This refers to university leadership's efforts to promote diversity and inclusion as well as to prevent sexual misconduct, and perceptions about the institution's response to disclosures of discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic and intimate partner/dating violence, and stalking. Questions may be asked based on the respondents' overall perception and also based on their personal experience with reporting an incident to the institution, including their perception of the helpfulness/usefulness of the institution's response.

Usually, there are separate survey modules for measuring institutional response to

- Sexual misconduct (sexual assault/violence, domestic violence, intimate/partner dating violence, stalking, sexual harassment)
- Diversity and inclusion

Sample items may include:

- The institution has a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- I am treated fairly and equitably in classrooms/classroom settings.
- Senior leadership demonstrates a commitment to diversity and equity on this campus.
- The institution provides sufficient programs and resources to foster the success of a diverse faculty.
- If I were sexually assaulted I believe this institution would
  - Take my case/report seriously
  - Protect my privacy
  - Treat me with dignity and respect
  - Enable me to continue my education without having to interact with the person who assaulted me
- In thinking about the events related to sexual misconduct, did /would [institution] play a role by
  - actively supporting you with either formal or informal resources
  - apologizing for what happened to you
  - believing your report
  - allowing you to have a say in how your report was handled
  - labeling you a troublemaker
- Do you know what the process for reporting sexual violence/assault involves at this institution?
- Based on your knowledge of reporting protocols for sexual assault/violence at this institution, how prompt do you think action will be taken to address complaints?
- If you ever experienced sexual assault or violence at this institution, how long did it take to have a resolution to your complaint? (in 24 hours or less, within 5 working days, within two weeks, within a month, over a month?)
- If I were sexually assaulted or violated at this school, I know where (which office or offices) to report the incident at this school.
- If I were sexually assaulted or violated, I know which resources are available to me at this school.

#### **(4) Student/Peer Response**

This core domain is similar to institutional response, but instead of asking how the institution would respond, it asks how students or peers would respond to another

student making a disclosure or report of sexual misconduct, sexual assault/violence, sexual harassment, domestic and dating violence, stalking, harassment, and/or discrimination. Sample items may include:

- Students would
  - label you a troublemaker
  - comfort you by telling you it would be all right or by holding you
  - tell you that you could have done more to prevent this experience from occurring
  - isolate and not talk to you for filing a complaint
  - support you in making sure that the right action is taken
  - have you targeted for lodging a complaint

#### **(5) Campus Education/Prevention Programs and Awareness of Campus Resources**

This core domain refers to efforts undertaken by the institution to educate the campus community about diversity and inclusion (including harassment and discrimination) and sexual misconduct (sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual harassment). Some surveys also measure awareness of campus resources for preventing, reporting, managing, or obtaining services regarding sexual misconduct and diversity and inclusion.

Sample items for diversity and inclusion may include:

- Courses I have taken actively foster an appreciation for diversity.
- I have taken courses that require me to believe or conform to behaviors outside of my personal convictions without my consent.

Sample items regarding sexual misconduct may include:

- Since coming to [school] have you received written or verbal information from anyone at [school] about:
  - definitions of sexual misconduct
  - how to report an incident of sexual misconduct
  - where to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct
  - about Title IX protections against sexual misconduct
  - how to help prevent sexual misconduct
  - the student code of conduct or honor code
- I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.
- I understand what happens when a student reports a claim of sexual misconduct at [institution].
- I know what my responsibility is if a student reports an incident of sexual assault or violence to me as an employee of this school.

- As a student, I understand that an employee of this school may be obligated to report any issue of sexual assault/violence I share with them even if I share it in confidence (employees other than confidential counselors).

## **(6) Direct Experiences**

Surveys may include questions about personal experiences with discrimination, bias, and harassment. Items may include self-reporting of being discriminated against or harassed due to specific aspects of one's social identity (e.g., race/ethnicity; sexual orientation; gender or gender identity; socioeconomic, religious, disability, or immigrant status; political views; age; physical appearance). Further, questions can ask participants to identify the type of discrimination or harassment experienced (e.g., written comments, remarks, intimidation, physical violence), as well as the location and/or source of the discrimination/harassment.

Sexual misconduct surveys often include self-report ratings of personal experiences as a victim or perpetrator of unwanted sexual contact, attempted sexual assault, completed sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual harassment, harassment, and discrimination. Some surveys use existing validated instruments, such as the Sexual Experiences Survey.<sup>6</sup>

The way in which direct experiences are measured varies by survey. Some measure only unwanted sexual contact and attempted and completed sexual assault, while others measure multiple forms of violence, including domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual harassment. Others measure only direct experiences with discrimination and harassment.

In addition, for respondents who disclose at least one incident, follow-up questions vary considerably from survey to survey. Some surveys ask about the worst or most serious incident, while others ask about the most recent, and still others ask about several distinct incidents. The narrative description for each detailed survey review will provide specific information about follow-up questions. Sample items include:

- Over the past 12 months, how often have you experienced discriminatory events at your institution because of your [sex, marital status, religion, age, race or ethnic identity]?
- Do you believe that any of the religious discriminatory events you have experienced are related to your specific religion?
- Have you experienced any discriminatory events regarding personal aspects that were not asked about in the previous questions?

---

<sup>6</sup> Koss, Mary P., Antonia Abbey, Rebecca Campbell, Sarah Cook, Jeanette Norris, Maria Testa, Sarah Ullman, Carolyn West, and Jacquelyn White. "Revising the SES: A Collaborative Process to Improve Assessment of Sexual Aggression and Victimization." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (2007): 357-370.

## **(7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance (For Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys) or Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion (For Diversity and Inclusion Climate Surveys)**

For the diversity and inclusion climate surveys, this theme captures attitudes towards diversity, inclusion, and discrimination. An example of how this is addressed in one survey is by asking respondents how comfortable they are interacting with people of different identities than their own (e.g., race, socioeconomic background, sexual orientation, gender, religion, disability, political views, age, immigration status, country of origin, language).

For the sexual misconduct surveys, questions ask about attitudes toward consent for sexual encounters (touching, fondling, oral sex, vaginal sex, anal sex) as well as attitudes associated with a higher likelihood of perpetrating unwanted sexual behavior, attempted sexual assault, or completed sexual assault. Sample items include:

- People get too offended by sexual comments, jokes, and/or gestures.
- It really doesn't hurt anyone to post sexual comments or photos of people without their consent through email, text, or social media.
- A person who is sexually assaulted while they are drunk is at least somewhat responsible for putting themselves in that position.
- It is not necessary to get consent before sexual activity if you are in a relationship with that person.

## **(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior**

This core domain is primarily used in sexual misconduct climate surveys, and it refers to respondents' attitudes toward taking action as a bystander to interrupt a situation that poses risk for sexual assault or domestic/dating violence (referred to as a risky situation), to take steps to prevent hostility and violence on campus, and/or to support a friend who may have experienced an unwanted sexual experience or domestic/dating violence. Also measured are actions taken as a bystander to interrupt a risky situation, to attempt to prevent hostility and violence on campus, or to support a friend who may have experienced an unwanted sexual experience or domestic/dating violence. Some surveys also measure missed opportunities for taking action as a bystander, meaning the respondent had an opportunity to intervene as a bystander but chose not to. Still others may measure what an individual would do if they had the opportunity. Sample items include:

- When the situation arose at [school] how often did you do any of the following:
  - intervene with a friend who was being physically abusive to another person
  - approach someone I know if I think they are in an abusive relationship and let them know I'm here to help

- try to distract someone who was trying to take a drunk person to another room or trying to get them to do something sexual
- walk a friend who has had too much to drink home from a party, bar, or other social event
- speak up against sexist jokes

### **Overview of Campus Climate Instruments**

The working group reviewed and vetted a number of national surveys. The following section provides an overview of what the group rated as the strongest campus climate surveys in the areas of diversity and inclusion (general) and sexual misconduct (see Appendix A for details about how surveys were selected). Information in the first table includes the survey link, cost, administration interviews, target audiences, survey length, and time to administer. Subsequent tables include a detailed review of each survey's strengths and weaknesses. Finally, there is a general summary of implications for policy and practice for each area.

## **Section 1A: Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables – Overview and by Core Domains**



## Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables – Overview

Overview			
Survey	Survey Link	Cost	Administration Interval Considerations
1. Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-diversity-equity-campus-climate-survey/">https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-diversity-equity-campus-climate-survey/</a>	\$1900 non HEDS member \$ 500 HEDS member (with annual \$3,100 member dues) Sample items in public domain	Any 3-6 week period from Jan 15-Apr 30
2. University of Michigan Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://diversity.umich.edu/strategic-plan/climate-survey/">https://diversity.umich.edu/strategic-plan/climate-survey/</a>	Public domain, no cost	NA
3. University of Chicago Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/Spring2016ClimateSurveyReport.pdf">https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/Spring2016ClimateSurveyReport.pdf</a>	Public domain, no cost	NA
4. Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Diverse Learning Environments Survey	<a href="https://heri.ucla.edu/diverse-learning-environments-survey/">https://heri.ucla.edu/diverse-learning-environments-survey/</a>	Cost associated: fee is calculated based on total full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollment (for student surveys) or full-time (faculty/staff survey). Lowest fee is \$1600 for under 500 FTE undergraduates. Additional costs apply for customization and email distribution.	NA

## Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Survey Tables –Core Domains

<b>(1) School Connectedness</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items measure sense of belonging	< 1 minute
2. University of Michigan	Students, faculty, staff	Ranges from 8 to 12 items (various depending on staff, faculty, or student survey)	5-10 minutes
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	NA	NA	NA

<b>(2) Campus Climate</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	15 items (question 1, 3, 5, 6) measuring campus atmosphere regarding diversity and inclusion	< 5 minutes
2. University of Michigan	Students, faculty, staff	12 or 13 items	8 minutes
3. University of Chicago	Students, faculty, staff	8 items measuring perceptions of overall climate, 15 items assessing deeper institutional experiences of climate	5-7 minutes
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	Students, faculty, staff	9 items measuring general campus climate	< 1 minute

<b>(3) Institutional Response</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	4 items (question 2) measuring institutional support for diversity and equity	< 2 minutes
2. University of Michigan	Students, faculty, staff	Ranges from 4 to 9 items (various depending on staff, faculty, or student survey)	3-6 minutes
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	Students, faculty, staff	9 items assessing institutional commitment to diversity	< 5 minutes

<b>(4) Student/Peer Response</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	NA	NA	NA
2. University of Michigan	NA	NA	NA
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	NA	NA	NA

<b>(5) Campus Education/Prevention and Awareness of Campus Resources</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	10 items (question 7) measuring campus activities and 3 items (question 12) measuring awareness of campus resources	< 5 minutes
2. University of Michigan	NA	NA	NA
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	NA	NA	NA

<b>(6) Direct Experiences</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	15 items (questions 10-11) measuring witnessing discrimination and harassment, 20 items (questions 13-20) measuring personal experience	< 10 minutes
2. University of Michigan	Students, faculty, staff	2 items	2 minutes
3. University of Chicago	Students, faculty, staff	15 items measuring direct experience with discrimination and/or harassment, includes consequences of	5-7 minutes

		discrimination and/or harassment	
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	Students, faculty, staff	11 items measuring direct discrimination and bias experiences, 8 items measuring witnessed incidents of discrimination	5-7 minutes

<b>(7) Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	10 items (question 4) measuring comfort with diversity	< 2 minutes
2. University of Michigan	Students, faculty, staff	2 items with 10 statements	3-5 minutes
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA
4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	Students, faculty, staff	16 items measuring norms and attitudes towards diversity	5-7 minutes

<b>(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey	NA	NA	NA
2. University of Michigan	NA	NA	NA
3. University of Chicago	NA	NA	NA

4. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	Students, faculty, staff	8 items measuring witnessing incidents of discrimination and harassment	< 5 minutes
--	--------------------------	---	-------------

## **Section 1B: Diversity and Inclusion Campus Climate Surveys Detailed Review**

## **(1) Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey (HEDS)**

### **Core domains measured:**

#### **√ (1) School Connectedness**

- Question 1, 2 items: sense of belonging and community

#### **√ (2) Campus Climate**

- Question 1, 2 items: overall campus climate  
Questions 3, 5, 6, 13 items: measure specific aspects of satisfaction and attitudes regarding campus climate on diversity and inclusion (e.g., race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, religion, immigration status), campus climate for diversity and equity

#### **√ (3) Institutional Response**

- Question 2, 4 items: campus commitment to diversity and inclusion; recruitment of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff; and management of tensions regarding individual and group differences. Institutional support for diversity and equity.

#### **(4) Student/Peer Response: NA**

#### **√ (5) Campus Education/Prevention and Awareness of Campus Resources**

- Question 7, 10 items: campus activities supporting diversity and inclusion
- Question 12, 3 items: awareness of campus resources

#### **√ (6) Direct Experiences**

- Questions 10-11, 15 items: witnessing discrimination or harassment on campus,
- Questions 13-20, 20 items: direct experiences with discrimination or harassment with follow-up regarding context and disclosure, insensitive or disparaging remarks.

#### **√ (7) Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion**

- Question 4, 10 items: comfort interacting with people who are different from the respondent (e.g., race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, immigration status, political affiliation)



(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior: NA

**Strengths**

- Comprehensive review of campus climate with one survey inclusive of various participants (students, faculty, staff, and administrators).
- Comprehensive review of campus climate, given wide array of core domains measured.
- Strong focus on areas including: interaction with diverse others, involvement in activities supporting inclusion, and individual experiences with harassment and discrimination.
- Data collection, analysis, and results reporting available for a fee to HEDS consortium members. The survey items are available for use in the public domain.
- Ability to customize and compare data sets of HEDS Consortium member institutions.
- Opportunity to connect and collaborate with other HEDS Consortium members regarding analysis and application of findings (e.g., conference, listserv).
- Reasonable overall length to encourage participation.
- Strong psychometric properties, as indicated by Cronbach alpha for survey subscales.

**Weaknesses**

- Must be HEDS member to access data, in general, and for benchmarking.
- Cost (\$3,100 membership, \$500 survey for members; or \$1,800 for non-members).
- Content areas lack core domains: Student/Peer Response, Bystander Attitudes and Behaviors.

**Contact information:**

Website: <http://www.hedsconsortium.org/>

Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium

General phone: (765) 361-6170

Email: [skillruk@wabash.edu](mailto:skillruk@wabash.edu)

## (2) 2016 University of Michigan (Student, Faculty, and Staff) Campus Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

### Core domains measured:

#### √ (1) School Connectedness

- Student survey, 12 items: perceived sense of belonging and acceptance
- Faculty survey, 9 items: perceived sense of belonging and acceptance
- Staff survey, 8 items: perceived sense of belonging and acceptance

#### √ (2) Campus Climate

- Student survey-Part 2, 13 items: feelings, perception, and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Faculty survey-Part 2, 13 items: feelings, perception, and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Staff survey-Part 2, 12 items: feelings, perception, and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion

#### √ (3) Institutional Response

- Student survey-Part 2, 4 items: institutional commitment
- Faculty survey-Part 2, 9 items: institutional commitment
- Staff survey-Part 2, 8 items: institutional commitment

(4) Peer/Student Response NA

(5) Campus Education/Prevention and Awareness of Campus Resources NA

#### √ (6) Direct Experiences

- Student survey-Part 2, 2 items: discrimination
- Faculty survey-Part 2, 2 items: discrimination
- Staff survey-Part 2, 2 items: discrimination

#### √ (7) Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion

- Faculty survey-Part 2, 2 items: departmental norms and fair treatment (faculty survey only)

(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior NA

**Strengths:**

- Surveys can be replicated for use with students, faculty, and staff at other institutions.
- Sample survey and consent available to the public.
- Used a large sample size with randomization.
- Highly interactive web-based survey.
- Self-administered survey, takes about 15 minutes to complete.
- Mean completion time for staff 12.66 minutes.
- Mean completion time for faculty 13.26 minutes.
- Mean completion time for students 11.47 minutes.
- Survey designed to minimize non-response and reduce potential for non-response bias by specific demographic groups.
- Survey structure comprised of four sections: consent, demographics, campus climate, and thank you/incentive-related questions.
- Uses a multivariate risk model of key variables.
- Includes a detailed methods appendix in results article.

**Weaknesses:**

- Sample size was one large midwestern university.
- Unlike other surveys, no data sets to share and compare data with other institutions.
- No psychometric properties of reliability, validity, convergent validity, and factor analysis fit reported (may need to contact researchers).
- Only multivariate analysis of group difference reported, source of specific differences not reported.

**Contact:**

Website: <https://diversity.umich.edu/strategic-plan/climate-survey/>

Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion

(734) 764-3982

Email: [diversitymatters@umich.edu](mailto:diversitymatters@umich.edu)

**References:**

See website above

### (3) University of Chicago Campus Climate Survey: Diversity and Inclusion (2016)

#### Core domains measured:

- (1) School Connectedness NA
- √ (2) Campus Climate
  - 8 items: perceptions of overall climate
  - 15 items: deeper institutional experiences of climate
- (3) Institutional Response NA
- (4) Peer/Student Response NA
- (5) Campus Education/Prevention and Awareness of Campus Resources NA
- √ (6) Direct Experiences
  - 15 items: direct experience with discrimination and/or harassment (includes consequences of discrimination and/or harassment)
- (7) Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion NA
- (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior NA

#### Strengths:

- Inventories experiences and perceptions based on sexual identities, gender identities, race/ethnicity, religious identities, disability status, and political views.
- Extensive demographic categories that are also manageable and meaningful for data analysis.
- Designed for multiple constituents, including faculty, students and staff.
- Free, in public domain.
- Development sample included 3,811 students, 928 academics and post-doctoral researchers, and 2,667 staff; for students: Black/African-American 5%, Asian 12%, White 47%, LatinX 9%; 50% female; for academics and post-docs: Black/African-American 4%, Asian 13%, White 68%, LatinX 4%; 40% female; for staff :Black/African-American 15%, Asian 7%, White 68%, LatinX 5%; 64% female.

#### Weaknesses:

- Benchmarking not available (no centralized database of institutions using this survey).
- No psychometric properties reported.
- No open-ended responses.

**Contact:**

Website: <https://climatesurvey.uchicago.edu>

Office of the Provost

The University of Chicago

(773) 702-1234

Melissa Gilliam, Vice Provost: (773) 834-3861

**References:**

See website above

#### (4) Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE)

##### **Core domains measured:**

- (1) School Connectedness NA
- √ (2) Campus Climate
  - 9 items: general campus climate
- √ (3) Institutional Response
  - 9 items: institutional commitment to diversity
- (4) Peer/Student Response NA
- (5) Campus Education/Prevention and Awareness of Campus Resources NA
- √ (6) Direct Experiences
  - 11 items: direct discrimination and bias experiences
- √ (7) Attitudes Toward Discrimination, Diversity, and Inclusion
  - 16 items: norms and attitudes
- √ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior
  - 8 items: witnessed incidents of discrimination

##### **Strengths:**

- Inventories experiences and perceptions of campus climate from the perspective of students, faculty, and staff for a more complete understanding of climate for diversity on campus.
- Six optional modules, including classroom climate, transition to major, intergroup relations, spirituality, climate for transfer at 2-year institutions; and climate for transfer at 4-year institutions.
- Survey tool applicable for an array of institutions, including 2-year institutions.
- Survey administration customizable. Institutions can select email notification and reminder dates, customize email notifications, and upload additional questions.
- Survey tool measures experiences of unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault.
- Survey data updates in real time, allowing institutions to download preliminary data at any point.

- Survey packet includes suggestions for increasing response rates, as well as a sample text for inviting students to participate and copies of UCLA IRB approval for the survey.

**Weaknesses:**

- Cost. Price varies based on the size of the institution. Fee based on total full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollment (for student surveys) or full-time (faculty/staff survey). Lowest fee is \$1600 for under 500 FTE undergraduates. Additional costs apply for customization and email distribution. Detailed pricing information can be found here: <https://heri.ucla.edu/pricing/>
- No information on the scientific validity of the scale, including lack of data on reliability, validity, or development sample for the survey.

**Contact:**

Website: <https://heri.ucla.edu/diverse-learning-environments-survey/>

Higher Education Research Institute © 2019

(310) 825-1925

[heri@ucla.edu](mailto:heri@ucla.edu)

**References:**

Comprehensive list of about 350+ publications listed at:

<https://heri.ucla.edu/publications/>

## **Overall Implications for Policy and Practice**

- Comprehensive analysis of perceptions of campus climate can drive strategic campus decisions and actions aimed to advance sense of belonging and safety for students, faculty, and staff of all social identities as well as curricular and co-curricular approaches to advancing multicultural understanding for all students as a part of their educational experience.
- Review of data disaggregated by specific social identities of students can inform specifically designed support mechanisms for marginalized students, promoting student retention and persistence to graduation.
- Review of data disaggregated by faculty/staff can inform recruitment, onboarding, professional development, and other programs designed for faculty/staff to promote their retention.
- Data can provide clear understanding of students, faculty, and staff sense of belonging and safety on campus.
- Comparisons of baseline results with those of future survey data can provide an indicator of where the institution stands relative to previous years and help drive strategic decision-making.
- Data should be disaggregated into subgroups to provide helpful clues about prioritizing where and how monetary resources should be allocated.
- Review of typology of experiences with discrimination and harassment can inform improvements to policy, incident reporting protocol, and associated student educational campaigns.
- Results can be shared with student campus community to raise awareness of issues and engage students in solution generation for an inclusive campus community. The dissemination of results and recommendations can provide a framework for implementing specific interventions with certain expected outcomes.

## **Survey Specific Implications for Policy and Practice**

- Review of benchmark data available with HEDS consortium members presents opportunity for institutional reflection to promote future enhancements.
- The University of Michigan survey sample design and methodology can be replicated at other institutions at a low cost (helpful for institutions with limited funds).
- The HERI survey focuses on connecting diversity efforts with campus practices, including items related to a curriculum of inclusion, student support services, and co-curricular diversity activities.
- The HERI survey assesses learning outcomes as core components of diversity efforts.



## **Section 2A: Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Overview and Core Domains**

## Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Overview

Overview			
Survey	Survey Link	Cost	Administration Interval Considerations
1. Administrator-Research Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3): Survey of Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Misconduct	<a href="https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/arc3-campus-climate-survey/">https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/arc3-campus-climate-survey/</a>	Public domain, no cost	Not reported, general recommendations from the field is every 2 years
2. #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/research-and-evaluation/understanding-and">https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/research-and-evaluation/understanding-and</a>	Public domain, no cost	Every 3-4 years
3. Association of American Universities (AAU) Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/Survey%20Instrument.pdf">https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/Survey%20Instrument.pdf</a>	Public domain, no cost	Not provided
4. Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ccsvsftr.pdf">https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ccsvsftr.pdf</a>	Public domain, no cost	Every 2 years
5. Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) Faculty/Staff Survey of Campus Climate for Sexual Violence/ Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey	<a href="https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-surveys/#1497371712557-e46ec948-b928">https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-surveys/#1497371712557-e46ec948-b928</a> <a href="https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-surveys/#1474399758908-bc3c6785-a91c">https://www.hedsconsortium.org/heds-surveys/#1474399758908-bc3c6785-a91c</a>	\$1800 non HEDS members, \$500 HEDS members; sample survey items in public domain	Any 3-6 week period from Jan 15-Apr 30

### Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Summary Tables - Core Domains

<b>(1) School Connectedness</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	NA	NA
3. AAU	Undergraduates	NA	NA
4. BJS	Undergraduates	12 items on feelings on belonging, connections, and closeness with campus community	< 5 minutes
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	NA	NA

<b>(2) Campus Climate</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	12 items on attitude toward institutional response to sexual misconduct (module 4), 8 items on campus safety and perception of sexual misconduct as a problem (module 17)	< 5 minutes
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	NA	NA
3. AAU	Undergraduates	3 items included in Section B: perceptions of risk of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct	< 1 minute

4. BJS	Undergraduate students	12 items on perceptions of campus police, administrators, and faculty and staff's overall concerns and treatment of students	< 3 minutes
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	15 items about campus safety and perceptions of respect, value, and positive support at institution	< 5 minutes

<b>(3) Institutional Response</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	7 items on perceptions of the university's responsiveness to incidents of sexual violence.	< 5 minutes
3. AAU	Undergraduates	7 items included in Section I: perceptions of responses to reporting	< 5 minutes
4. BJS	Undergraduates	7 items on perceptions of the university's responsiveness to incidents of sexual violence	< 5 minutes
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	10 items about perceptions of institutional response to dangerous situations or reports of sexual assault	< 5 minutes

<b>(4) Student/Peer Response</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute

2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	3 items on perceptions of peers' supportiveness of sexual violence survivors on campus.	< 1 minute
3. AAU	NA	NA	NA
4. BJS	NA	NA	NA
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	NA	NA

<b>(5) Campus Education/Prevention Programs and Awareness of Campus Resources</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	6 items on how confident students are that they would know what to do if they or a friend experienced sexual/dating violence; 7 questions about whether they had encountered various messages and events relating to sexual and dating violence before and since coming to the university; students presented with 11 campus-based services to measure their awareness of these campus-based services	< 5 minutes
3. AAU	Undergraduates	5 items included in Section C: awareness of resources; 2 items included in Section H: sexual misconduct prevention training	< 5 minutes
4. BJS	Undergraduates	5 items on awareness of university resources relating to sexual violence and dating violence;	< 5 minutes

		7 items on participation in trainings (e.g., “training or classes offered by this school that covered the legal definition of sexual assault”)	
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	8 items about receiving information/education about resources/reporting of sexual assault and the helpfulness of this information	< 5 minutes

<b>(6) Direct Experiences</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	Unwanted sexual contact: 6 items to assess the frequency of several unwanted sexual experiences; 13-15 follow-up items for “most serious” incident; Dating violence: validated measures used to assess physical (16 items), digital (19 items), psychological (14 items), and financial abuse (3 items); 4 follow-up items asked about the “most serious” incident	< 10 minutes
3. AAU	Undergraduates	Sexual harassment: 14 items in Section D to assess the frequency and content of sexual harassment; Stalking: 12 items in Section E to assess the frequency and content of stalking behaviors; Intimate partner violence/dating violence: 12 items in Section F to assess the frequency and content of interpersonal violence; Nonconsensual sexual contact: 9 items in	< 10 minutes

		Section G to assess frequency and content of nonconsensual sexual contact since the student has been at the college or university; 42 potential follow-up questions with detailed skip logic regarding experiences of nonconsensual sexual contact, including time of occurrence, relationship, whether incident occurred on or off campus, drug and alcohol use, use of location services, and outcomes (e.g., injuries, pregnancy).	
4. BJS	Undergraduates	Sexual assault victimization: initial gate or screener questions covered both completed and attempted physically-forced sexual assault and incapacitated sexual assault; timeframe not specified; follow-up questions for up to 3 incidents; intimate partner violence victimization: 3 items	< 10 minutes
5. HEDS	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	Unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault: 4 items to assess unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault; Up to 24 follow-up items, detailed skip logic	< 10 minutes

<b>(7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance</b>			
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Time to Complete</b>
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	7 items on attitudes related to personal acceptance of sexual violence	< 1 minute
3. AAU	NA	NA	NA

4. BJS	Undergraduates	7 items on attitudes related to personal acceptance of sexual violence; 4 items to assess perception of student norms related to sexual misconduct	< 1 minute
5. HEDS	NA	NA	NA

**(8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior**

Survey	Target Audience	Description	Time to Complete
1. ARC3	Students, faculty, staff, administrators	2 items on satisfaction with institution (module 1)	< 1 minute
2. #iSPEAK	Undergraduates, graduate students	10 items to assess students' likelihood of positive bystander behaviors in the future	< 2 minutes
3. AAU	Undergraduates	6 items included in Section J to assess students' past bystander behavior	< 2 minutes
4. BJS	Undergraduate students	7 items to assess students' likelihood of positive bystander behaviors in the future.	< 2 minutes
5. HEDS	Administrators, Faculty, Staff, Students	7 items about bystander behavior.	< 2 minutes



## **Section 2B: Sexual Misconduct Campus Climate Surveys Detailed Review**

## (1) Administrator-Research Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3)

### Core domains measured:

- √ (1) School Connectedness:
  - Module 1, 2 items: possible outcomes
- √ (2) Campus Climate:
  - Module 4A, 12 items: perception of campus climate
  - Module 17, 8 items: campus safety
- √ (3) Institutional Response:
  - Module 13, 28-34 items: perceived/actual (depending on respondent experience) institutional responses
- √ (4) Student/Peer Response:
  - Module 14, 13 items: perceived peer supportiveness
- √ (5) Campus Prevention/Education and Awareness of Resources:
  - Modules 4B and 4C, 14 items: perception of campus climate
- √ (6) Direct Experience:
  - Modules 5-12, 110-166 items: sexual harassment by faculty/staff and students, and stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence perpetration and victimization; includes reports of behaviors and relationship, whether incident occurred off campus, under influence of drugs or alcohol, and emotional reaction for most serious incident/incident having greatest effect
- √ (7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance:
  - Module 3, 12 items: peer norms
  - Module 15, 13 items: consent
- √ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior:
  - Module 16, 7 items: bystander intervention

### Strengths:

- Development guided by 8 principles as follows:
  - Inclusive, mutual respect and collaboration among researchers, university administrators, and students.
  - Commitment to iterative and transparent drafting and development process.
  - Guided by ethics of science and aims to minimize bias.

- Uses best scientific evidence as foundation of survey.
- Equal focus on victimization and perpetration.
- Adopts civil rights approach grounded in Title IX.
- Uses Belmont Report as guide for human subject participation.
- Sensitive to unique issues faced by diverse populations and higher education institutional types (e.g., 2- vs 4-year institutions, public vs private).
- Each survey module adapted from an existing, validated survey instrument that has undergone peer review (e.g., Sexual Experiences Survey).
- Scientifically valid, with strong reliability and validity so that results can be trusted: internal consistency of modules strong; convergent validity demonstrated by expected patterns of association among modules.
- Development sample included 909 students from 3 different universities: 44% resided on campus; Black/African-American 13%, Asian 9%, White 75%, LatinX 4.4%; 80% undergraduates; 20% graduate students; 75% female.
- 85% completion rate for those who start survey.
- No extensive skip logic, which simplifies and abbreviates the survey and simplifies programming of the survey if administered online; reduces participant confusion if administered in paper and pencil format (skip logic only used for those having direct experiences with different forms of sexual harassment and violence).
- Sexual misconduct is the term used in survey items measuring institutional response, campus climate, campus safety, and education/awareness of resources.
- Specific definition of sexual misconduct is provided in the survey “physical contact or non-physical contact of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence.”
- Different time frames, depending on module, used for questions asking about experiences at a certain point in time (e.g., since enrolled at/coming to institution, past semester).
- Includes attention check items to evaluate if respondent is answering questions randomly.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Insufficient information to judge sample representativeness.
- Benchmarking not available as there is no centralized database of institutions using this survey.
- Length: on average, survey completion time is 30 minutes.
- 25% of students reported some level of distress when completing the survey, suggesting resources and supports should be accessible immediately after survey completion.
- Those who have had direct experiences with sexual harassment, stalking, dating violence, or sexual violence report on the incident having the greatest effect (victimization) or most severe situation (perpetration); thus there are follow-up

questions for only one incident. For those with multiple incidents, this may yield incomplete or biased information about Title IX violations at the institution.

**Contact:**

Website: <https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/>

Kevin Swartout, PhD  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology  
Georgia State University  
Office: (404) 413-6278  
Email: [kswartout@gsu.edu](mailto:kswartout@gsu.edu)

Sarah Cook, PhD  
Professor, Department of Psychology  
Associate Dean, Honors College  
Georgia State University  
Office: (404) 413-5577  
Fax: (404) 413-5578  
Email: [scCook@gsu.edu](mailto:scCook@gsu.edu)

**References:**

Swartout, Kevin M., William F. Flack Jr, Sarah L. Cook, Loreen N. Olson, Paige Hall Smith, and Jacquelyn W. White. "Measuring Campus Sexual Misconduct and Its Context: The Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Consortium (ARC3) Survey." *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy* 11, no. 5 (2019): 495.

## (2) #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey (#iSPEAK)

### Core domains measured:

- (1) School Connectedness NA
- (2) Campus Climate NA
- √ (3) Institutional Response
  - 7 items: perceived university responsiveness towards incidents of sexual/dating violence
- √ (4) Student/Peer Response
  - 3 items: perceived peer supportiveness
- √ (5) Campus Prevention/Education and Awareness of Resources
  - 11 items: level of awareness of on-campus sexual/dating violence resources
  - 7 items: level of exposure to information about sexual/dating violence
  - 6 items: student confidence in seeking help
- √ (6) Direct Experience
  - 80 items: dating violence and sexual violence victimization, including reports of behaviors and relationship, of whether incident occurred off campus and/or under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and of emotional reaction to the most serious incident/incident having greatest effect
- √ (7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance
  - 7 items: personal acceptance of sexual violence
- √ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior
  - 10 items: bystander intentions

### Strengths:

- Developed in collaboration by numerous stakeholders across Rutgers University, has been tailored based on results of piloting the tool in April 2014 as part of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.
- Free, in public domain.
- Many survey modules are adapted from an existing, validated survey instrument that has undergone peer review (e.g., Sexual Experiences Survey). Survey items that have been created for the purposes of the #iSPEAK survey have been

included and cited in several other campus climate survey instruments, including the ARC3.

- Scientifically valid: internal consistency of modules is strong.
- To reduce survey length, the survey tool can be administered in alternating modules across time (Module one includes a focus on sexual violence and could be administered in first survey cycle; Module two is focused on dating violence and could be administered in next survey cycle.).
- Development sample included 5911 students: 48% resided on campus; Black/African-American 7%, Asian 32%, White: 42%, Latinx: 13%; 79% undergraduates; 21% graduate students; 69% female.
- No extensive skip logic, which simplifies and abbreviates the survey. This also simplifies programming of the survey if administered online and reduces participant confusion if administered in paper and pencil format.
- Skip logic is used for those having direct experiences with different forms of sexual violence and dating violence.
- Nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact are the terms used in survey items measuring institutional response, campus climate, campus safety, and education/awareness of resources.
- Module one: Specific definition of unwanted sexual contact is provided in the survey, with definition including two types of unwanted sexual contact: unwanted touching of a sexual nature and unwanted penetrative contact. Module two provides definition of dating or domestic violence: “dating or domestic violence is controlling, abusive, or aggressive behavior in a romantic relationship. It can include verbal, emotional, physical, electronic, economic, or sexual abuse, or a combination of these behaviors.”
- Use of a consistent time frame for questions asking about experiences within a specific time frame: since enrolled at/coming to institution.
- Includes attention check item to evaluate if respondent is answering questions randomly.

**Weaknesses:**

- Benchmarking not available as there is no centralized database of institutions using this survey.
- Survey does not include measures of general campus climate or community connectedness.
- Survey tool does not include specific student outcome measures (e.g., academic outcomes, mental health).
- Incident-specific follow-up questions ask students to only report on the “most serious” incident reported by a student. For those with multiple incidents, this may yield incomplete or biased information about Title IX violations at the institution.

**Contact:**

Website: <http://endsexualviolence.rutgers.edu/climate-assessment/>

Dr. Sarah McMahon

Rutgers School of Social Work

(848) 932-4393

Email: [campusclimatestudy@ssw.rutgers.edu](mailto:campusclimatestudy@ssw.rutgers.edu)

**References:**

McMahon, Sarah, Kate Stepleton, Julia Cusano, Julia O'Connor, Khushbu Gandhi, and Felicia McGinty. "Beyond Sexual Assault Surveys: A Model for Comprehensive Campus Climate Assessments." *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 55, no. 1 (2018): 78-90.

McMahon, Sarah, Kate Stepleton, and Julia Cusano. "Understanding and Responding to Campus Sexual Assault: A Guide to Climate Assessment for Colleges and Universities." Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey: New Brunswick, NJ. (2016). Retrieved from: <https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/research-and-evaluation/understanding-and>

McMahon, S., K. Stepleton, J. O'Connor, and J. Cusano. "Campus Climate Surveys: Lessons Learned from the Rutgers-New Brunswick Pilot Assessment." Retrieved March 29 (2015): 2016.

### (3) Association of American Universities Campus Climate Survey (AAU)

#### Core domains measured:

- (1) School Connectedness NA
- √ (2) Campus Climate
  - Section , 3 items: perceptions of sexual assault or sexual misconduct risk
- √ (3) Institutional Response
  - Section I, 7 items: perceptions of responses to reporting
- (4) Student/Peer Response NA
- √ (5) Campus Prevention/Education and Awareness of Resources
  - Section C, 5 items: awareness of resources
  - Section H 2 items: sexual misconduct prevention training
- √ (6) Direct Experience
  - Section D, 14 items: sexual harassment
  - Section E, 12 items: stalking
  - Section F, 12 items: intimate partner violence/dating violence
  - Section G, 9 items: nonconsensual sexual contact
    - 42 potential follow-up questions for Section G (nonconsensual sexual contact) about time of occurrence, relationship, whether incident occurred on or off campus, drug and alcohol use, use of location services, and outcomes (e.g., injuries, pregnancy). Detailed skip logic throughout.
- (7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance NA
- √ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior
  - Section J, 6 items: bystander behavior to assess students' past bystander behavior.

#### Strengths:

- Used in one of the largest studies to examine sexual misconduct in the United States. The initial sample included 780,000 students from top research universities in the US, with a 19.3% response rate (n = 150,072): 61.5% undergraduates, 38.4% graduate students, 59.3% female, and 72.6% from public colleges or universities.
- Extensive resources available on the AAU website, including the full report of the results from the 2015 survey, a sample press release, the full survey instrument, and a report about methodological choices made by the survey developers.



- The skip logic may be complicated for those unfamiliar with programming a survey, or for those who don't have access to advanced survey software (e.g., Qualtrics). However, the [Survey Instrument](#) in public domain provides a clear explanation about the recommended skip logic. Using the recommended skip logic ensures participants only respond to questions relevant to them and shortens the length of the survey for some participants.
- Core set of 63 questions that are asked of every respondent. Additional questions are administered if respondents report being victimized. The survey takes roughly 20-30 minutes to complete.
- When asking about personal experience with sexual victimization, the survey instrument uses the language of “nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact.”

#### **Weaknesses:**

- While many validated instruments were used and/or modified for the survey, no psychometric properties (reliability or validity information to evaluate scientific merit) are provided for the measures as they appear in this survey. However, given the reliance on validated measures during survey development, as well as the transparency surrounding survey development decisions and implementation (as documented in the [Full Report](#) and [Methodology Report](#)), little psychometric data is provided.
- Does not assess rape myth acceptance or attitudes about sexual violence.
- At this time, this survey has only been implemented once. However, in 2018 the AAU announced it will be [conducting this survey among AAU member schools again](#).
- Non-AAU member institutions are unable to participate in the AAU's administration of the survey; however, the AAU has made the full survey instrument available in the public domain.
- The phrasing “sexual assault or sexual misconduct” is used when the survey asks students to report on their perceptions of campus safety (thus, sexual assault and sexual misconduct are unable to be disentangled with regard to student *perceptions* of campus safety).
- The survey asks for explicit details surrounding incidents of “nonconsensual sexual contact.” The utility of this level of detail is unclear in terms of a campus climate survey.

#### **Contact:**

#### **Website:**

<https://www.aau.edu/key-issues/aau-climate-survey-sexual-assault-and-sexual-misconduct-2015>

<https://www.aau.edu/issues/climate-survey-sexual-assault-and-sexual-misconduct>

Association of American Universities

Office: (202) 408-7500

**References:**

Cantor, David, Bonnie Fisher, Susan Helen Chibnall, Reanne Townsend, Hyunshik Lee, Gail Thomas, Carol Bruce, and Westat, Inc. "Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct." (2015).

**(4) Bureau of Justice Statistics Campus Climate Survey (BJS)**

**Core domains measured:**

√ (1) School Connectedness

- Campus Climate Module, 12 items: school connectedness

√ (2) Campus Climate

- Campus Climate Module, 12 items: general perceptions of campus police, faculty, and school leadership

√ (3) Institutional Response

- Campus Climate Module, 7 items: perceptions of school leadership climate for sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention and response
- Campus Climate Module, 4 items: perceptions of school leadership climate for treatment of sexual assault victims

(4) Student/Peer Response. NA

√ (5) Campus Prevention/Education and Awareness of Resources

- Campus Climate Module, 5 items: awareness and perceived fairness of school sexual assault policy and resources
- Campus Climate Module, 7 items: participation in training

√ (6) Direct Experience

- Sexual Harassment Victimization and Coerced Sexual Contact Module, 6 items: sexual harassment and coercion victimization
- Sexual Assault Victimization Module, 3 items: on personal experiences in sexual assault victimization. Includes follow-up questions about time of occurrence, relationship, whether incident occurred on or off campus, drug and alcohol use, use of location services, and outcomes (e.g., academic outcomes).
- Intimate Partner Violence Victimization Module, 3 items: intimate partner violence (physical violence only) victimization

√ (7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance

- Campus Climate Module, 7 items: personal acceptance of sexual violence

- Campus Climate Module, 4 items: student norms related to sexual misconduct

✓ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior

- Campus Climate Module, 7 items: bystander intentions

**Strengths:**

- Development guided by cognitive testing, both crowdsourcing and in-person cognitive interviewing with 248 individuals aged 18-25 years old.
- Free, in public domain.
- Each survey module is adapted from an existing, validated survey instrument that has undergone peer review (e.g., Sexual Experiences Survey).
- Scientifically valid: internal consistency of modules is strong. Additionally, to measure the accuracy of reported prevalence estimates and produce unbiased estimates of the latent core domains of interest (experiencing unwanted sexual contact since the beginning of the 2014–2015 academic year) latent class analysis (LCA) was used. The LCA findings suggest that the indicator used for estimating the prevalence of sexual assault minimized classification errors and increased precision of prevalence estimates.
- Development sample included over 20,000 students from 9 different institutions that were diverse in terms of 2-year vs. 4-year status; public vs. private status; geographical location; 44% residence on campus; Black/African-American 7%, Asian 13%, White 63%, LatinX 12%; 80% undergraduates; 20% graduate students; 58% female.
- Average length of the survey was 16 minutes for participants.
- The tool was systematically organized, asking about experiences of sexual harassment victimization and experiences with coerced sexual contact before questions about unwanted and nonconsensual contact. This was done to ensure that respondents did not include experiences with harassment and/or coercion when they answered the critical gate questions about unwanted/nonconsensual sexual contact.

**Weaknesses:**

- Incident-specific follow-up questions ask students to respond for each experience, for up to three separate incidents. Pilot testing showed that survey items most often not answered by students were the sexual assault incident follow-up questions for second and third incidents, which indicates respondent fatigue.
- Further survey development work may be needed to accurately document the victims' perspectives on the tactic used by the offender to execute a particular incident of sexual assault. When presented with the close-ended response options

for type of tactic in the pilot instrument, a number of victims did not endorse any of the tactics.

- Additional refinement of the questions used to document the reasons victims did not report incidents to officials is needed. The pilot instrument asked about only six reasons for not reporting.
- The reference period (since the beginning of the [enter years] academic year) may be problematic as students seemed to report incidents outside of the reference period.
- Further work is also needed on the current perpetration measures included in the pilot instrument as they did not appear to be successful.

**Contact:**

Website:

<https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5540>

<https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ccsvsftr.pdf>

Christopher Krebs, Christine Lindquist, Marcus Berzofsky, Bonnie Shook-Sa, and Kimberly Peterson (RTI International)  
RTI International

Michael Planty, Lynn Langton, and Jessica Stroop (Bureau of Justice Statistics)  
Bureau of Justice Statistics

**References:**

Krebs, Christopher, Christine Lindquist, Marcus Berzofsky, Bonnie Shook-Sa, Kimberly Peterson, Michael Planty, Lynn Langton, and Jessica Stroop. *Campus Climate Survey Validation Study: Final Technical Report*. BJS, Office of Justice Programs, 2016.

**(5) Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium Faculty/Staff Survey of Campus Climate for Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey (HEDS)**

**Core domains measured:**

(1) School Connectedness NA

√ (2) Campus Climate

- Section One, 15 items: general campus climate and views on sexual assault at institution; items on campus safety and perceptions of respect, value, and positive support at institution,

√ (3) Institutional Response

- Section One, 10 items: institution response to difficult or dangerous situations and institutional response to report of sexual assault; asks for perceptions of institutional response to dangerous situations or reports of sexual assault

(4) Student/Peer Response NA

√ (5) Campus Prevention/Education and Awareness of Resources

- Section One, 8 items: resources/reporting of sexual assault and the helpfulness of this information

√ (6) Direct Experience

- Section Two, 4 items: unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault victimization since coming to institution, specifically unwanted verbal behaviors, unwanted nonverbal behaviors, unwanted brief physical contact, touching of a sexual nature, oral sex, vaginal sex, anal sex, vaginal or anal penetration with object or body part other than penis or tongue.
- Up to 24 follow-up items (as per skip logic) for affirmative responses about the context of sexual assault (whether incident involved physical force, drinking, drugs, inability to provide consent), disclosure, and formal reporting at the institution.

(7) Consent and Attitudes toward Sexual Violence/Rape Myth Acceptance NA

√ (8) Bystander Attitudes and Behavior

- Section Four, 7 items: bystander behavior

**Strengths:**

- Comprehensive assessment of general campus climate and perceptions of risk for sexual assault on campus, off campus, or at social activity or event near campus.

- Developed in collaboration with Title IX officers, institutional researchers, student affairs practitioners from 30 institutions and based on the sample survey released by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault in April 2014.
- Pilot tested at five institutions in spring 2017, using survey methodology, focus group, and cognitive interviewing.
- Cronbach's alpha excellent for General Campus Climate, Institution Response to Difficult or Dangerous Situations, Views on Sexual Assault at Institution (e.g., number of sexual assaults on campus is low), and Institutional Response to Report of Sexual Assault.
- Includes separate assessment of faculty, staff, administration, and student contributions to a positive and supportive campus climate.
- Separate versions of the survey for students and faculty/staff/administration.
- Includes questions about helpfulness of campus resources and how well education from institution is remembered.
- Detailed behavioral definitions provided for unwanted sexual contact and assault and expansive definition of locations (on campus, off campus at event connected to institution, including study abroad and internships, or social activity or party near campus).
- Follow-up questions about disclosure, reasons for non-disclosure, and subjective experience (e.g., helpful, satisfied) with formal reporting at institution.
- Detailed bystander behavior questions.
- Sample informed consent form provided.
- Although there is a fee for HEDS to collect and analyze data and report results, this service is only available to HEDS consortium members. The survey items are available for use in the public domain.
- Benchmarking available for HEDS consortium institutions.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Only HEDS consortium participants may participate in benchmarking. Must be a private institution to join HEDS consortium.
- Complex skip logic embedded in survey, requiring knowledge of survey programming for online administration. Would be complicated for participants to complete in paper and pencil format because of complex skip logic.
- Follow-up questions to experiences with unwanted sexual contact or assault do not isolate on a single or specific incident.
- If more than one incident, respondent marks all responses that apply, aggregating across all victimization experiences.
- Does not measure perpetration or sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence or stalking.
- Limited assessment of institutional response to specific incidents of unwanted sexual contact or assault.

- Cost: for HEDS to administer survey, provide data set, and prepare report, fee is \$1800 for non-HEDS members and \$500 for HEDS members. HEDS membership fee is \$3000.

**Contact information:**

Website: <http://www.hedsconsortium.org/>

Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium

General phone: (765) 361-6170

Email: [skillruk@wabash.edu](mailto:skillruk@wabash.edu)

Director of Survey and Institutional Research

Adrea L. Hernandez phone: (765) 361-6343

**References:** See website above.

## Overall Implications for Policy and Practice

- Dissemination of survey results to all university constituents (students, faculty, staff, administrators) will both promote participation in future surveys and overall campus engagement in the value of climate surveys.
- Surveys will enable institutions to track change in rate and frequency of harassment, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence over time.
- Surveys will enable institutions to monitor changes in perceptions of campus safety, campus climate, institutional response, bystander behavior, and student attitudes to direct resources and prevention/education efforts in areas where change may be most needed.
- Surveys will enable institutions to evaluate compliance with Title IX federal mandates and recommendations and facilitate planning of new initiatives based on complement of resources already available on campus.
- Results may inform prevention and education on campus, identifying areas where the campus community is well informed and where it may need more guidance or information. Results may also help institutions reflect on the successes and shortcomings of education and trainings provided to students regarding sexual assault and sexual misconduct.
- Results may identify gaps or barriers in services or resources and information about the context for sexual misconduct (e.g., hotspots where misconduct or violence occurs, reasons for non-reporting, to whom victims make reports, relationship to alleged perpetrators).
- Institutions using similar methods and measures will be able to compare their survey results in a collaborative effort to better understand and ultimately reduce sexual misconduct and improve campus climate.

## Survey Specific Implications for Policy and Practice

- #iSPEAK is embedded within a comprehensive campus climate assessment process. This process includes a resource audit prior to the survey to document all campus services and tailor the survey accordingly; provides follow-up methods to gather more detailed information, such as focus groups; provides recommendations for developing an action plan.
- One size does not fit all and campus climate surveys should be tailored with questions specific to each campus, for each university or college to make the data collected meaningful at that institution. #iSPEAK includes several scales that can be modified to each unique campus environment.
- A campus climate survey can be educational. The #iSPEAK survey was done in conjunction with careful outreach planning built on collaboration across campus and offered a way to engage the entire campus community in raising awareness about the issue of sexual violence and allowing students to share their experiences.



Schools utilizing the #iSPEAK tool can take advantage of the visual identity of the survey and use of the name #iSPEAK to promote student involvement.

- Following the 2015 AAU Campus Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct, the AAU released a [Campus Activities Report](#), detailing how universities are trying to reduce sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campuses.
- Benchmarking to other HEDS consortium members provides useful information for institutions to compare their campus climate, institutional responsiveness, education impact, and prevalence of unwanted sexual contact and assault to other similar institutions. Review of benchmark data available with HEDS consortium members presents opportunity for institutional reflection to promote future enhancements.
- Data from the HEDS detailed checklist reasons for non-disclosure can be used to improve response of campus officials to disclosure as well as enhance communications about the formal reporting process to increase reporting and disclosure.
- Review of HEDS data from students can be compared to data from faculty/staff/administrators and identify gaps in constituency experiences that may inform student prevention, education, and professional development.

## Appendix A: Methodology of Survey Selection

The working group proceeded through a series of steps to identify the surveys included in the detailed review.

**Step 1:** Each member of the working group for this charge independently curated surveys based on their professional expertise and experience in the field. The working group adopted the following criteria to guide survey selection:

- Available in public domain
- Scientifically supported, based on peer review and/or data on survey reliability and validity
- Benchmarking data available
- Participation of a dozen or more universities
- Personal experience with survey at one's own institution
- General knowledge of the field

The working group also supplemented the list with surveys reported in Wood, L., C. Sulley, M. Kammer-Kerwick, D. Follingstad, and N. Busch-Armendariz. "Climate Surveys: An Inventory of Understanding Sexual Assault and Other Crimes of Interpersonal Violence at Institutions of Higher Education." *Violence Against Women* 23, no.10 (2017): 1249-1267.

The following surveys were identified:

### **Campus Climate Surveys on Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Assault**

1. HEDS Campus Sexual Assault Survey
2. Seattle University Campus Climate Project 2015
3. Bureau of Justice Statistics Campus Climate Survey
4. ARC 3
5. #iSPEAK Campus Climate Survey
6. White House Task Force Sample Survey
7. AAU Campus Climate Survey
8. University of Kentucky Campus Climate Survey
9. Johns Hopkins It's on Us
10. University of Oregon Campus Climate Survey
11. SoundRocket

### **Campus Climate Surveys on Diversity and Inclusion**

1. HEDS Diversity and Equity Climate Survey
2. University of Michigan Climate Survey
3. Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey
4. University of Chicago Climate Survey
5. HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey

**Step 2:** Members of the working group reviewed each survey for the following information (below) and reported their findings in a shared working document:

- Full survey title
- Weblink to survey
- Original citations for survey
- Core domains measured by survey (e.g., campus climate, institutional response)
- Brief description of survey content
- Target audiences: undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral students, staff, faculty, administrators
- Survey length, including number of items and duration to completion
- Year published or first available
- Strength of scientific validation, including reliability and validity data (not reported, weak, moderate, strong)
- Methods for scientific validation, including sample size, response rate, demographics (age, race, ethnicity, living on/off campus, religion, level of education)
- In public domain (yes or no)
- When to administer (time of academic year and frequency of administration)
- Sample items, response options
- Expert analysis of strengths and weaknesses

**Step 3:** Members of the working group rated each survey to identify those that would be reviewed in detail in this report.

An online survey was created for each member of the working group to rate each survey. Four members of the working group with expertise in issues of diversity and inclusion rated campus climate surveys on this topic, and three members of the working group with expertise in sexual harassment, sexual assault/violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking rated campus climate surveys on this topic.

Working group members were instructed to rate each survey on a 5-point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is very poor. Raters were advised to use information in shared working document and to consider the following qualities when making their ratings:

- Benchmarking, i.e., comparison to other institutions
- Survey length and fatigue, i.e., response rate
- In public domain, i.e., no or low cost
- User friendliness
- Includes views of students, faculty, staff, and/or administration
- Psychometric properties

**Step 4:** Data were aggregated and campus climate surveys on sexual misconduct/sexual assault with a mean value of 4.00 (good) or greater were selected for detailed review, and campus climate surveys on diversity and inclusion with a mean value of 3.67 (good-fair) or greater were selected for detailed review. If a threshold of 4.00 had been used for the diversity and inclusion surveys, only two surveys would have been selected for detailed review. To increase the number of surveys reviewed in detail and because the University of Chicago Climate Survey and the HERI each had positive attributes based on the expertise of the working group, they were retained and the threshold set at 3.67 for the diversity and inclusion surveys.

#### **Campus Climate Surveys on Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Assault**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
ARC 3	5.00	.00
#iSPEAK Campus Climate Survey	4.67	.47
AAU Campus Climate Survey	4.33	.47
HEDS Campus Sexual Assault Survey	4.00	.00
Bureau of Justice Statistics Campus Climate Survey	4.00	.82
White House Task Force Sample Survey	3.67	.47
University of Kentucky Campus Climate Survey	2.67	.47
Seattle University Campus Climate Project 2015	2.67	.47
Johns Hopkins It's on Us	2.67	.47
University of Oregon Campus Climate Survey	2.67	.47
SoundRocket	2.00	.00

#### **Campus Climate Surveys on Diversity and Inclusion**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
HEDS Diversity and Equity climate survey	4.33	.47
University of Michigan climate survey	4.00	.00
University of Chicago climate survey	3.67	.47
HERI Diverse Learning Environments Survey	3.67	.47
Campus Religious and Spiritual climate survey	3.50	.50

## Appendix B: List of Institutions and Surveys Used

### 1) Institutions and the Surveys Currently Used

Contact primary author of citation below for list of climate surveys included in their review:

Krause, K. H., R. Woofter, R. Haardörfer, M. Windle, J.M. Sales, and K.M. Yount, "Measuring Campus Sexual Assault and Culture: A Systematic Review of Campus Climate Surveys." *Psychology of Violence*. Online First Publication, October 1, 2018.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000209>

### 2) ARC3 Climate Surveys

<https://www.lifepathsresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/Bell-Dinwiddie-Hamby-PVS-replication-report-2018.pdf>

#### Institutions:

- University of Washington
- University of Illinois
- Ferris State University
- Ohio University
- Palm Beach Atlantic University
- Tulane University
- University of Iowa (2017)
- University of Oregon
- University of Iowa (2015)
- Penn State Campuses
  - University Park (main campus)
  - Wilkes-Barre
  - Schuylkill
  - Behrend
  - Berks
  - Harrisburg (undergraduate)
  - Abingdon
  - Altoona
  - York
  - Payette
  - Greater Allegheny
  - Worthington Scranton
  - Lehigh Valley
  - Mont Alto
  - Harrisburg (Graduate)
  - Beaver
  - Shenango

- Hershey
- Hazleton
- Dickinson Law
- DuBois
- Brandywine
- New Kensington
- Great Valley

### **3) #iSPEAK Campus Climate Survey**

- Rutgers University-New Brunswick
- Rutgers University-Newark
- Rutgers University-Camden
- Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) School of Public Health
- Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) New Jersey Medical School
- Princeton University (used modified version of survey)

### **4) AAU 2019 Climate Survey Participants**

- Boston University
- Brown University
- California Institute of Technology
- Carnegie Mellon University
- Case Western Reserve University
- Harvard University
- Iowa State University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Northwestern University
- Rice University
- Stanford University
- Texas A&M University
- Johns Hopkins University
- Ohio State University
- University of Arizona
- University of Chicago
- University of Kansas
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
- University of Florida
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- University of Missouri

- University of Oregon
- University of Pennsylvania
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of Rochester
- University of Southern California
- University of Virginia
- Vanderbilt University
- Washington University in St. Louis
- Yale University

Non-AAU Participating University:

- Georgetown University

## **Appendix C: Proprietary Surveys**

There are vendors with whom institutions can contract to conduct campus climate surveys. The list below represents a sampling of vendors of proprietary surveys. These proprietary surveys are provided since the working group reviewed extensive information about these surveys and they each had some important strengths, but as shown in Appendix A, they did not reach the threshold for inclusion in the detailed review.

### **Diversity and Inclusion, Sexual Misconduct, Domestic and Dating Violence, Sexual Harassment, Stalking: National Campus Climate Survey % SoundRocket**

**Brief Description:** Sexual misconduct, diversity and inclusion climate surveys  
<http://www.nationalcampusclimatesurvey.org/>

#### **Pricing Information:**

Pricing is customized to institution size and need. Contact vendor for information.

#### **Major Strengths:**

Sample recruitment and response rate.

#### **Universities Adopting this Survey/Used for Benchmarking:**

University of Michigan







# SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

## WORKING GROUP DELIVERABLE

The **Safe and Inclusive Learning Environment Working Group** will focus on developing best practices to enhance safety and support services on campus, and giving students a voice in these important campus matters. In particular, the group will be charged with:

- ➔ Promoting the practice of data analysis through campus climate surveys.
- ➔ Establishing best practices for creating campus safety and inclusive environments.
- ➔ Drafting an implementation guide for colleges on the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault.

### CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS:

Milton A. Fuentes, Psy.D. (Co-Lead)    Jean Semelfort, Jr., M.A., LPC (Co-Lead)

Marilu Marcillo, D.M.  
Pamela Pruitt, Ed.D.

Tamika Quick, M.A.  
Zaneta Rago-Craft, Ed.D.

Vance Stephens, MBA

**March 25, 2020**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	2
Unpacking Diversity, Inclusion, and Safety	2
General Recommendations	3
Key Elements to Consider for Designing Safe and Inclusive Environments	3
Assessment	4
Best Practices	5
Policies	6
Procedures	7
Incentives	7
Accountability	7
Closing Comments	8
References	9
Suggested Readings and Resources	10
Other Possible Resources	20
Appendix A: Policies	21
Anti-Harassment and Sexual Misconduct	21
Freedom of Speech and Expression	23
Bias-Related & Hate Crimes	24
Use of Technology & Social Media	25
Student Code of Social Conduct	26

## Overview

In [Where Opportunity Meets Innovation](#), New Jersey's Plan for Higher Education, the State introduces a bold vision for the New Jersey Student Bill of Rights. Part of that vision states that, "Every student in New Jersey should feel safe and supported in their learning environment. This means colleges must work to ensure students are not only safe from physical harm, but also included and welcome on campus." To help further this vision, the Safe and Inclusive Learning Environment Working Group has developed this Resource Guidebook. It is intended to be a useful resource that aids college administrators in establishing best practices for creating safe and inclusive environments for our students. This Resource Guidebook opens with definitions of key terms related to these efforts. It then enumerates general recommendations relevant to all campus stakeholders. The working group then offers a framework to initiate and organize efforts around diversity, safety, and inclusion. Finally, the document concludes with a list of suggested readings and resources organized by relevant topics to assist readers in developing their safe and inclusive campuses.

## Unpacking Diversity, Inclusion, and Safety

To guide our efforts, the working group offers working definitions for three key terms: diversity, inclusion, and safe campuses.

**Diversity** refers to the unique characteristics that distinguish individuals, visibly and invisibly, from one another, whose values are intrinsically representative of each person, and who come from a wide array of demographic and philosophical differences. The dimensions of diversity may include but are not limited to: age, socioeconomic background, educational attainment, gender expression and identity, citizenship status, linguistic proficiency, mental or physical able-bodiedness, national origin, political beliefs, race/ethnicity, religious or ethical beliefs, sexual orientation, social or family class/status, race, veteran status, and work experience (National Education Association, 2008).

**Inclusion** involves a welcoming environment in which individuals feel a strong sense of belonging in a place where they are safe from physical or verbal harm, contempt, or imminent danger in all spaces (in-person and virtual), treated fairly and respectfully, and are connected to others in positive interactions, which include debate and deliberation, wherein there can be mutual consent to agree to disagree, and where there is acceptance of the intersection between academic excellence and social justice. An inclusive campus is where all individuals are valued for their unique attributes that they possess which can contribute to being empowered in shaping and building a greater culturally-rich community in a myriad of ways, in which both the individuals and the institution achieve successful outcomes (Hussain, Jones, 2019; Pruitt, 2016).

**Safety** connotes a campus is that provides individuals the opportunity to teach, learn, and work in an environment free of discrimination, intimidation, or threat to physical and emotional well-being. It is a place in which students are able to pursue their academic potential and co-curricular engagement without being fearful of any of their surroundings, whether it be from others within or outside the campus, or from the actual infrastructure of the institution itself. A safe campus responds to such threats, and potential harmful situations, and takes decisive, corrective action to eliminate them. A safe campus is one

that is monitored for safety, one where the various dimensions of the environment are routinely evaluated, and adjustments are made as appropriate. Safety is an institutional responsibility and one that requires participation and commitment from multiple parties within the institution (Rund, 2002).

All three of these ideas are central for creating welcome and inclusive environments on our campuses.

### General Recommendations

As institutions across New Jersey move to create and/or maintain safe and inclusive environments, the working group shares the following general recommendations and encourages campuses to:

1. **Connect** your safety and inclusion efforts to your institution's mission, vision, and values, as well as build them into your strategic plan. This ensures that these efforts are central to your campus and hold all relevant stakeholders accountable.
2. **Consider** a broad understanding of diversity. Identities are complex and nuanced. It is critical to adopt a broad understanding of their associated socio-cultural factors and to consider their intersectionality.
3. **Engage** all relevant stakeholders. Efforts related to safety and inclusion should be everyone's responsibility. Resist the urge to silo these efforts in a particular office or relegate these duties to a select group's portfolio.
4. **Embrace** the dynamic nature of your safety and inclusion efforts. These efforts require ongoing attention as your campuses evolve.
5. **Provide** authority and access to the key personnel responsible for addressing inclusion, safety, and diversity (e.g., Chief Diversity Officer). Best practices indicate that relevant personnel should have the authority to engage in system-wide endeavors and the access to senior administration to collaborate with in fostering safety and inclusiveness.
6. **Promote** self-study efforts. Campuses are encouraged to evaluate their efforts around safety and inclusion regularly. Clear goals and objectives should be established and related mechanisms for evaluating efforts should be put in place. Additionally, campuses are encouraged to look at current data sets to identify and address any concerning trends.

### Key Elements to Consider for Designing Safe and Inclusive Environments

Based on the working group's collective wisdom from working in higher education in different areas across various campus, including academic affairs, administration, financial aid, student affairs, and other critical entities, this working group identified key elements for institutions of higher education to develop, implement, and foster initiatives related to diversity, inclusion, and safety. These elements are not necessarily sequential and are depicted in Figure 1.



*Figure 1. Key Elements to Consider for Designing Safe and Inclusive Learning Environments.*

## Assessment

To develop a plan for addressing inclusion and safety, it is important to conduct a scan of what currently exists on your campus to identify strengths and gaps. There are various tools to help assess your institution's endeavors. For example, environmental scans allow colleges and universities to engage in self-assessment, based on several key dimensions related to diversity. A sample tool is the Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Higher Education, developed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE).<sup>1</sup>

Campus climate surveys are another way to assess current strengths and gaps related to safety, diversity and inclusion (see: "[Campus Climate Surveys: Implementation Guide and Survey Review](#)"). In addition to conducting environmental scans and campus climate surveys to determine your institution's next steps, assessment processes should be ongoing in order to identify the effectiveness of implemented initiatives and compare the experiences of students over time.

<sup>1</sup> [NERCHE Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Higher Education](#)

## Best Practices

The results of assessments conducted at your institution should be compared to existing best practices related to diversity, inclusion, and safety. From this comparison, recommendations should be generated with specific suggestions or proposals for addressing any gaps. A resource to help you in this process is the U.S. Department of Education's comprehensive report on promising practices that promote the advancement of diversity and inclusion in higher education (see: [Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education](#)).

*Examples of some best practices include the following:*

- **Offer mandatory and ongoing university-wide cultural competency training** for all levels of your campus community, including the board of trustees, the president's cabinet, faculty, staff, students, and alumni, so that everyone becomes aware of and understands what is necessary for an inclusive institution.
- **Ensure physical safety for all students.** This includes providing dormitories that are securely locked, with surveillance cameras in places where there is no need for privacy.
- **Provide safe and affirming spaces** for students, employees, and visitors, such as accessible gender neutral restrooms.
- **Organize tiered mentoring programs** for students, connecting them to their peers, faculty, staff, and/or alumni. This can promote a sense of community, connectivity, and personal growth, which furthers the sense of inclusion and diversity on campus.
- **Promote educational/professional development** opportunities for faculty and staff to learn strategies that help them establish safe and inclusive learning environments for all students. This will create and nurture a welcoming and inclusive culture on campus.
- **Provide mental health and disability services,** accommodations, and awareness training to meet all needs of any students requiring this assistance.
- **Provide easily-accessible mechanisms to report instances of bias.** Some institutions implemented online forms for students and staff to access remotely, for example, Montclair State University adopted "Simplicity," an online portal for reporting potential misconduct involving University employees, including harassment, discrimination, and other types of inappropriate behavior. Guidance for this resource can be found at: [Conduct Simplicity: How to Create a Public Incident Report](#)
- **Create effective programs to recruit and retain minority faculty and staff:** This must become a priority at New Jersey Higher Education Institutions, so our students see themselves reflected in their faculty and staff, thereby promoting diversity (see the guide on "Attracting and Supporting Diverse Faculty and Staff" produced by the Research, Innovation, and Talent Working group for more information).
- **Include work on diversity as criteria for tenure and promotion,** which may help faculty take these efforts seriously as they learn that the institution will consider this work formally in tenure and promotion decisions.
- **Providing departmental support** can be vital to tenure and promotion, but it is also crucial to avoid burnout from hurdling numerous barriers to deep and meaningful change. Are there other change agents among your colleagues? Are change agents

receiving tenure and being promoted? Are your departmental colleagues and the department chair talking seriously about diversity, equity, and inclusion?

- **Providing high level institutional support** through actions will speak louder than words. Look not only to what key administrators are saying regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion. Who on campus is working on diversity, equity, and inclusion, and how much power do they have? Are they spoken about with respect? How many resources are being allocated? How do administrators treat others on your campus?

## Policies

A scan of institutional efforts to address diversity, safety, and inclusion should include a review of your institution's policies. Policies involve articulating the standards and rules of behavioral expectations and are critical for setting the tone on campus. There are various types of policies, including those that are legally required and those that are aspirational and can help build safe and inclusive policies. Below are some key policy areas in which your institution should be robust in order to create safe and inclusive learning environments, with links to further explanations in Appendix 1:

- [Anti-Harassment and Sexual Misconduct](#)
- [Freedoms of Speech and Expression](#)
- [Bias-related & Hate Crimes](#)
- [Use of Technology & Social Media](#)
- [Student Code of Social Conduct](#)

### **Institutional policy statements on diversity and inclusion.**

In addition to having a range of policies related to these issues, your campus can demonstrate its commitment to diversity, inclusion, and safety by issuing institutional statements about its expectations for the campus community. This can be proactive, and not in response to any particular incident, to set the tone for the campus climate. For example, Montclair State University issued a statement to its community on campus climate for civility and human dignity. It was physically posted throughout campus and sent through email, explaining that the institution understands "its responsibility to foster an atmosphere of respect, understanding and good will among individuals and groups, with special sensitivity to those most likely to be subjected to disrespect, abuse and misunderstanding because of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity or expression, national origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation" ("Human Relations Statement on Campus Climate for Civility and Human Dignity," n.d.).

Institutional statements may also be important to issue in reaction to a bias incident or a hate crime on campus to re-affirming the institution's values around diversity and inclusion. The President or a high-level university official should directly issue this statement denouncing the act. For example, San Jose's president, Dr. Mary Pappazain, sent out a university-wide communication to the community in response to hate incidents, asserting:

"Even as we engage in dialogue and review our relevant policies and practices, San Jose State University also will denounce the actions of white supremacist and white



nationalist hate groups. Our community will not tolerate bigotry, hatred, discrimination and other forms of social violence against individuals or groups based on their race, ethnicity, immigrant status, religion or other identities. We are committed to providing a campus community that is safe, equitable and responsive. Our inclusive educational environment will always challenge bigotry and ignorance” (Janes, 2019).

## **Procedures**

The spirit of the policy should be present in the procedures developed. These procedures should also be transparent. Procedures are the process by which recommendations and suggestions are implemented and carried out. In our collection of information, we have found some institutions of higher education who model that synergy. As an example, Princeton University’s procedures on addressing sexual misconduct as one of the many examples. Princeton University’s Title IX office created a specific website detailing their policies and the ways in which they implement these policies (see: [Policy on Discrimination and/or Harassment](#)).

## **Incentives**

There are significant incentives- or motivating factors- for fostering safety, diversity, and inclusion at institutions. According to the American Council on Education, “Diversity enriches the educational experience; it promotes personal growth and a healthy society; it strengthens communities and the workplace; and it enhances America’s economic competitiveness” (ACE Board of Directors, 2012). There are also existing federal and state funding opportunities that support enhancing diversity on campus. These programs can help improve students’ overall academic success, which lends to a more successful academic institution overall.

## **Accountability**

To create a safe, diverse, and inclusive environment, it is important to develop a system of accountability ensuring that colleges and universities (a) are responsive to the concerns of students, faculty, and staff, and (b) are prepared to take actionable steps to address problematic behaviors that may violate implemented policies. Such a system reinforces the importance of those policies in maintaining a learning environment, in which those with varying identities can thrive.

Alternatively, adopting restorative practices (such as peacemaking and/or healing circles) may also provide another opportunity to foster accountability. Trained staff can promote the use of indigenous practices to create a space and opportunity to address violations of the policies and repair the harm. Restorative practices strengthen relationships between individuals and foster a greater sense of safety and community accountability. These practices enhance communication and provide community members the opportunity to work through conflict and learn from each other. For more information on restorative justice options, see the [University of San Diego: Center for Restorative Justice](#) or the [International Institute: Defining Restorative](#).

Student-faculty coalition groups or town halls may offer another means of institutional accountability. Meetings or town halls can be used as forums for student and faculty representatives to engage with administrators regarding relevant issues regarding diversity, safety, and inclusion, such as systemic accountability. Administrators would have the opportunity to acknowledge the concerns of the group and collaborate with each other to develop concrete steps that address and repair the systemic shortcoming or “harm” that occurred. Whenever possible, institutions of higher education should share any data they collect on safety, diversity, and inclusion, as well as any kind of strategic plans to address gaps found. For more information on developing action plans related to campus safety and sexual violence, see:

[https://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/workinggroups/safe\\_and\\_inclusive\\_learning\\_environments/deliverable1](https://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/workinggroups/safe_and_inclusive_learning_environments/deliverable1).

Fostering a space for accountability that challenges and reimagines the distribution of power between students, faculty, and administrators may increase the institutional ability to maintain an environment that promotes safety, diversity, and inclusion. One way to do this is to draw upon transformative and feminist leadership styles, which can foster an environment in which students and faculty feel included in shaping the institution’s culture and environment. (see: [Transformative and Feminist Leadership for Women’s Rights](#)).

Lastly, it is also important to invite the greater campus community to participate in its safety, diversity, and inclusion efforts. By framing these issues as areas where everyone has an individual responsibility and a role to play in creating welcoming climates, community members can hold one another and the institution accountable to its commitment.

### **Closing Comments**

Our hope is that this guidebook serves as a helpful resource, which institutions can use to implement policies and practices that embrace diversity and promote safe and inclusive environments for all identities. The framework provided here illustrates several important factors to consider for implementation of these policies in procedures and practices that help cultivate and nurture safe and inclusive learning environments. We want to acknowledge that this guidebook is a living document. We are not endorsing any one example, instead providing a myriad of options for institutions to access. We recognize that the ways in which we understand student success will evolve, so we want this document to continue growing alongside them. It is not enough to recruit students with varying identities; it is essential that we create safe and inclusive spaces where students can learn, grow, and thrive.

## References

- ACE Board of Directors. (2012). On the Importance of Diversity in Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/BoardDiversityStatement-June2012.pdf>.
- Diversity Toolkit. National Education Association, 2008. <http://www.nea.org/tools/diversity-toolkit.html>.
- Guckenheimer, D. "How to Evaluate Your Campus Climate: A Tool for Faculty Change Agents to Survive and Prosper." Medium. Last modified September 11, 2018. <https://medium.com/national-center-for-institutional-diversity/how-to-evaluate-your-campus-climate-a-tool-for-faculty-change-agents-to-survive-and-prosper-aec4f60368f>.
- Human Relations Statement on Campus Climate for Civility and Human Dignity. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.montclair.edu/policies/all-policies/human-relations-statement-on-campus-climate-for-civility-and-human-dignity/>
- Hussain, M., & Jones, J.M. (2019). Discrimination, diversity, and sense of belonging: Experiences of students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000117>.
- Janes, M. (2019). Recent hate incidents on campus and elsewhere. Message posted to <https://blogs.sjsu.edu/president/2019/08/20/recent-hate-incidents-on-campus-and-elsewhere/>
- Pruitt, P. *How First-Year College Leadership Programs Influence Students' Behavior and Attitudes in Order to Promote Civic Engagement Through Democratic Dialogue and Democratic Deliberation*. University of Pennsylvania, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2016. 10158520.
- Rund, J. A. "The changing context of campus safety." *New Directions for Student Services* 99, (2002):7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.56>.

## Suggested Readings and Resources

### General

- Bohnet, I. (2016). *What Works: Gender Equality by Design*. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- DiAngelo, R. J. (2016). *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2006). *Managing Diversity: toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Morse, A. Q. (2018). NASPA Policy and Practice Series: The First Amendment and the Inclusive Campus - Effective Strategies for Leaders in Student Affairs. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)*, 8. Retrieved from [https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/NASPA\\_Policy\\_and\\_Practice\\_Issue\\_3\\_Free\\_Speech\\_DOWNLOAD.pdf](https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/NASPA_Policy_and_Practice_Issue_3_Free_Speech_DOWNLOAD.pdf).
- Palfrey, J. G., & Ibarra, A. (2017). *Safe Spaces, Brave Spaces Diversity and Free Expression in Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: The MIT Press.
- Patton, L. D. (2010). *Culture Centers in Higher Education: Perspectives on Identity, Theory, and Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L. & Mueller, J. A. (2014). *Creating Multicultural Change on Campus*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L. & Mueller, J. A. (2019). *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs; Advancing Social Justice and Inclusion (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender and Sexual Orientation*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tatum, B. D. (2017). *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?" and Other Conversations about Race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic Diversity Leadership*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Pub.
- Williams, D., & Wade-Golden, K. C. (2013). *The Chief Diversity Officer: Strategy, Structure, and Change Management*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

## Implicit Bias and Microaggressions

- Acevedo-Polakovich, I. D., Beck, K. L., Hawks, E., & Ogdie, S. E. (2016). Toward a relevant psychology of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination: Linking science and practice to develop interventions that work in community settings. In A. N. Alvarez, C. H. Liang, H. A. Neville, A. N.
- Alvarez, C. H. Liang, H. A. Neville (Eds.), *The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination* (pp. 317-337). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14852-015
- Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 6(3), 242-261.
- Blair, I. V., Dasgupta, N., & Glaser, J. (2015). Implicit attitudes. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, E. Borgida, J. A. Bargh, M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, ... J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology, Volume 1: Attitudes and social cognition* (pp. 665-691). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14341-021
- Brown, K. (2015). Amherst Task Force Takes On 'Implicit Bias' In Schools. Retrieved from <http://nepr.net/news/2015/04/14/am-herst-task-force-takes-on-implicit-bias-in-schools/>
- Bryant-Davis, T., & Ocampo, C. (2006). A therapeutic approach to the treatment of racist-incident-based trauma. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 6(4), 1-22.
- Buhin, L., & Vera, E. (2009). Preventing racism and promoting social justice: person-centered and environment-centered interventions. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 30(1), 43-59. doi:10.1007/s10935-008-0161-9
- Butts, H. F. (2002). The black mask of humanity: Racial/ethnic discrimination and post-traumatic stress disorder. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 30, 336-339.
- Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Isaac, C., Manwell, L. B., Ford, C. E., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., & Sheridan, J. (2012). Promoting institutional change through bias literacy. *Journal of diversity in higher education*, 5(2), 63.
- Carter, R. T. (2007). Racism and psychological and emotional injury: Recognizing and assessing race-based traumatic stress. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35 13-105.
- Chatterjee, D. (2016). Approaching "Baltimore Is Burning" from a systems change perspective: Role of I-O psychologists as change agents. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*. 9, 3. p. 565-572.
- Chavous, T. M., Rivas-Drake, D., Smalls, C., Griffin, T., & Cogburn, C. (2008). Gender matters, too: the influences of school racial discrimination and racial identity on academic

- engagement outcomes among African American adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 44(3), 637.
- Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist*, 54, 805-816.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (2016). Racial trauma recovery: A race-informed therapeutic approach to racial wounds. In Alvarez, A.N. (Ed); Liang, C. T. H. (Ed); Neville, H. A. (Ed), *The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination*. Cultural, racial, and ethnic psychology book series (pp. 249-272). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Dasgupta, N. (2004). Implicit ingroup favoritism, outgroup favoritism, and their behavioral manifestations. *Social Justice Research*, 17 (2), 143-169.
- Dasgupta, N. (2013). Implicit Attitudes and Beliefs Adapt to Situations: A Decade of Research on the Malleability of Implicit Prejudice, Stereotypes, and the Self-Concept. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 233-279.
- Dasgupta, N., & Asgari, S. (2004). Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on the malleability of automatic gender stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(5), 642-658.
- Dasgupta, N., & Greenwald, A. G. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes: combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 800-814.
- Department of Education (2014). Expansive survey of America's public schools reveals troubling racial disparities. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/expansive-survey-americas-public-schools-reveals-troubling-racial-disparities>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8, 88-102.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Reducing contemporary prejudice: Combating explicit and implicit bias at the individual and intergroup level. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. 'The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology'* (pp. 137-163). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 62-68. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.62
- Dovidio, J., Kawakami, K., & Beach, K. (2001). Implicit and explicit attitudes: Examination of the relationship between measures of intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner

- (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Vol. 4. Intergroup relations* (pp. 175–197). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 510-540.
- Drakulich, K. M. (2015). Explicit and hidden racial bias in the framing of social problems. *Social Problems*, 63, 391-418. doi: 10.1093/socpro/spu003.
- Facebook. (2015). *Managing Unconscious Bias*. Retrieved from <https://managingbias.fb.com/>
- Fischer, A. R., & Shaw, C. M. (1999). African Americans' mental health and perceptions of racist discrimination: The moderating effects of racial socialization experiences and self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling psychology*, 46(3), 395.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and addressing contemporary racism: From aversive racism to the common ingroup identity model. *Journal of Social issues*, 61(3), 615-639.
- Gendler, T. S. (2011). On the epistemic costs of implicit bias. *Philosophy Study*, 156, p. 33-63. doi: 10.1007/s11098-011-9801-7.
- Girod, S., Fassiotto, M., Grewal, D., Ku, M. C., Sriram, N., Nosek, B. A., & Valantine, H. (2016). Reducing implicit gender leadership bias in academic medicine with an educational intervention. *Academic Medicine*, 91(8), 1143-1150.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, (1), 4.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E. & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464–1480.
- Hardy, K. V. (2013). Healing the hidden wounds of racial trauma. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 22(1), 24-28.
- Harrell, J. P., Hall, S., & Taliaferro, J. (2003). Physiological responses to racism and discrimination: An assessment of the evidence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 243-248.
- Hayes, S., Bissett, R., Roget, N., Padilla, M., Kohlenberg, B. S., Fisher, G., et al. (2004). The impact of acceptance and commitment training and multicultural training on the stigmatizing attitudes and professional burnout of substance abuse counselors. *Behavior Therapy*, 35(4), 821-835.

- Helms, J. E., Nicolas, G., & Green, C. E. (2010). Racism and ethnoviolence as trauma: Enhancing professional training. *Traumatology*, 16, 53–62.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534765610389595>
- Holroyd, J. (2012). Responsibility for implicit bias. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 43(3), 274–306.
- Hudson, D. L., Eaton, J., Lewis, P., Grant, P., Sewell, W., & Gilbert, K. (2016). “Racism?!?...Just Look at Our Neighborhoods”. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 24(2), 130–150.
- Huynh, V. W. (2012). Ethnic microaggressions and the depressive and somatic symptoms of Latino and Asian American adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(7), 831–846.
- Ingriselli, E. (2015). Mitigating Jurors’ Racial Biases: The effects of content and timing of jury instructions. *The Yale Law Journal*, 124, 1690–1745.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 881–919.
- Kang, Y., Gray, J. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2014). The nondiscriminating heart: Lovingkindness meditation training decreases implicit intergroup bias. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(3), 1306.
- Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism: A psychohistory*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Lai, C. K., Skinner, A. L., Cooley, E., Murrar, S., Brauer, M., Devos, T., & ... Nosek, B. A. (2016). Reducing implicit racial preferences: II. Intervention effectiveness across time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(8), 1001–1016.  
doi:10.1037/xge0000179.
- Landy, F. (2008). Stereotypes, biases, and personnel decision: Strange and stranger. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(4), 379–392.
- Lau, M. Y., & Williams, C. D. (2010). Microaggressions research: Methodological review and recommendations. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics and Impact* (pp. 313–336). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lee, D. L., & Ahn, S. (2011). Racial discrimination and Asian mental health: A meta-analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39, 463–489.
- Lee, D. L. & Ahn, S. (2012). Discrimination against Latina/os: A meta-analysis of individual level resources and outcomes. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 40, 28–65.
- Levine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1267–1278. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003



- Levinson, J. D., Smith, R. J., & Young, D. M. (2014). Devaluing Death: An empirical study of implicit racial bias on jury-eligible citizens in six death penalty states. *New York University Law Review*, 89, 513–581.
- Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). Microaggression: Strong claims, inadequate evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12, 138-169.
- Lillis, J. & Hayes, S. (2007). Applying acceptance, mindfulness, and values to the reduction of prejudice: A pilot study. *Behavioral Modification*. 31, 4. p. 389-411.
- Lueke, A., & Gibson, B. (2015). Mindfulness meditation reduces implicit age and race bias: The role of reduced automaticity of responding. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(3), 284-291.
- Lueke, A., & Gibson, B. (2016). Brief mindfulness meditation reduces discrimination. *Psychology of Consciousness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 3(1), 34.
- Mann, T. C., & Ferguson, M. J. (2015). Can we undo our first impressions? The role of reinterpretation in reversing implicit evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(6), 823-849. doi:10.1037/pspa0000021.
- Mays, V. M., Johnson, D., Coles, C. N., Gellene, D., & Cochran, S. D. (2013). Using the Science of Psychology to Target Perpetrators of Racism and Race-Based Discrimination For Intervention Efforts: Preventing Another Trayvon Martin Tragedy. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*, 5(1), 11–36.
- Miller, G. H. (2009, March). Commentary: The trauma of insidious racism. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 37, 41–44.
- Mock, G. (2013). Report Finds Gains and Remaining Challenges in Faculty Diversity. *Duke Today*. [https:// today.duke.edu/2013/04/facdiversity2013](https://today.duke.edu/2013/04/facdiversity2013)
- Neville, H. A., Awad, G. H., Brooks, J. E., Flores, M. P., & Bluemel, J. (2013). Color-blind racial ideology: theory, training, and measurement implications in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 68(6), 455.
- Neville, H. A., Coleman, M. N., Falconer, J. W., & Holmes, D. (2005). Color-blind racial ideology and psychological false consciousness among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 31(1), 27-45.
- Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site [Special issue]. *Group Dyn.* 6: 101–115.
- Noh, S., & Kaspar, V. (2003). Perceived discrimination and depression: Moderating effects of coping, acculturation, and ethnic support. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 232-238.

- Okazaki, S. (2009). Impact of racism on ethnic minority mental health. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 103-107.
- Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., Gupta, A., Kelaher, M., & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 10, 1-48.
- Pieterse, A. L., Todd, N. R., Neville, H. A., & Carter, R. T. (2012). Perceived racism and mental health among Black American adults: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59, 1-9.
- Pieterse, A. L., Carter, R. T., Evans, S. A., & Walter, R. A. (2010). An exploratory examination of the associations among racial and ethnic discrimination, racial climate, and trauma-related symptoms in a college student population. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(3), 255-263. doi:10.1037/a0020040
- Plant, E. A., Devine, P. G., Cox, W. T., Columb, C., Miller, S. L., Goplen, J., & Peruche, B. M. (2009). The Obama effect: Decreasing implicit prejudice and stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 961-964. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.018
- Polanco-Roman, L., Danies, A., & Anglin, D. M. (2016). Racial discrimination as race-based trauma, coping strategies, and dissociative symptoms among emerging adults. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice and Policy*, 8(5), 609-617. doi:10.1037/tra0000125.
- Project Implicit. (2011). *About the IAT*. Retrieved from <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/iatdetails.html>
- Redfield, S. (2012). The courage to pay heed: Knowing and responding to Implicit Bias. *Woman Advocate*, 17(4), 2-6.
- Romano, J. L., & Hage, S. M. (2000). Prevention and counseling psychology: Revitalizing commitments for the 21st century. *Counseling Psychologist*, 28(6), 733-763. doi:10.1177/0011000000286001.
- Rudman, L. A. (2004). Social justice in our minds, homes and society: The nature, causes, and consequences of implicit bias. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 29-142. doi: 0885-7466/04/0600-0129/0.
- Rudman, L. A., Ashmore, R. D., & Gary, M. L. (2001). 'Unlearning' automatic biases: The malleability of implicit prejudice and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 856-868. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.856
- Sabin, J. (2015). Letter to the Editor - The Yale Student and the Policeman. *The New York Times*. [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/27/opinion/the-yale-student-and-the-policeman.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/27/opinion/the-yale-student-and-the-policeman.html?_r=0)
- Sanchez-Hucles, J. V. (1999). Racism. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1, 69-87.

- Spanierman, L. B., & Heppner, M. J. (2004). Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites Scale (PCRW): Construction and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(2), 249.
- Staats, C., Capatosto, K., Wright, R. & Jackson, V. (2016). *State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review*. Retrieved from <http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/implicit-bias-2016.pdf>
- Stell, A., & Farsides, T. (2016). Brief loving-kindness meditation reduces racial bias, mediated by positive other-regarding emotions. *Motivation & Emotion*, 40(1), 140-147. doi:10.1007/s11031-015-9514-x
- Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 15(2), 183-190. doi: 10.1037/a0014191
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62, 271-286.
- Steele, C. M. (2011). *Whistling Vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Burrow, A. L. (2010). Racial microaggressions and psychological functioning among highly achieving African-Americans: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(10), 1074-1099.
- Torres, L., & Taknint, J. T. (2015). Ethnic microaggressions, traumatic stress symptoms, and Latino depression: A moderated mediational model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 62(3), 393.
- Truong, K., & Museus, S. (2012). Responding to racism and racial trauma in doctoral study: An inventory for coping and mediating relationships. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(2), 226-254.
- Wang, J., Leu, J., & Shoda, Y. (2011). When the seemingly innocuous “stings” Racial microaggressions and their emotional consequences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(12), 1666-1678.

## Race/Ethnicity

AAC& U - Equity Scorecard <https://www.aacu.org/node/12607>

“The Equity Scorecard™ is both a process and a data tool developed by researchers at the Center for Urban Education (CUE), which is housed at the University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education. As a process, the Equity Scorecard™ combines a theoretical framework with practical strategies to initiate institutional change that will

improve outcomes for all students as well as close gaps experienced by students from underrepresented racial-ethnic groups.”

## **Sexual Orientation**

Campus Pride <https://www.campuspride.org/>

“Campus Pride represents the leading national nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization for student leaders and campus groups working to create a safer college environment for LGBTQ students. The organization is a volunteer-driven network “for” and “by” student leaders. The primary objective of Campus Pride is to develop necessary resources, programs and services to support LGBTQ and ally students on college campuses across the United States.”

## **Disability**

Best Colleges - College Guide for Students with Physical Disabilities

<https://www.bestcolleges.com/resources/college-planning-with-physical-disabilities/>

“For students with physical disabilities, finding a suitable postsecondary institution can be difficult. Thanks to legislative efforts over the last 50 years, institutions of higher learning have considerably expanded campus resources for those with special needs. This resource guide includes information on accommodating students with disabilities, transitioning from high school to college, assistive technology, and other resources.”

National Educational Association of Disabled Students -

[https://www.neads.ca/en/norc/campusnet/leadership\\_starting.php](https://www.neads.ca/en/norc/campusnet/leadership_starting.php)

“The National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS), supports full access to education and employment for post-secondary students and graduates with disabilities across Canada. This link is to a guidebook for students with disabilities to ‘Start an Organization of Students with Disabilities on your Campus’ and to organize at the grassroots level, using existing resource materials from the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS).”

## **Religion**

Interfaith Youth Core - <https://www.ifyc.org/>

“IFYC works in higher education, partnering with U.S. colleges and universities to make interfaith cooperation a vital part of the college experience, and ultimately a positive force in our society. Our various programs and initiatives equip campus leaders and help energize their efforts. IFYC offers free tools and other knowledge resources to students and educators, we offer grants and other funding, we organize spaces (real and virtual) to get training and share ideas, we advance research to help U.S. higher education find solutions and establish best practices, and we work directly with institutions who need a partner in engaging complex issues of religious and worldview diversity.”

AAC&U Leadership Practices for Interfaith Excellence in Higher Education - <https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2015/winter-spring/patel>

“This is an article about leadership practices that colleges and universities can embrace and apply, as part of a liberal education, that promote interfaith excellence. It describes what excellence looks like when it comes to the engagement of religious diversity on a college or university campus.”

### **National & Geographic Origin/International Students**

Diversity Abroad - <https://www.diversitynetwork.org/>

“Diversity Abroad’s mission is to create equitable access to the benefits of global education by empowering educators, engaging stakeholders, and connecting diverse students to resources and opportunity.”

Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Comprehensive Internationalization in Higher Education - [https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.diversitynetwork.org/resource/resmgr/Advancing Diversity, Equity..pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.diversitynetwork.org/resource/resmgr/Advancing_Diversity_Equity..pdf)

“Diversity Abroad’s Strategic Leadership Forum convenes an intimate cohort of Chief Diversity Officers and Senior International Officers to examine best practices for strategic collaboration as higher education institutions tackle the challenges and opportunities of both campus internationalization and diversity, equity, and inclusion goals.”

### **First Generation**

Center for First-Generation Student Success - <https://firstgen.naspa.org/blog/beyond-barriers-best-practices-for-first-generation-students-provides-best-practices-for-working-with-first-generation-students-on-college-campuses>

“Advising, academic support, financial guidance, programs, initiatives, resources, tools, and support for first-generation students.”

### **Veteran/Military**

American Council on Education - Toolkit for Veteran Friendly Institutions - <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Toolkit-for-Veteran-Friendly-Institutions.aspx>

“Online resource designed to help higher education institutions build effective programs for military-connected students, including a variety of best practices and models.”

## Other Possible Resources

### Assessments

- [Campus Pride Index](#)
- [National Inclusive Excellence Toolkit](#)

### Professional Development

- [National Conference on Race & Ethnicity \(NCORE\)](#)
- [NASPA Multicultural Institute](#)
- [Paperclip Communications](#)

### Associations

- [National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education \(NADOHE\)](#)

### Multicultural Centers

- [Association of Black Cultural Centers \(ABCC\)](#)
- [CAS Standards](#)

### Awards

- [INSIGHT into Diversity Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award \(HEED\)](#)

### Trans-Affirming

- [Best Practices for Asking Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation on College Applications](#)
- [Best Practices for Supporting Trans Students in Higher Education](#)
- [Best Practices for Supporting Transgender and Queer Students of Color](#)
- [Colleges and Universities with Nondiscrimination Policies that Include Gender Identity/Expression](#)
- [Colleges and Universities that Cover Transition-Related Medical Expenses Under Student Health Insurance](#)
- [Colleges and Universities that Cover Transition-Related Medical Expenses Under Employee Health Insurance](#)
- [Colleges and Universities that Provide Gender-Inclusive Housing](#)
- [Colleges and Universities that Allow Students to Change the Name and Gender on Campus Records and to Have Their Pronouns on Course Rosters](#)
- [Colleges and Universities with a Trans-Inclusive Intramural Athletic Policy](#)
- [Colleges and Universities with LGBTQ Identity Questions as an Option on Admission Applications & Enrollment Forms](#)
- [Colleges and Universities with LGBTQ Identity Questions as an Option on Admission Applications & Enrollment Forms](#)
- [Women's Colleges with Trans-Inclusive Admissions Policies](#)

## Appendix A: Policies

This appendix provides a list of sample policies established by colleges across the country in the following areas: Anti-Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, Freedoms of Speech and Expression, Bias-related & Hate Crimes, Use of Technology and Social Media, and Student Code of Social Conduct.

To ensure variety of colleges were represented, we included a range from 4-year research universities to community colleges, including both public and private institutions. This is not a comprehensive listing of policies, nor is it an endorsement of the policies. Some of the policies were selected because they depicted verbiage that promoted safety and inclusion, which other institutions may want to consider when crafting their policies.

### Anti-Harassment and Sexual Misconduct

*Brief description:* These first two examples of university policies specifically address harassment and discrimination. They use specific language for visually identifying these issues to help individuals on campus recognize violations of this policy. They also delineate instructions and responsibilities for all parties likely to be involved and provide details on how to contact the campus offices and staff best equipped to address any reports of these incidents. The policies are also easy to locate and review because they have their own page on each respective website.

*Sample Policy Language from [Ramapo College of New Jersey: Policy Prohibiting Discrimination](#):*

- a comprehensive list of specific “protected categories,” such as race, religion, and gender identity, which can be the target of harassment and discrimination
- Title IX language delineating the protected members under federal law.
- Specifying the physical locations to which the policy applies: “conduct that occurs at the College” AND “conduct that occurs at any location which can be reasonably regarded as an extension of the College.”
- Separate processes for filing a discrimination complaint specific to reports by either student or by a faculty/staff/administrator/”applicants for employment”
- Direct hyperlinks to any relevant forms for easy access
- Names and contact info of various faculty/staff/administrators or offices responsible for intake of complaints or any other duties
- Guiding definitions and examples of “behaviors that may constitute a violation of this policy”
- Responsibilities of every party included (students, staff, the College) prior to and after the reporting of an incident
- Information specifically regarding the processes of confidentiality and training
- Explicit language discussing the expected disciplinary action for violation of this policy

*Sample Policy Language from [Union County College: Non-discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy](#):*

- A table of contents for easily glancing through the policy’s headings

- A few “safe options” for students who have been victims of sexual misconduct, including ways to obtain a restraining order or shelters for victims of domestic violence
- Guidelines on how to proceed as a student or employee when “sex or gender based violence was reported to you”
- A requirement for education and training for all employees and students, including specific areas that must be addressed, such as “discrimination awareness and prevention” and “equal employment opportunity issues for supervisors”

*Brief description:* This third example of a university policy specifically addresses sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, as well as other related prohibited behaviors (ex. stalking, retaliation, flashing, or public sex acts). The institution here placed all “University-wide Regulations” on one page with hyperlinks at the top for each policy on the page to make them easily accessible.

*Sample Policy Language from [Princeton University: Regulation 1.3 - Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct](#):*

- Language explaining the responsibility of the university to respond to any suggestive or observed sexual misconduct:
  - “Lack of a formal complaint does not diminish the University’s obligation to respond to information suggestive of sex discrimination or sexual misconduct.”
- Language regrading confidentiality and “interim measures” which the university will help the victim with, including “rescheduling of exams” or “change in work schedule or job assignment”
- Explicitly listing the people to which this policy applies:
  - “University students, regardless of enrollment status;”
  - “faculty; staff;”
  - “Third parties (i.e., non-members of the University community, such as vendors, alumni/ae, visitors, or local residents).”
- Definitions and explicit examples of sex discrimination/sexual misconduct (this kind of explicit language can be especially helpful to enforcers of this policy):
  - “Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration (commonly referred to as rape). Any act of vaginal or anal penetration by a person's penis, finger, other body part, or an object, or oral penetration by a penis, without consent.”
- Serious and specific range of disciplinary actions against proven acts of sexual misconduct, varying from a dean’s warning to expulsion
- Language to clarify common misunderstandings regarding actions committed to violate this policy:
  - Example: “The consumption of alcohol or the use of illegal substances does not constitute a mitigating circumstance when it contributes to a violation regarding sexual misconduct.”
  - Example: “Domestic Violence in the Context of Intimate Relationships.”
- A large section defining consent with specific examples including:
  - “Consent is not implicit in a person's manner of dress.”
  - “Accepting a meal, a gift, or an invitation for a date does not imply or constitute consent”



- A comprehensive list of specific with University resources for students, such as “the University's Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources, and Education (SHARE) office” and their contact info
- A list of available resources in the community not affiliated with the University, such as “Mercer County Sexual Assault Response Team” or “Womanspace, Inc.”
- Sections detailing penalty and appeal procedures for different groups of respondents: students, faculty/staff, third-parties

## Freedom of Speech and Expression

*Brief description:* These two policies aim to provide guidance on the Freedoms of Speech and Expression, which follow tenets of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. They explain the protections guaranteed to dissenters and to each organization, staff, and student on campus, as well as the responsibilities they have when bringing in these guest speakers. The policies also explain the restrictions each institution has placed on these freedoms.

*Sample Policy Language from [Kean University: Free Speech and Dissent Policy](#):*

- An explicit guarantee from the University to give its members “free speech and dissent”
- Highlighting “the obligation” for those dissenting “not to interfere with any member’s freedom to hear and to study unpopular and controversial views on intellectual and public issues”
- Explicitly stating the University’s commitment of “supporting the right of a group or individual to sponsor speakers or events with unpopular or controversial points of view while enabling those who oppose these points of view the opportunity to express disagreement or dissent in ways that do not restrict the ability of individuals to hear the ideas being presented”
- Language addressing restrictions on open meetings/events (where attendance is voluntary), as well as the classroom and academic freedom, in reference to the invitation of external speakers
- A list of examples “meant to suggest the limits of acceptable dissent” but not “comprehensive”
- Hyperlinks to guidelines and a form to request an area for demonstration and distribution of accompanying literature on campus

*Sample Policy Language from [Bergen Community College Board of Trustees: Student Guest speaker Policy](#)*

- Referencing guest speakers invited by organizations on campus: “No attempt is made to regulate the selection of speakers.”
- The requirement that any organizations sponsoring events with outside speakers include the College’s pre-written statement (written in this policy) in any advertising as a disclaimer that the College did not necessarily provide “approval or endorsement of the views expressed by the guest speaker, or by anyone else present at the event”

Sample Policy Language from [St. Louis University: Policy on Speech, Expression and Civil Discourse](#)

- The responsibilities of “a member of the University community or organization” when they present “a speech or performance outside the classroom or not as a part of the curriculum for an academic course”

*Brief description:* This policy mainly focuses on academic freedom as it relates to freedom of speech and expression. It discusses the institution’s boundaries, as well as the general responsibilities of its members.

Sample Policy Language from [University of Wisconsin: Commitment to Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression](#)

- Explicit definitions of academic freedom and freedom of expression, giving students and faculty “the right to speak and write as a member of the university community or as a private citizen without institutional discipline or restraint, on scholarly matters, or on matters of public concern.”
- Detailed language on where the university is not to interfere with these freedoms, keeping the university from any “attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they, or others, find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive”
- Clearly stating that the institution must and will restrict these freedoms if someone’s actions violate state/federal law or other university policies

## **Bias-Related & Hate Crimes**

*Brief description:* These two policies address Hate and Bias-related Crimes. They discuss the definition of these terms according to the institutions and the law. They also include specific details on recognizing and reporting any incidents in order to resolve the matter as efficiently and peacefully and possible.

Sample Policy Language from [Stevens Institute of Technology: Policy on Discrimination, Harassment, and Bias Incidents](#)

- Under Prohibited Content, the university defines bias incidents or hate crimes, stating that the latter are prohibited under federal and state law
- A procedure is delineated from reporting an incident, to the investigation, any interim measures, findings/recommendations, and an appeal process
- A section on retaliation is included, specifying that if it occurs “any time during or after the investigation,” disciplinary actions will be taken

Sample Policy Language from [Pace University: Hate/Bias-Related Crime Policy:](#)

- The University quotes its Guiding Principles of Conduct to explain the responsibility of each member of Pace’s community to maintain an environment that fosters free speech
- There is a strict and very detailed definition of the term “hate crime”
- The title IX coordinator and Affirmative Action Officer’s contact information is available for reporting, as well as a list of other officials and offices

- For anyone unsure of whether a hate-crime has been committed, the contact number for Counseling Centers in New York is included
- There are hyperlinks to policies regarding harassment, sex-based misconduct, and university disciplinary procedures

## Use of Technology & Social Media

*Brief description:* These two policies address the responsibilities of the members of each respective institution when using technology on campus. The second one specifically addresses social media platforms and their use in affiliation with the University.

*Sample Policy Language from [College of Saint Elizabeth: Acceptable Use Policy](#):*

- Language addressing privacy when using “the College’s computing, communication and information resources” as well as “the [College’s] right to access communications and other data using College hardware, software, and information systems for its legitimate business or academic purposes”
- A list of responsibilities for any “users” of the College’s technology, including “refrain[ing] from conduct that can be characterized as harassing, obscene, or a nuisance”

*Sample Policy Language from [Rowan University: Social Media Policy](#)*

- Dates for most recent revision to the policy are placed at the top for the viewer
- The parameters for the policy’s applicability are specifically stated: “all members of the University community who use social media for University-affiliated communication and those who use the University name in association with social media accounts”
- A disclaimer that the policy is not comprehensive accounting for the rapid growth of technology, “as the evolution of technology precludes the University from anticipating all potential means of storing, capturing and transmitting information”
- Outlined expectation of the University’s members on their use of any social media platforms in connection with the institution “in an official capacity for their unit”
- Language prohibiting any “personal use of social media” with the University, adding the following:
  - “All accounts and posts in which a user identifies him/herself as a member of the University community should clearly communicate: ‘The views and opinions expressed are strictly those of the author. The contents have not been reviewed or approved by Rowan University’ or ‘Views/opinions are my own.’”
- A specific and simple procedure on how to report harassment done through social media
- A list of all the University’s official social media accounts necessary in the event of crisis management

## Student Code of Social Conduct

*Brief description:* This policy details the institution's expectation of its students, as well as the disciplinary measures that will be taken if students violate any part of the policy.

*Sample Policy Language from [Rutgers University: University Code of Student Conduct](#)*

- A section explaining parties responsible for the policy, their contact information, the parts they recently revised within the policy
- Language establishing this policy's jurisdiction on "University premises; at University sponsored activities; at functions, activities, or events hosted by recognized students or student organizations, on or off campus; and other off-campus conduct that affects a University interest."
- Hyperlinks to other policies regarding the expectation for student behavior, such as academic integrity and sexual harassment
- Specificity on the kinds of violations a students can commit under different subtitles, such as "invasion of privacy" and "Hazing"
- Details on the criteria upon which disciplinary sanctions are determined and acted upon, ranging from fines to loss of university housing or expulsion
- A through outline of the disciplinary and appeals process for violations of this policy



# SAFE AND INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

## WORKING GROUP DELIVERABLE

The **Safe and Inclusive Learning Environment Working Group** will focus on developing best practices to enhance safety and support services on campus, and giving students a voice in these important campus matters. In particular, the group will be charged with:

- ➔ Promoting the practice of data analysis through campus climate surveys.
- ➔ Establishing best practices for creating campus safety and inclusive environments.
- ➔ Drafting an implementation guide for colleges on the recommendations set forth by the 2017 Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault.

### CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS:

Jordan L. Draper, Ed.D. (Co-Lead)   Ronald Gray, Ph.D. (Co-Lead)

Nancy Blattner, Ph.D.  
Joseph Hines

Laura Luciano  
Joseph Marswillo

Marissa Marzano  
Brian Mauro

**March 25, 2020**

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Prevention and Education .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Issues, Policies, and Resources.....	5
Key Components and Recommendations for Prevention and Education.....	6
Table 1. Different Approaches to Prevention and Education.....	9
Evidence-Based Prevention Programming for Colleges and Universities .....	10
Table 2: Selected Research-supported Prevention and Education Programs for Campus Sexual Violence.....	10
<b>Services for Survivors and Accused Students.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Services for the Survivor.....	13
Services for the Accused.....	16
<b>Investigation and Adjudication.....</b>	<b>17</b>
New Jersey Task Force Recommendations.....	17
General Considerations for Administrators.....	20
<b>Community Collaboration .....</b>	<b>22</b>
Memorandums of Understanding Between Sexual Violence Programs and Institutions of Higher Education .....	22
Memorandums of Understanding between Law Enforcement Agencies and Institutions of Higher Learning.....	24
<b>Evaluation and Assessment.....</b>	<b>26</b>

Evaluation Tools.....	26
Resources.....	27
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Appendix A .....	33
Appendix B.....	43
Appendix C .....	53
Appendix D .....	55

## Introduction

In June 2017, the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault released an official report with recommendations for the state's institutions of higher education. The report, *Addressing Campus Sexual Violence: Creating Safer Higher Education Communities*, was compiled by experts across the state who had a vested interest in continuing to see New Jersey positively impact efforts for sexual violence education and prevention. The report and recommendations were intended to serve as a baseline for many schools (report available here:

<https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>).

In March 2019, the Office of the Secretary for Higher Education (OSHE) released a state higher education plan, [\*Where Opportunity Meets Innovation: A Student-Centered Vision for New Jersey Higher Education\*](#). The purpose of this plan was to ensure that education is affordable and accessible for students across the state. Within the plan was a vision for a New Jersey Student Bill of Rights, listing 10 critical components of education that all students deserve. To help carry out that vision, the Safe and Inclusive Environment Working Group was established to develop actionable steps and share best practices for institutions and the state. One of the charges for this group was to create an implementation guide to address the nine recommendations from the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault's 2017 report. Those recommendations include the following:

1. Campus climate surveys should be conducted every three to four years and should be specifically tailored to each campus. Results should be shared with the college or university community. Data from the climate surveys should be used to develop an action plan to collect missing information or provide necessary services.
2. Sexual violence education needs to begin sooner than college. A Sexual Violence Primary Prevention Task Force for New Jersey should be created to research best practices in teaching curriculum content for the middle and high school years.
3. Higher education institutions should ensure that students' rights are protected and that equal representation is provided to survivors and the accused.
4. Each college and university should develop an investigation and adjudication model that honors the survivor, the respondent, and the particular needs, character, and philosophy of the college or university.



5. Investigations should be separate from adjudications in campus sexual assault cases. Investigators who are trained in collecting evidence should not also sit in judgment as adjudicators.
6. Students should know where they can confidentially report an incident of sexual violence, and they should know that if they report an assault, they will be able to obtain counseling and services without being required to report the incident to authorities, except in cases where reporting is mandated by state or federal guidelines.
7. Students should be accurately educated on the role of law enforcement so they can make informed decisions regarding reporting, including being apprised of the availability of county victim witness advocates who can assist the student in navigating the legal process.
8. Although not every campus has the capacity to provide appropriately in-depth prevention and intervention services outlined in federal guidelines, community partnerships can help increase the availability of services. A formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) should exist between campuses and county-based rape crisis centers so that help and expertise is available whenever necessary. A collaborative strategy for addressing funding for the MOU must be developed.
9. Colleges and universities should be invited to attend meetings for the county Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART), which provide coordinated community responses to sexual violence.

This implementation guide was created to provide tangible information and resources to ensure our institutions of higher education are able to deliver on the recommendations presented above. The nine recommendations from the Task Force Report are grouped into the following implementation areas that are covered in this guide:

- prevention and education,
- services for survivors and accused students,
- investigation and adjudication,
- community collaboration, and
- evaluation and assessment.

Each of these areas is discussed further with suggestions for implementation based on a review of best practices and innovative methods.

## **Prevention and Education**

According to the National Institute of Justice, 1 in 5 women and 1 in 16 men are sexually assaulted during their time at college<sup>1</sup>. For students that identify as LGBTQ+, research has shown higher rates of sexual violence on campus<sup>2</sup>. As a result, it is critical that students, faculty, and staff receive adequate and comprehensive education around issues related to interpersonal violence, which includes sexual violence, domestic violence, stalking, and gender- and power- based harassment. Further, research indicates many individuals experience acts of sexual violence prior to attending college,<sup>3</sup> suggesting that prevention education should start before college. According to the Task Force recommendations, sexual violence education, including what constitutes consent, needs to begin at home and be reinforced throughout the middle and high school years. Then, when students arrive at college campuses, programming efforts can expand upon the foundation that is already in place.

It is important that institutions be able to tailor prevention programming and education to the unique campus community. Attempts should be made to meet the needs of all members of the campus; however, we recognize that not all programs will meet these needs. Below are some general guidelines and best practices that can and should be tailored in accordance with state guidelines, federal mandates, and the specific needs of each institution.

### **Issues, Policies, and Resources**

It is important for students to have an overall understanding of what constitutes sexual violence, including definitions, relevant statistics, who is impacted, and the short- and long-term consequences of victimization (including physical and mental health, social, and academic impacts). Institutions must also ensure that students, faculty, and staff are aware of the available campus and community resources, as well as how to access such services. It is also critical to educate students, faculty, and staff about the institution's policies, including their rights and responsibilities. Campus and community resources and services should always be a part of prevention and education efforts on campus.<sup>4</sup> It is reasonable for campuses to experience an increase in student disclosures and reports of sexual violence when participating in awareness and prevention efforts.

## **Key Components and Recommendations for Prevention and Education**

### **Begin early and often<sup>5</sup>**

Prevention and education efforts should begin in the home and be reinforced throughout the middle, high school, and college years. Brief, one-session programs are not effective at changing behavior in the long run and should therefore be avoided. Exposure to messages around sexual violence prevention should be regular and should be reinforced in other settings, through programs, and reflected in campus culture (i.e., on syllabi and university websites).

### **Incorporate theory and evidence<sup>6,7</sup>**

Strategies should be based on the best available evidence and relevant theory (i.e. the social-ecological model, social norms theory, theory of change). Emphasis should also be placed on rigorous evaluation measures.

### **Be comprehensive<sup>8</sup>**

Prevention and education efforts must address the multiple root causes, risk factors, and protective factors at various levels of the socio-ecological model (a theory-based framework for understanding the multifaceted and intersecting factors that influence a person's life). It is important for programs to be intersectional in that they address multiple areas of a person's life and identities.

### **Utilize varied teaching methods<sup>9</sup>**

Prevention and education efforts should recognize that not all students learn in the same way and should include a combination of lectures and discussions; active, skill-based components; multi-media elements; and hands-on experiences. It is important to be inclusive and to meet students where they are so that they are encouraged to learn and engage around the issue.

### **Be culturally relevant<sup>10</sup>**

Students and survivors should be made to feel included, respected, supported, and connected. In order to achieve those goals, prevention and education efforts should be intersectional and tailored to fit within cultural beliefs, practices, and local community norms. Campus communities are diverse, so deliverers of information should be knowledgeable about and familiar with the unique campus communities and target audiences. Programming should not take a one size fits all approach.

### **Emphasize healthy and positive relationships<sup>11</sup>**

A strengths-based approach would avoid focusing solely on unhealthy or abusive behavior. Effective programming would also include information on strong, positive,

healthy relationships and what they do and do not look like. Programming should promote social norms that protect against violence and model appropriate behavior and conduct.

### **Encourage bystander intervention<sup>12</sup>**

Mobilizing students and peers around prosocial behavior is key to ending sexual violence on campus. Research has shown that encouraging bystander intervention and a wider community approach is more effective than targeting individuals as perpetrators or victims. Bystander intervention training is important because it incorporates students and peers as potential witnesses to problematic behavior as well as educates them about how to respond to a peer that may have experienced sexual violence.

### **Teach consent<sup>13, 14</sup>**

Teaching students about healthy sexuality and affirmative consent is important in prevention and education efforts. Positive and affirmative consent is a necessary component of a healthy sexual relationship, but oftentimes students are not clear on how to obtain or give consent.

### **Address attitudes and beliefs<sup>15</sup>**

Prevention programs that work to address attitudes, beliefs, and social norms are more effective because cultural and social norms influence behavior, including the use of violence. Topics to include range from gender inequality and unhealthy masculinity to rape myth acceptance and media literacy.

### **Involve the entire campus community<sup>16, 17</sup>**

Institutionalized prevention and education means that prevention should be a part of everyone's job on campus. Faculty, staff, administrators, and leadership should all be engaged and should use a common language around prevention. Leadership buy-in is crucial and impacts opportunities for campus prevention and education efforts. Faculty and staff, in particular, are in a unique position as they may play multiple roles in the effort to combat sexual violence on campus, including a potentially supportive role for a survivor. It is important that they are aware of policies, resources, services, and best practices in terms of reporting obligations and how to respond to a student who discloses.

### **Collaborate with community agencies<sup>18, 19</sup>**

Campuses that employ prevention and advocacy staff should collaborate with community-based agencies to ensure that all members of the community have access to all services available and to highlight that prevention efforts are a community concern. Campuses that do not employ prevention and advocacy staff should work with local, community-based sexual violence programs, including law enforcement, which are trained in prevention approaches, and contract with them to provide assistance with awareness and prevention programs.

**Employ a trauma-informed approach<sup>20</sup>**

Prevention and education programming should be survivor-centered and trauma-informed. A trauma-informed program recognizes the impact that trauma can have on an individual's life and integrates this knowledge into every aspect of the program. Efforts should support survivor's needs, avoid victim blaming, and aim to not re-traumatize the survivor.

**Include rigorous evaluation<sup>21</sup>**

Prevention and education strategies should emphasize rigorous evaluation that measures changes in behavior and program effectiveness. Evaluating programs can provide valuable feedback to individual campuses on the impact of their prevention and education efforts. It also allows programs to be adjusted based on the evaluation and feedback.

**Employ a well-trained staff**

Staff and educators must be well-trained in the area of violence prevention, and even more specifically, in the area of sexual violence. Areas of expertise should include: social change theory, the social ecological model, advanced knowledge of sexual violence issues, intersectionality, program evaluation, and current best practices and evidence on prevention and education strategies.

**Awareness Versus Risk Reduction Versus Prevention<sup>22</sup>**

Comprehensive campus education and prevention programs can address a number of factors. Some key approaches typically utilized on college campuses include primary prevention, awareness/outreach, and risk reduction. Each of these has different goals and intended outcomes. Research suggests that primary prevention is critical in order to ultimately reduce perpetration and victimization. Awareness and outreach are critical for increasing understanding of the issues and utilization of services. The role of risk reduction has been debated over the years, but research increasingly demonstrates that integrating it with other forms of prevention programming can help increase safety. Each approach is further described in Table 1.

**Table 1. Different Approaches to Prevention and Education**

	<b>Primary Prevention</b>	<b>Awareness/Outreach</b>	<b>Risk Reduction</b>
<b>Definition</b>	Education that focuses on preventing the perpetration of sexual violence; stopping violence before it even begins.	Education that focuses on raising awareness about the issues, such as the dynamics, prevalence, and consequences of sexual violence.	Education that focuses on reducing or minimizing the risk of someone becoming a victim.
<b>Focus</b>	Changing and/or addressing the underlying root causes of sexual violence; challenging social norms; addressing multiple risk factors.	Educating the community about sexual violence and where to access services and resources.	Teaching individuals skills to reduce their risk of being victimized and empowering them to identify their needs and wants. (Focuses on some forms of sexual violence.)
<b>Target</b>	Aims to change risk factors for individuals and for the community. Places the responsibility on everyone in the community to eradicate the root causes of sexual violence.	Aims to educate the general public so that individuals can intervene when appropriate and help survivors access services and supports.	Aims to educate a potential victim on how to assess risk of sexual assault, identify resistance strategies, stop an attack in progress, increase empowerment, and develop healthy communication skills.

<b>Goal</b>	Eliminating and reducing factors that perpetuate sexual violence to keep it from happening in the first place; creating healthy norms and healthy communities; challenging social norms, beliefs, and attitudes; creating safe spaces.	Telling the community that sexual violence exists; reaching out to victims/survivors so that they will seek services.	Thwarting an attack in process; avoiding imminent attacks; avoiding potentially dangerous people or situations
-------------	--	---	--

## Evidence-Based Prevention Programming for Colleges and Universities<sup>23</sup>

Table 2 includes examples of curricula that have been vetted through rigorous research. By no means is this an exhaustive list, but a sample of options available. For additional information for each program, please visit the [Culture of Respect website](#).

**Table 2: Selected Research-supported Prevention and Education Programs for Campus Sexual Violence**

Program Name	Format	Target Audience	Program Goal
<a href="#">Bringing in the Bystander</a>	In-person workshop, one day	Undergraduate	This program focuses on healthy relationships and increasing prosocial bystander skills to interrupt and prevent sexual violence and dating violence.
<a href="#">Enhanced Access, Acknowledge, Act (EAAA) Sexual Assault Resistance</a>	In-person workshop, 12-hour course	Undergraduate	This is for female-identified students and helps them detect risk in men's behavior.

<a href="#">Green Dot</a>	In-person workshop and marketing campaign, length varies	Undergraduate Graduate Faculty/Staff	This program focuses on creating a change in culture, bystander training, and increasing awareness.
<a href="#">interACT</a>	Presentation, length varies	Undergraduate	Utilizes interactive theatrical performance to help increase the number of students engaging in bystander intervention.
<a href="#">Know Your Power</a>	Marketing campaign and guided exercises	Undergraduate Graduate Faculty/Staff	Provides resources regarding bystander intervention.
<a href="#">Media Aware</a>	Online course, up to 2 hours	Undergraduate	This program focuses on increasing healthy behavior and reducing risky behavior regarding sexual health.
<a href="#">Men's Workshop</a>	In-person workshop, 2 ½ hours	Undergraduate	This workshop is for male-identified students and addresses how they can foster empathy toward survivors and increase awareness of consent.
<a href="#">Men's Program</a>	In-person workshop, 45 minutes	Undergraduate	This workshop is for male-identified students and helps them gain skills to recognize, intervene, and assist survivors.
<a href="#">One Act</a>	In-person workshop, four hours	Undergraduate Graduate	This program focuses on decreasing myths around sexual violence and increasing prosocial bystander behavior.
<a href="#">RealConsent</a>	Online course, three hours	Undergraduate	This program is for male-identified students and helps them increase knowledge regarding sexual violence, informed consent, and how to build skills for intervening.



<a href="#">SCREAM Theater and SCREAM Athletes</a>	In-person workshop, 75 minutes	Undergraduate	Interactive session and discussion on various topics including harassment, alcohol, and consent.
<a href="#">Sex Signals</a>	Presentation, 1 hour	Undergraduate	This program establishes a baseline on how culture impacts unhealthy sexual behavior and how students can intervene.
<a href="#">The Women's Program</a>	In-person workshop, no time length provided	Undergraduate	This program is designed for female-identified students to recognize high-risk perpetrators and help them intervene or help rape survivors.

*Note: Cost varies based on the needs of the institution.*

Resource: <https://cultureofrespect.org/programs-and-tools/matrix/>

## Services for Survivors and Accused Students

According to the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report, institutions of higher education (IHE) should “...strive to create an atmosphere in which survivors feel safe to (1) seek services and resources available to him or her, both on and off campus, after an alleged assault and (2) to participate in the adjudication processes available to him or her, both on- and off-campus, if they choose to do so”<sup>24</sup>. Additionally, IHEs also have “the challenge of attending to the person accused of perpetrating the assault if that person is a member of the campus community”. Below is information on each of the types of services that should be provided to survivors and to accused students.

### Services for the Survivor

The Task Force recommends<sup>25</sup> “that higher education institutions should ensure that there are adequate services available to assist students who are victims/survivors of sexual assault”. Victim service programs should incorporate efforts that are tailored to the individual needs of the victim/survivor, be trauma informed, culturally relevant, collaborative, inclusive, and be accessible to all students. Services for the victim/survivor should be comprehensive and “should include medical care, mental health support, and general counseling services”<sup>26</sup>.

Services can be provided directly from **on campus resources** or **off campus providers** and should include crisis intervention, advocacy, and counseling.

### On-Campus Resources

Category	Description
<b>Crisis Intervention</b> <sup>27</sup>	Ensures immediate assistance to victims/survivors in a confidential setting.
24-hour availability	The most important element of crisis intervention is the ability to provide immediate response to student needs. <sup>28</sup>
24-hour response line	Each program should promote a 24-hour phone number that students can call to access services and emotional support.
Safety planning	During a crisis, students may feel emotionally and physically unsafe. Program staff can assist by assessing their safety and developing safety plans with the victims/survivors.

Victim Assistance Emergency Fund	These funds exist and should be easily accessible to help restore a sense of dignity and safety during a crisis situation. They can be used for emergency food, clothing, toiletries, shelter, transportation, or any other immediate needs.
Trauma-informed spaces	Each victim services program must consider the physical, psychological, and emotional impact of interpersonal violence and respond with an awareness of the effects of trauma. It is important for physical spaces to be confidential and private to provide an opportunity for students to share their experience in a safe environment. <sup>29</sup>
<b>Advocacy</b>	Includes creating a safe environment for victims/survivors, believing and validating them, acknowledging their feelings and perceptions, educating them about their options, and supporting their decisions. <sup>30</sup>
Information and referral	Those representing the victim services program serve an important role in providing information about reporting options, victim rights, crime compensation, and appropriate resources. <sup>31</sup>
Accompaniments	Advocates can provide support at proceedings such as reporting to law enforcement, legal proceedings, campus adjudication meetings, or forensic exams.
Accommodations	Victim services programs may also play a role in supporting victim/survivor requests to make changes that enhance their wellbeing and safety. Accommodations can include parking and transportation assistance, escort services, interpreter services, housing or employment modifications, and academic or financial support. <sup>32</sup>
Survivor-centered services	Advocacy must be victim/survivor centered. Advocates are distinct from Title IX Coordinators and university administration as they are first and foremost responsible to the victim/survivor. <sup>33</sup>
<b>Counseling</b>	Counseling is crucial to addressing both the short and long term impact of sexual violence and helps students identify difficulties, address symptoms, develop skills, and process the experience in a supportive space. <sup>34</sup>
Individual counseling	It is recommended that both short-term and long-term individual counseling is offered. <sup>35</sup> Clinicians providing this counseling must have trauma-informed training, as well as training specific to sexual violence, domestic violence, and stalking. <sup>36</sup>
Group counseling	Support groups aid in recovery and work to build the victim/survivor support network as well as decrease the feeling of being isolated. <sup>37</sup>

## Off-Campus Resources

- Substantive partnerships between higher education institutions and local community agencies is essential to insuring survivors receive informed services and responses. Please see the section on [MOUs](#) in the guide.
- Campuses should be prepared to advise survivors of the availability of the county based Sexual Assault Response Team, which can provide access to a confidential sexual violence advocate, a forensic nurse examiner, and local law enforcement.<sup>38</sup> A confidential sexual violence advocate assist survivors by “providing crisis intervention, emotional support, essential information, and referrals.”<sup>39</sup>
- Campuses should have an understanding of, and relationship with, local and county law enforcement agencies.<sup>40</sup>

## Policies

According to the New Jersey Task Force report, campuses should develop policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct that are easy to understand, “are easily accessible to students and widely publicized” (p. 15).<sup>41</sup>

- A comprehensive list of both on-campus services and off-campus community resources should be available to students. This list should be inclusive of all student populations (i.e. international students, LGBTQ+ students, commuter students, etc.) and include medical services (including forensic exam locations), mental health services, counseling services, law enforcement contact information, and advocacy support services information;
- Information on how a survivor may be able to contact a confidential sexual violence advocate off-campus or an on-campus equivalent;
- A list of reporting sites and/or college and university personnel that clearly defines who are mandatory reporters and who are confidential resources, as defined by federal law;
- Guidelines for reporting a sexual assault to the college or university, and the college or university adjudication process that follows; and
- Amnesty or “responsible action” policies for survivors who may fear being subjected to alcohol or drug violations under campus conduct codes.

## Services for the Accused

Students who are accused of sexual assault should have access to services and resources and support to assist with understanding their rights and school policies. According to the Task Force recommendations, “While higher education institutions must strive to create an atmosphere in which the individual making an accusation of sexual assault (“the complainant”) feels safe to access services and resources and participate in adjudication processes if he or she chooses to do so, higher education institutions also have the challenge of attending to the person accused of perpetrating the assault (“the respondent”) if that person is a member of the campus community.”<sup>42</sup>

- Services and resources should be available to provide health, mental health support, general counseling services, and legal support services both on and off campus.<sup>43</sup>
- A resource advisor who serves the respondent should be identified by the institution as a point person for learning and accessing services available and should act as “a support person with whom the respondent can speak face to face” (p. 17).<sup>44</sup>
  - This resource advisor should be:
    - informed as to the campus and community services, and the legal resources available to the respondent, on and off-campus
    - familiar with the Title IX investigation and adjudication process
    - aware of potential legal proceedings that may occur at the request of the complainant
    - separate and apart from the Title IX Coordinator, the investigator and/or adjudicator, and should be a different advisor from the advisor recommended to assist the complainant

## Policies

- Campuses should develop written policies and procedures outlining the investigation process as well as the potential sanctions the institution may impose following a final determination.
  - Policies and procedures should be available online and easily accessible.

## Investigation and Adjudication

As stated in the New Jersey Task Force Report, “Federal law dictates that all higher education institutions respond to allegations of sexual assault involving a college or university student with an on-campus investigation and adjudication process. To date, there is no “model process” for New Jersey to look to as federal guidance on Title IX implementation continues to expand and develop.”<sup>45</sup> Title IX is a part of the Educational Amendments of 1972 (Title 20 U.S.C. Sections 1681-1688), and is focused on the prohibition of sex discrimination in schools and has since been interpreted as important to the issue of sexual violence. Colleges and universities, regardless of their size and resources, must comply with Title IX and state non-discrimination laws and respond fairly and equitably to Title IX complaints. Schools with limited resources face many challenges and often must be creative with personnel in order to achieve compliance.

The Task Force Report divides Title IX proceedings into two key parts: 1) investigation and 2) adjudication. Although not generally required by Title IX, the report states that “These two processes should be independent and conducted by two or more individuals with specific delineated roles– an investigator and an adjudicator. These roles should not be merged into one process or into one person serving as both investigator and adjudicator.”<sup>46</sup>

The purpose of this section is to provide information on best practices, points to consider when developing investigative and adjudication procedures, and sample policies from a diverse assortment of colleges and universities, both private and public. This section will also highlight some guidance points.

The content of this section and the New Jersey Task Force Report are based on current federal law. The U.S. Department of Education has proposed rules that would substantially change the federal requirements, including by imposing many new procedural requirements for Title IX investigations and changing the substantive standards for identifying sexual harassment. If adopted, the proposed rules will require schools to undertake significant efforts to train staff and educate students about the new rules, and certain recommendations in the New Jersey Task Force Report and this document may no longer comport with federal requirements.

### New Jersey Task Force Recommendations

Key recommendations related to investigation and adjudication from the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault report include the following:

- “Investigations should be led by experienced, trained investigators. It is encouraged that these investigators be trained in trauma-informed response and, particularly in how trauma can affect both the complainant and the respondent. Once the investigation is concluded, these investigators should memorialize their factual findings in a report that is given to the Title IX adjudicator.”<sup>47</sup>
- “Adjudicators should receive appropriate and on-going training on Title IX requirements, developments in Title IX implementation nationwide, best practices of Title IX nationwide, and sexual assault prevention and intervention training that enrolled students are required to receive. It is encouraged that students, faculty, staff and administrators collaborate on the development of the campus’s adjudication model, processes and procedures. Once the adjudication process has concluded with either a “Responsible” or “Not Responsible” adjudication, the findings should be released to the complainant and the respondent at the same time”<sup>48</sup>.

In order to implement these recommendations, the following guidance is offered. In their review of adjudicating student sexual misconduct, Wilgus and Lowery (2018) note several promising practices<sup>49</sup>, some of which are listed below:

### 1. Determine an appropriate investigative model

Currently, there are a number of investigative models available that universities and colleges utilize for both student and employee processes. Three main processes are used most frequently: 1) the investigative model, 2) the hearing administrator model, and 3) the hearing panel model.

- The **investigative model** has one or two trained investigators that manage the case from information collection through adjudication. This approach was not recommended by the New Jersey Task Force, although it remains in use throughout the country, particularly at smaller schools.
- The **hearing administrator model** has one or two trained investigators that collect information. Then a single administrator hears the information and makes a decision on responsibility and sanctions.
- The **hearing panel model** is similar to the hearing administrator model in which investigator(s) collect information and forward a report. However, in this model a panel comprised of several faculty, staff, and (sometimes) students hears the case and makes a determination on responsibility and

sanctions. Some experts caution against panels which include students, due to their lack of training and concerns about confidentiality.

Increasingly, best practices suggest using a model in which the investigators are not the decision makers (i.e. the hearing administrator or panel), and to ensure that anyone involved in the investigation is properly trained.

## **2. Provide specialized training**

The 2014 White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault<sup>50</sup> highlighted the importance of training for investigators, who must understand how sexual assault occurs and how victims may respond. As such, trauma-informed training is critical.

*Trauma-informed training* focuses on the neurobiology of trauma and educates those involved in an investigation or adjudication process how someone in a traumatic state may respond “differently” than expected. Some experts question whether trauma-informed investigations inherently create a bias for the victim/complainant. This Working Group recommends that institutions familiarize themselves with trauma-informed practices; not as a way to justify a decision but as a way to understand behaviors (from either party) displayed during a Title IX process.

## **3. Use research-informed sanctioning methods**

Each institution needs to determine whether to adopt a sanction range for incidents of sexual violence within their jurisdiction. Any minimum sanction or prescribed range of sanctions should be identified in policies and align with the mission of the institution.

The Task Force recommends that there be a range of sanctions (i.e. from suspension to expulsion) for sexual violence to account for the facts of each case.

## **4. Offer Restorative Justice Practices and Alternative Resolution**

Information gathered in campus climate surveys confirms that students affected by sexual violence are looking for additional avenues to redress the harm caused them. An alternative resolution process based on restorative justice practices may allow a harmed party to participate in a process that is less focused on disciplining the other party or parties.

At The College of New Jersey, for example, “alternative resolution is a voluntary process that allows a respondent in a Title IX investigation process to accept responsibility for their behavior and/or potential harm. By fully participating in this process the Respondent will not be charged with a violation of college policy. The alternative resolution process is designed to eliminate the prohibited conduct, prevent



its recurrence, and remedy its effects in a manner that meets the needs of the Reporter while still maintaining the safety of the overall campus community.”<sup>51</sup>

## General Considerations for Administrators

This section highlights reminders and considerations for Title IX administrators throughout their sexual misconduct processes.

- In accordance with the Clery Act, college administrators should determine if there is an imminent and ongoing threat to the college community. If so, disseminate information regarding the incident and any safety tips. If there is not an ongoing threat but the initial report includes claims regarding a weapon, physical injury, or a repeat respondent, the college should consider interim measures (i.e., interim suspension of the accused) and contacting law enforcement for the safety of the complainant/reporter.
- Invite students, faculty, staff, and administrators to collaborate on the development of the campus’ adjudication model, processes, and procedures. Having buy-in from all levels is incredibly important to demonstrate a whole campus approach to addressing campus sexual violence.
- Develop guidelines for reporting Title IX incidents to the college or university and ensure that training is conducted so all community members know how to report and what happens when information is reported. It is recommended that colleges routinely retrain their responsible employees as policies and procedures may change. Additionally, if not all employees are considered responsible employees then open training sessions for all who may be interested in learning more about campus processes are recommended.
- In addition to training, colleges should publish a list of reporting sites and/or college and university personnel that clearly defines those who are considered mandatory reporters and who are confidential resources, as defined by federal law. For example, Ramapo College (<https://www.ramapo.edu/titleix/files/2017/01/Title-IX-Reporting-Requirements-Responsible-Employees-.pdf>) has designated **all** employees as responsible employees. Alternately, The College of New Jersey (<https://titleix.tcnj.edu/policy-procedures/responsible-employee/>) has a **limited** designation of employees.
- Develop a cadre of trained Title IX investigators to serve multiple roles on a case by case basis. Frequently, Title IX administrators are understaffed, so it is recommend training additional on-campus professionals to assist in different capacities.

- Provide written disclosure of rights and options to both parties immediately after a complaint is submitted. Both parties should be offered free mental health services as well.

- Implement amnesty or “responsible action” policies for students who may fear being subjected to alcohol and/or drug violations under campus conduct codes.

This example, taken from Cornell University, could be applied to your institution.

- *“The health and safety of every student at the university is of utmost importance. The university recognizes that students who have been drinking and/or using drugs (whether such use is voluntary or involuntary) at the time that prohibited conduct under these procedures occurs may be hesitant to report incidents due to fear of potential consequences for their own conduct. The university strongly encourages students to report such prohibited conduct. A student bystander or complainant acting in good faith who discloses any incident of prohibited conduct under these procedures to a [insert college name] official or to law enforcement shall not be subject to action under the university’s policies for violation of alcohol and/or drug use occurring at or near the time of the commission of the prohibited conduct.”<sup>52</sup>*

## Community Collaboration

Institutions of higher education have a multitude of responsibilities in terms of educating and protecting students, oftentimes with limited capacity and/or resources. Institutions may choose to engage with community-based partners who have extensive expertise in serving victims/survivors of violence.

The implementation of community collaboration is often guided through the development of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) which outline how the institution of higher education and the community agency will collaborate in ways that clearly delineate roles, responsibilities, and communication. Per guidance in the 2017 final report from the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault, “[a]lthough not every campus has the capacity to provide appropriately in-depth prevention and intervention services, community partnerships can help increase the availability of services. A formal MOU should exist between campuses and county-based rape crisis centers so that help and expertise is available whenever necessary.”<sup>53</sup>

The following section will discuss considerations for colleges and universities as they enter memorandums of understanding with community partners, specifically two key partners: sexual violence programs and law enforcement agencies.

### **Memorandums of Understanding Between Sexual Violence Programs and Institutions of Higher Education**

Formalized and collaborative relationships between sexual violence programs (“SVP”) and institutions of higher education (“IHE”) can be enormously beneficial for survivors. Memorandums of Understanding enable the IHE and SVP to define the roles and responsibilities of each party, provide clear guidance around confidentiality and its limits, delineate services that will be provided, and more.

As the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault noted in its report, “The scope of the partnership [between an IHE and SVP] will vary according to the needs of the school and the capacity of the rape crisis center.”<sup>54</sup> For this reason, the enclosed sample MOU (see Appendix A & B) is largely customizable, as this Committee also recognizes and affirms that the most successful relationships between IHEs and SVPs will be unique to each party’s needs, responsive to their respective communities and

student bodies, respectful of each other's staffing structures and resources, and will therefore vary in content and deliverables based on these and other factors.

It is important to note that changes can never be made to the MOU that would affect or infringe upon the confidentiality of a confidential sexual violence advocate (CSVA) and the supervisory structure that allows CSVAs to hold privileged communications.<sup>55</sup> The MOU should also clearly outline the financial compensation for each service provided by the SVP, per guidance from the SVP on expenses of services.

Commonly, MOUs between IHEs and SVPs include some or all of the following services:

- 1. Sexual violence prevention training to students, faculty, administrators, and staff**
  - a. Comprehensive, appropriate, and adequate sexual violence prevention training “addresses factors at all levels of the social ecology – the individual, relational, community, and societal levels.”<sup>56</sup> Prevention education also infuses principles of anti -racist, -sexist, -homophobic, -ableist, -transphobic, and -classist work (along with other -isms), effectively placing the work of preventing sexual violence in its appropriate, broader context of dismantling oppression (see [“Prevention and Education”](#) of this report). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (the CDC) also emphasizes the importance of developing an MOU specifically covering prevention programming, noting, “The existence of the MOU helps to illustrate each entity’s shared belief in the importance of preventing sexual violence. Creation of the MOU allows for thoughtful discussion and helps define what each agency will do, together and as separate organizations, to mutually promote sexual violence prevention.”<sup>57</sup>
  - b. Prevention work that is implemented with fidelity extends beyond one-time sessions at orientation, recognizing that single-dose sessions or outreach events have not been recognized as effective in preventing sexual violence.<sup>58</sup> (See [“Prevention and Education”](#) of this report.)
  - c. Data-driven sexual violence prevention strategies seek to reduce the risk of sexual violence perpetration, which differs significantly from strategies that seek to reduce the risk of victimization. ‘Risk reduction’ training focuses on placing responsibility on potential victims to prevent violence against themselves, which does not contribute to the larger changing of social norms that allow sexual violence to persist. (See [Appendix C.](#))
  - d. While the MOU should include the SVP’s expertise in terms of prevention, “Schools are cautioned to recognize that partnerships with community

organizations should be used to supplement and assist a school's sexual assault prevention and response programs, not to replace them."<sup>59</sup>

**2. Information about off-campus resources, including hotline, counseling, Sexual Assault Response Team (SART), etc.**

- a. The IHE can cross-share information regarding how students can access services at the SVP. The IHE should take care to emphasize the confidential nature of these services.
- b. Trained, confidential sexual violence advocates (CSVAs) are available to survivors via the statewide hotline and as a part of the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART), which is the three-pronged response team that meets survivors at hospitals or police stations, when requested. The CSVA serves a critical, non-duplicative role in the response process to a survivor, acting in a critical supporting role to help the survivor navigate a medical exam or an interview with a law enforcement officer. As the CDC notes, "[v]ictims who work with advocates have more positive experiences with both medical and legal systems, including increased reporting and receipt of medical care and decreased feelings of distress."<sup>60</sup>

**Memorandums of Understanding between Law Enforcement Agencies and Institutions of Higher Learning**

Responsible collaboration and communication between institutions of higher education and law enforcement agencies includes strategic planning for responding to, preventing, and providing service to sexual assault victims on college campuses. As identified critical stakeholders, law enforcement agencies (LEA) and institutions of higher learning (IHE), along with the communities they provide service to, benefit from shared efforts of planning, response, prevention, and education.

The goal, of course, is to prevent sexual assault altogether. Assuring that specific preventative measures and procedures are implemented is a daunting task for one single entity. However, through a collaborative approach via agreements such as an MOU, specific delineation of responsibilities and appropriate procedural tasks can be mapped out and followed accordingly. To echo the White House Task Force's position on stakeholders working together, "Coordinating sexual assault prevention and response works best as part of an integrated public safety and crime prevention strategy and where there is a concerted effort to develop close working relationships and trust among IHEs (Institutions of Higher Education) and law enforcement partners and community groups".<sup>61</sup>

An outlined agreement between the LEA and IHL will clearly outline the role law enforcement plays in responding to sexual assault reports from campus. The agreement shall include a statement of principles, as well as procedures for communication, coordination, collaboration, the immediate aftermath, victim response, evidence, prevention, training, accountability, and confidentiality. These elements have been included based upon specific recommendations of the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report<sup>62</sup> as well as practical law enforcement principles and strategies. The MOU does not constitute legal advice, and it is further understood that each IHE across the country is different and operates under tailored university policy and procedure. Parties agreeing to the MOU may choose to tailor it to their liking or modify certain aspects of this MOU. The MOU serves as a template based on previously utilized MOUs and/or recommendations from task forces comprised of individuals from any number of educational, law enforcement, and other backgrounds.

Written understandings with local law enforcement authorities should always be reviewed by IHE legal counsel for consistency with applicable laws, including federal and state confidentiality and privacy laws, such as the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX), Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Title IV), the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 42 U.S.C. § 14141 (Section 14141), and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Safe Streets Act). Similarly, we expect that local law enforcement agencies may wish to consult legal counsel regarding applicable local, state, and federal laws, Attorney General Law Enforcement Directives, and other policies.<sup>63</sup>

See Appendix B for a sample MOU between and IHE and LEA.

## Evaluation and Assessment

Collecting information and understanding the impact of programs, policies, and/or procedure are critical for higher education institutions. The three sections above outline specific examples for schools to utilize; however, we recognize that every college has a unique set of circumstances. In this section, information on evaluation tools can help institutions collect information and determine effectiveness, as well as assessment measurements which can be used as a start-up or comparison guide.

### Evaluation Tools

#### 1. Climate Surveys

Climate surveys, which were noted in the White House Task Force recommendations as well as previous guidance, are an important data collection tool for campuses. To learn more about climate surveys, different tools colleges can utilize, recommendations for implementation, and evaluation processes, please refer to:

[https://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/workinggroups/safe\\_and\\_inclusive\\_learning\\_environments/deliverable1](https://www.state.nj.us/highereducation/workinggroups/safe_and_inclusive_learning_environments/deliverable1).

#### 2. Focus Groups

While the purpose of climate surveys is to collect anonymized quantitative data specific to individual campuses, focus groups are a method to further enhance a college's understanding of the data in an effort to make changes or solidify programs, policies, and/or procedures.

Two schools in New Jersey have recently conducted focus groups after a climate survey to elicit further feedback from their population. First, the Rutgers Center on Violence Against Women and Children conducted the iSpeak Focus Groups as part of its comprehensive campus climate assessment. This included a resource audit, climate survey, and focus groups. Focus groups were used as a way for researchers to better understand the data collected through surveys and ask questions of specific subsets of students. The results of the assessment were used to develop an action plan, and the next assessment was used to evaluate the impact of that plan. Second, The College of New Jersey conducted the #LiveLikeLions Focus Groups modeled off of Rutgers University.

The National Sexual Violence Resource Center provides a free toolkit for institutions that are planning to use focus groups and/or surveys to collect data on sexual violence. It includes guidance on the logistics of conducting focus groups, appropriate data analysis,

and an overview of measurement tools to use when assessing sexual violence prevention programs. The National Sexual Violence Resource Center has been recommended by the CDC as a resource for campus prevention programs<sup>64</sup>.

### 3. Resource Audits

A resource audit is a research method that examines publicly available program information and input from knowledgeable stakeholders to compile a comprehensive listing of the available resources within an organization.<sup>65</sup>

A resource audit can help ensure that an institution's programs, policies, procedures, and resources are up-to-date on-campus, as well as across all campus websites. This may also be a good tool if an institution is looking for funding (internal or grant) or to institutionalize current practices. Additionally, for those creating their own climate survey, a resource audit can be an important first step.

## Resources

Although the issue of sexual violence on college campuses is larger than the issue of Title IX compliance, prevention and response efforts must work within the framework imposed by Title IX guidelines and related legal requirements. Below are some resources to assist with this process.

### **Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education**

In April 2019, the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education released recommended standards for addressing sexual violence. CAS publishes its book of standards every 3-5 years and revises existing standards every 8-10 years. Unfortunately, this schedule may not keep pace with the frequent changes in the field of sexual violence and gender-based harassment.

### **The Association of Title IX Administrators (ATIXA)**

The Association of Title IX Administrators (ATIXA) is the national professional organization for Title IX compliance and one of the largest professional organizations in the field. ATIXA provides training, consulting, and model policies for institutions throughout the United States. As one of the earliest professional organizations to offer formal training for Title IX Coordinators and investigators, it has become very influential in this field. Many of their recommended investigation methods are now considered best practice and their membership includes approximately 3,600 institutions.

### **End Violence Against Women International (EVAWI)**



End Violence Against Women International (EVAWI) also has a plethora of resources (many free) that colleges and universities can look to for guidance. While not solely focused on educators, EVAWI has a well-established cadre of experts on a wide range of topics such as how alcohol facilitates sexual assaults, trauma-informed investigation techniques, and corroborating evidence.

### **NASPA Culture of Respect**

NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA) Culture of Respect builds the capacity of educational institutions to end sexual violence through ongoing, expansive organizational change.<sup>66</sup> According to its website, the Core Blueprint “is a reference guide of evidence-based and expert-recommended practices in campus sexual violence prevention and response. Compiled by experts from our multidisciplinary Advisory Board, the CORE Blueprint is organized around six key areas - the six pillars - that are essential to an effective institutional strategy for ending sexual violence” (NASPA, 2019).

### **Federal and State Grants**

Funding and personnel can often be a barrier when it comes to implementing efforts to address campus sexual violence, such as those outlined by the New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault. There are federal- and state-based grants which can alleviate some of the financial burdens that colleges face. Currently, there are federal grants through the Department of Justice through two sources: the Office of Violence Against Women’s campus-grants program ( <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/grant-programs>), and through Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funds distributed through the state Attorney General’s Office.

#### **Case Study: Caldwell University Campus Programs Grant<sup>67</sup>**

Caldwell University is a recipient of the Campus Programs grant via the Office of Violence Against Women (OVW). This program is designed to enhance victim services, implement prevention and education programs, and develop and strengthen campus security and investigation strategies in order to prevent, prosecute, and respond to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on college campuses. The Campus Program grant has four statutory, or mandatory, requirements; as well as four additional requirements:

### Statutory Requirements

- **Create a coordinated community response (CCR)** including both organizations external to the institution and relevant divisions of the institution.
- **Establish a mandatory prevention and education program** about sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking for all incoming students (i.e., first year and transfer).
- **Train all campus law enforcement** to respond effectively to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.
- **Train all participants in the disciplinary process**, including members of campus disciplinary boards and investigators, to respond effectively to situations involving sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

### Additional Requirements

- **Implement universal prevention strategies that include:**
  - Ongoing prevention program for entire campus community
  - Bystander intervention program for all students
- Provide **confidential victim services and advocacy**
- Participate in ongoing, mandatory **technical assistance**
- Follow the appropriate **staffing and activities requirements**

Awarded in August 2018, Caldwell University is an FY (fiscal year) 18 grantee. The Technical Assistance provider assigned is the Victim Rights Law Center. The cohort to which the university belongs is Small Institutions and includes schools such as Centenary University, Albertus Magnus College, and Molloy College.

In submitting the application, Caldwell University formed an internal team comprised (primarily) of the Vice President for Student Life; Director of Corporate, Foundation and Government Relations; Executive Director of Counseling Services; and Assistant Dean of Student Engagement and Retention. The latter two staff had especially useful voices as their offices were the ones that implement programs and events related to sexual, dating, domestic, and stalking violence. This perspective helped provide historical context necessary for the grant application and spoke to the needs of the Caldwell student population.

This internal team identified and successfully met with several campus partners to explain the grant requirements and the partners' roles in fulfilling said requirements; secure

collective buy-in; and get campus partners to sign an Internal Memorandum of Understanding (IMOU) to formalize their partnership. All campus partners who signed the IMOU also agreed to participate on the Coordinated Community Response team.

The internal team also met with two key external partners – the Caldwell police department and the executive director of SAVE of Essex County, the local rape crisis center. Both agencies agreed to partner on the grant and sign the external Memorandum of Understanding. The executive director of SAVE, however, provided more in-depth guidance and feedback – speaking to the feasibility of the grant requirements related to education, prevention, and advocacy; training for staff; and participation on the Coordinated Community Response team. Additionally, both agencies agreed to send staff to OVW Training and Technical Institutes, another requirement of the grant.

Another crucial component of the grant application was the partnership with the consulting agency, McAllister & Quinn, who helped the Caldwell team write the grant. With the assistance of McAllister & Quinn, Caldwell University successfully submitted a Project Narrative/application, an abstract, a concept paper, a budget narrative, and budget summary sheet.

To secure the grant, it was important to show that while grant funds and guidance was needed, Caldwell University had a solid infrastructure already in place or was acting working towards solidifying the infrastructure – namely, the IMOU and EMOU, the CCR team, partnership with the local rape crisis center and police departments



## Appendices

## Appendix A

### Memorandum of Understanding Between [Sexual Violence Program] and [Institution of Higher Education]

This Memorandum of Understanding is between *[Institution of Higher Learning]* and *[Sexual Violence Program]*. The MOU formalizes the commitment of the parties to work together to provide trauma-informed services and support to student and employee victims of sexual assault and to improve the overall response to sexual harassment at *[Institution of Higher Learning]*. The parties share the goal of preventing sexual assault on campus and in the community, enhancing survivor autonomy, and responding appropriately to students and employees who have experienced sexual violence while living, learning, or working on campus.

#### I. PARTIES

*[Sexual Violence Program]* is a community-based Sexual Violence Program (“SVP”) dedicated to providing services to survivors of violence and promoting safe communities through primary prevention programming. *[Include mission or goal statement and service provided.]* The SVP services are available to individuals and families throughout *[County or service area]*.

*[Institution of Higher Learning]* is an institution of higher learning (“IHE”) committed to offering quality education to students, as well as a safe and respectful learning environment for all students, faculty, and staff. *[Include school mission or commitment statement and/or background information on structure or student body [e.g. private faith-based university, commuter campus, small private liberal arts school.]]*

#### Contact Information

The Parties agree to each identify a liaison or primary point of contact for the other with respect to this MOU. Unless otherwise agreed to, all information-sharing between the Parties described in this MOU will flow between these points of contact.

#### Contact Information for SVP

The SVP liaison and primary point of contact shall be:

[Name, Title of staff member], and may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address].

The Executive Director of the SVP is:

[Name of Executive Director], and may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address].

Survivors and/or significant others who wish to contact the SVP directly should call [telephone/hotline number] or [other contact information].

#### **Contact Information for IHE Staff**

The IHE liaison and primary point of contact shall be:

[Name, Title of IHE staff member], and may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address].

The IHE's Title IX Coordinator is:

[Name, Title of IHE Title IX Coordinator], and may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address].

Other relevant IHE staff:

- [Name, Title of IHE Counseling Center staff member], may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address] for issues regarding [describe purpose of contact (e.g., safety planning coordination, prevention programming, etc.)]
- [Name, Title of IHE Dean of Students staff member], may be reached at [telephone number] or [email address] for issues regarding [describe purpose of contact (e.g., safety planning coordination, prevention programming, etc.)]

The Parties agree to share a contact list with their point of contact for implementation of this MOU, and to notify the Parties of any changes to their points of contact as soon as practicable.

#### **History of Previous Collaboration**

*[If the partnership is pre-existing]*

The IHE and SVP have worked together in some capacity for [insert the length in years of the collaboration, if uncertain use language such as, "for several years" or "since as early as \_\_\_\_\_."] on programs to prevent and/or address sexual assault on campus. The SVP and IHE have worked together to [list as applicable: provide training and educational resources to members of the campus community; ensure students and staff are provided with access to a variety of resources, including referrals to off-campus counseling and advocacy organizations; provide written and online information related to sexual assault; etc.] This MOU builds on previous collaboration to provide services to victims, facilitate meaningful and relevant training to additional school officials, and support the IHE in institutionalizing policies and practices that strengthen their commitment to creating a safer and more respectful campus community.

*[If the partnership is new or emerging]*

The mission of the SVP is [include mission, goal, or vision statement] and is consistent with the IHE's commitment to creating a safe learning and living environment for all members

of the campus community. This MOU is intended as a formal commitment between the two organizations to provide services to victims, facilitate meaningful and relevant training to additional school officials, and support the IHE in institutionalizing policies and practices that strengthen their commitment to creating a safer and more respectful campus community.

## II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this MOU is to *[establish/enhance/modify]* collaboration between parties regarding the response to and prevention of sexual violence on campus. This strengthened and unified approach to creating a safer campus community could include a number of projects and dynamics, as outlined later in this document.

## III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES<sup>68</sup>

- A. Meaningful and mutually-respectful relationship-building: The Parties agree to identify areas where communication, coordination, and collaboration can be enhanced and take thoughtful action to address those areas in order to effectively respond to sexual assault and violence and hate crimes, promote positive social change, and protect a survivor's confidential information.
- B. Champion Campus and Community Safety: The Parties will receive training to assist in the recognition of and appropriate response to any allegation regarding sexual misconduct. This includes, but is not limited to, ways to offer trauma-sensitive treatment and identifying ways that sexual misconduct directly affects the real and perceived safety of all members of a campus community.
- C. Upholding Civil Rights, Civil Liberties, and Victims' Rights: The Parties agree to comply with state and federal laws in a manner that protects individuals' civil rights and liberties and championing justice for survivors. The Parties explicitly recognize the distinctions between criminal law and civil law in the handling of sexual assault and violence that arise under both state and federal statutory frameworks.
- D. Centering the Victim's Needs in Responses to Sexual Assault: The Parties agree to institute specialized, trauma-informed responses developed in consultation with campus and community-based victim advocates.
- E. Specialized Training and Knowledge: The Parties agree that sexual assault and hate crimes require specialized, trauma-informed training for individuals included in this document, potential first responders, and other members of the



campus community. It is recommended that members of the partnership will be conferred with when selecting speakers, topics, and formats for trainings.

- F. Respecting the Unique Needs of Undocumented Individuals: Parties agree to strive to develop, promote, and implement policies and practices that address the unique needs of campus community members who may not have a secure citizenship status or are undocumented, including implementing culturally and linguistically appropriate on- and off- campus support and law enforcement services.
- G. Respecting the Unique Needs of Marginalized Individuals: Parties agree to strive to develop, promote, and implement policies and practices that address the unique needs of campus community members who experience various forms of oppression and inequality, including (but not limited to) implementing cultural and linguistically appropriate on- and off- campus support and law enforcement services, as well as partnering with community organizations.

#### **IV. PARTNERSHIP ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **Sexual Violence Program**

The Sexual Violence Program agrees, when it does not present an undue burden or conflict, to provide or participate in the following:

- A. Appoint a qualified and full-time staff member as a liaison to facilitate communications and assist with delivering accessible services students and employees referred by the IHE. This person shall serve as the primary point of contact between the SVP and the IHE.
- B. Ensure that staff and volunteers supporting the 24-hour rape crisis hotline services are aware of off- and on-campus resources available to students and employees of the IHE.
- C. Provide confidential crisis intervention, counseling, information and referral, and accompaniment to sexual assault forensic examinations and any court proceedings as requested by students and employees. Services may be limited by available resources.
- D. Provide safety planning to students and employees of the IHE, including a discussion of possible campus-specific safety options, such as no-contact orders and special accommodations. If requested by the student or employee, connect them with the designated IHE contact regarding campus-specific safety planning.
- E. Provide students and employees of the IHE with basic information about available options, including how to contact confidential and non-confidential support staff within the IHE and/or how to report a crime to local or campus law enforcement.

- F. Assist the IHE with the development, research, and/or provision of appropriate prevention programming and training to faculty, students, and school officials. In recognition of the limited resources that may be available to the SVP to fulfill this objective, this role may be modified to one of technical assistance, or offering expertise, on promising practices, emerging trends in primary prevention, and capacity-building for on-campus trainers.
  - a. Upon request and with adequate financial and logistical support as needed from the IHE, provide [*specify hours*] of training to IHE [*specify employee categories and particular student groups*] on [*specify topics*]. See section IVB for more information.
  - b. The SVP will strive to ensure a representative is available and present at relevant IHE events, such as health or student resource fairs. The parties understand that, due to the limited availability of resources, the SVP may be unable to provide particular trainings or event representation, and that such trainings or representation may occasionally be beyond the scope of services offered by the SVP. See section IVB for more information.
  - c. SVPs will also support, as much as possible, campus-based research efforts taking place regarding comprehensive prevention programming, as well as share insights and emerging research from the field with campus partners.
- G. Meet quarterly with the IHE's Title IX Coordinator and/or appointed contact(s) from IHE and other relevant staff to share information regarding, but not limited to: the needs of victims, trends in sexual assault service provision, additional services that are recommended for or requested by students and employees, and the effectiveness of the IHE's sexual assault prevention and response program.
- H. Review and discuss with the IHE's Title IX Coordinator and other relevant staff the results of the IHE's campus climate surveys, in an effort to identify needs and areas where the SVP can assist the IHE to improve sexual assault programming, campus culture, and sexual assault response.
- I. Participate in the IHE's coordinated effort to respond to sexual assault disclosures and crises.
- J. Participate in the IHE's efforts to update/revise/strengthen institutional policies regarding sexual misconduct and hate crimes on campus.

### **Institution of Higher Education**

The Institution of Higher Learning agrees, when it does not present an undue burden or conflict, to provide or participate in the following:

- A. Identify a central point of contact for the SVP staff to facilitate coordination and communication between the SVP and the IHE.

- B. Offer the SVP as a confidential off-campus option to students and employees who have disclosed experiences of sexual violence. Referrals may be made by any IHE employee, and the IHE will ensure that all employees likely to receive reports of sexual assault have accurate and up-to-date information and knowledge regarding resources that are available both on- and off- campus. Students and employees who have disclosed experiences of sexual violence will be encouraged to make their own choices about when, where, and whether to receive services.
- C. Provide printed and online materials about services available to students and employees in New Jersey, including materials from the SVP and the New Jersey Coalition Against Sexual Assault. It is highly encouraged that local and state hotline information be included in outreach materials, policy documents (in print and online), and other visible education content.
- D. Provide students and employees with printed and online materials regarding the nearest facility with a forensic nurse examiner (FNE) and sexual assault forensic exam (SAFE) participating facility. Materials will also include information about local community sexual assault response team (SART) processes, including rights regarding pursuing (or not pursuing) law enforcement processes, sexual assault survivor rights, the role of local SVP advocates, and how long evidence can be held for forensic exams.
- E. Provide students and employees with printed and online materials regarding how to obtain campus-based no-contact orders, civil protective orders, and other legal remedies. The IHE shall ensure that students who have disclosed experiences of sexual violence are provided with written information regarding their legal rights and available legal services and advocacy.
- F. Provide printed and online materials about reporting options for students and employees, including information about how to file a grievance with the IHE and how to report a crime to local or campus law enforcement.
- G. Provide the SVP with copies of sexual assault prevention and response materials available to students and employees and organize opportunities to collaborate on strengthening the content of materials.
- H. Collaborate with the SVP on research efforts regarding prevention approaches and activities in order to ensure strategies are consistent with and contribute to promising practices in sexual violence prevention. Prevention programming will reflect principles of effectiveness and be offered at varying times throughout a student's tenure at the IHE, as well as be a part of faculty and staff ongoing development.
- I. Keep the SVP updated on:
  - a. On-campus resources that are available to student and employee victims of sexual assault;

- b. IHE's plans for complying with federal and state requirements for campus sexual assault response;
  - c. Reporting procedures for students or employees who wish to file a report with campus law enforcement;
  - d. Reporting procedures for students or employees who wish to file a grievance with IHE administrators;
  - e. The student code of conduct and disciplinary process; and
  - f. The educational and safety accommodations that are available to students who have experienced a sexual assault.
- J. Keep the SVP updated regarding reporting obligations of IHE employees and identify those employees with whom students can speak confidentially (and any exceptions to that confidentiality). This includes identifying responsible employees under Title IX,<sup>69</sup> and campus security authorities under the Clery Act.<sup>70</sup>
  - K. Keep the SVP updated regarding the IHE's prohibition on retaliation, how allegations of retaliation can be reported, and what protections are available for students who experience retaliation.
  - L. Keep the SVP updated regarding the IHE's policy regarding drug and alcohol consumption or use in the context of a sexual assault report, as well as the IHE's amnesty policy.
  - M. Ensure the availability of the Title IX Coordinator and other relevant staff to meet regularly with the SVP liaison.
  - N. Share results from the IHE's campus climate survey in a timely manner to allow for feedback and insights on strengthening response, education, and prevention efforts.
  - O. Contribute \$[3,000] to the SVP as compensation toward the services provided, including support for liaison services, travel expenses, event representation, and training-related expenses. Additional support may be requested or provided for individual events.

## **V. COMMUNICATION & CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Parties will meet regularly – at least once per quarter – to:

- 1. Share and examine data and research regarding current trends and patterns in sexual assaults both on and off campus;
- 2. Share additional relevant, non-identifying crime data in furtherance of crime prevention goals. The SVP understands that once the IHE becomes aware of an incident of sexual assault, it has obligations to take prompt and appropriate action to investigate, independent of any investigation by local law enforcement.
- 3. Plan implementation and/or evaluation of training and prevention efforts on campus.

4. Provide updates on laws or regulations relevant to sexual violence on campus.

### **Communications Between Parties**

The IHE agrees that if a victim requests confidentiality regarding a reportable incident, Parties will take all reasonable steps to comply with the victim's request or inform the victim when the IHE or SVP cannot ensure confidentiality.

When meeting or referencing survivor needs, Parties will not disclose names or identifying information to other Parties, unless the survivor has provided written consent to being identified after being informed of their right to have identifying information withheld.

- A. All Parties will inform individuals disclosing sexual assault that notification to the IHE - including confidential on-campus resources - will likely result in notice to the campus Title IX coordinator. **However, notification to confidential resources will not result in disclosure of personally identifiable information to the Title IX coordinator.**

### **Privileged & Confidential Resources for Victims**

The Parties acknowledge that communications between victims and Confidential Sexual Violence Advocates operating under the supervision of the SVP, licensed clinical professionals (e.g. counselors or social workers) employed by a SVP, or Clergy Members are privileged communications. The privilege covers all confidential communications with professionals and those who work or volunteer in their offices when the communications are reasonably necessary for the accomplishment of the purpose for which the professional was consulted. Such professionals generally are under no obligation to report incidents of sexual violence, unless the victim is a minor, and can generally claim the privilege in a criminal proceeding.

The Parties further acknowledge that communications between campus-designated "confidential resources" and victims are generally ***protected from disclosure of personally-identifying information*** except in limited circumstances, including potentially in a criminal proceeding unless they qualify as privileged.

Finally, the Parties acknowledge that communications between victims and any Responsible Employees on [Campus] who are NOT designated "confidential resources" are not confidential and are subject to federal and state reporting requirements.

The Parties agree to develop materials to share with each other, with individuals who disclose sexual assault, and with the campus community listing appropriate points of contact on- and off-campus within the above three categories, and including information about the levels of confidentiality and privilege applicable to resources in each category.

## **VI. OTHER PROVISIONS**

This MOU shall begin on [date] and shall terminate on [date]. *[One year is suggested for the first year.]*

This MOU may be renewed at the option of either Party. If each of the Parties desires to renew this MOU, they shall make every effort to exercise this option no later than 60 days prior to MOU expiration.

The individuals executing this agreement on behalf of each party warrants their individual authority to execute the agreement on behalf of their respective agencies and that the agency will be bound by the terms and conditions herein.

This MOU is effective upon signature by each Party. This MOU may be terminated upon 30 days' notice by any Party. This MOU may be amended or terminated by mutual agreement of the Parties. An amendment or termination should be done in writing. This MOU may be executed in counterparts.

Each Party agrees to act in good faith to observe the terms of this MOU; however, nothing in this MOU is intended to require any unlawful or unauthorized act by any Party. Nothing in this MOU shall be interpreted to limit or restrict each of the Parties' legal, jurisdictional, or other rights or obligations with respect to the subject matter of this MOU. No provision of this MOU shall form the basis of a cause of action at law or equity by any Party against any other Party, nor shall any provision of this MOU form the basis of a cause of action at law or equity by any third party.

---

Sexual Violence Program Liaison – Printed  
Name

---

Role

---

Sexual Violence Program Liaison – Signature

---

Date

---

---

Sexual Violence Program Executive Director –  
Printed Name

---

Role

---

Sexual Violence Program Executive Director –  
Signature

---

Date

---

College or University liaison and primary  
point of contact – Printed Name

---

Role

---

College or University liaison and primary  
point of contact – Signature

---

Date

## **Appendix B**

### **Memorandum of Understanding Between [Law Enforcement Agencies] and [Institution of Higher Education]**

#### **I. PARTIES**

This Memorandum of Understanding is between [Institution of Higher Education, or “IHE”] and [Law Enforcement Agency, or “LEA”]. The Parties agree to establish a point of contact for the other with respect to this MOU. [Insert points of contact for each Party]. All information sharing and communications described in this MOU should flow between the designated points of contact established in the “Parties” section of this MOU. Should the Parties of any entity entered in this MOU change, notification of those changes should be made to other Parties as soon as possible.

#### **II. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this MOU is to set forth the respective roles of each party and to memorialize their agreement as to each party’s responsibilities and shared collaborative efforts in responding to reports of campus sexual assaults. The process of developing an MOU fosters open communication among the parties and helps to build relationships necessary to create a successful strategy to reduce sexual assaults. These partnerships are also vital in efforts to change the culture and restore trust and confidence among victims, the accused, families, and the public in how our institutions of higher education and the criminal justice system respond to these crimes.<sup>71</sup>

It is further the purpose of this MOU to enhance safety for students, employees and visitors, and better serve the residents and students in this community, ensure that investigations are comprehensive, aid in disciplinary proceedings, facilitate the prosecution of offenders, respect the legal rights of those accused of sexual assault, and provide appropriate support to victims of sexual assault, this Memorandum of Understanding sets forth the respective roles and responsibilities of the Parties related to the prevention of and response to sexual assault. The Parties acknowledge that the unique circumstances of individual cases may give rise to issues not addressed by this MOU, which may necessitate further discussion and agreement.<sup>72</sup>

Lastly, it is the purpose of this MOU to promote compliance with the numerous state and federal laws that provide specific requirements related to these issues, as outlined in “New Jersey Statutes 18A. Education, Subtitle 8A. Public and Private Institutions of Higher Education, Chapter 61E. Campus Sexual Assault Victim’s Bill of Rights Act”, the



federal Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (“Clery Act”); Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (“Title IX”), and Regulations on the requirements of Title IX, 34 C.F.R. Part 106 – Nondiscrimination on the basis of sex in education programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

### **III. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES<sup>73</sup>**

A. Improving Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration: The Parties agree to enhance communication, coordination, and collaboration to remedy sexual assault, and protect the victim’s confidential information.

B. Championing Campus and Community Safety: The Parties will receive training to assist in the recognition that any allegation regarding sexual misconduct requires sensitive treatment and directly affects the real and perceived safety of all members of a campus community.

C. Upholding Civil Rights, Civil Liberties, and Victims’ Rights: The Parties agree to comply with state and federal laws in a manner that protects individuals’ civil rights and liberties, while prosecuting crimes and championing justice for survivors. The Parties explicitly recognize the distinctions between criminal law and civil law in the handling of sexual assault and violence that arise under both state and federal statutory frameworks.

D. Centering the Victim’s Needs in Responses to Sexual Assault: The Parties agree to institute specialized, trauma-informed responses developed in consultation with campus and community-based victim advocates and delineated in this agreement.

E. Ensuring Accountability & Auditing: In an effort to promote greater transparency, the Parties have, or will implement a means to monitor, record, and accurately maintain all reports of sexual assaults, their outcomes, and processes, while maintaining confidentiality where the law provides. Record retention shall be guided by and in compliance with the State of New Jersey Division of Revenue and Enterprise Services – Records Management Services (RMS) “Records Retention Schedule” as appropriate:

<https://www.nj.gov/treasury/revenue/rms/retention.shtml>

F. Specialized Training and Knowledge: The Parties agree that sexual assault require specialized, trauma-informed training for the Parties and other potential first responders.

G. Respecting the Unique Needs of Undocumented Individuals: Parties should strive to promote policies and practices that address the unique needs of undocumented individuals, including implementing culturally and linguistically appropriate campus and law enforcement services.

#### IV. DEFINITIONS

A. Campus Police- Law Enforcement Agency with sworn members employed by an IHE, whose primary patrol and reporting responsibilities lie therein.

B. Institution of Higher Education, or “IHE”- General definition of institution of higher education as provided by 20 U.S. Code § 1001.

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/1001>

C. Jean Clery Act- In summary, The Clery Act “is a consumer protection law that aims to provide transparency around campus crime policy and statistics”.<sup>74</sup>

<https://clerycenter.org/policy-resources/the-clery-act/>

D. Law Enforcement Agency, or “LEA”- Government agency that is responsible for the enforcement of laws. For purposes of this MOU; the LEA Party or Parties in agreement to this MOU could be Local / Municipal, County, State, or “other” Law Enforcement Agencies.

E. New Jersey Campus Sexual Assault Victim’s Bill of Rights- Rights provided to victims of sexual assault who are students of IHEs or victims of sexual assault that occurs on campus of IHEs. 2013 New Jersey Revised Statutes Title 18A –

EDUCATION Section 18A: 61E <https://law.justia.com/codes/new-jersey/2013/title-18a/section-18a-61e-1/>

F. Sexual Assault- 2018 New Jersey Revised Statutes Title 2C- The New Jersey Code of Criminal Justice Chapter 14, Section 2C:14-2 Sexual Assault Definition.

<https://law.justia.com/codes/new-jersey/2018/title-2c/chapter-14/section-2c-14-2/>

G. Sexual Assault Forensic Exam, or “SAFE”- Also known as a “rape kit”. Exam given, at the consent of the victim, following a sexual assault.

<https://www.rainn.org/articles/rape-kit>

H. Sexual Assault Response Team, or “SART” - The Sexual Assault Response Team consists of a forensic nurse examiner, a confidential sexual violence advocate (CSVA) and a law enforcement officer. The SART uses a team concept in providing the compassionate and all-inclusive medical care, emotional and informative support, along with the gathering of crucial evidence of the sexual assault incident.<sup>75</sup> <https://www.njsp.org/division/operations/sexual-violence-info.shtml>

I. Title IX- The U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) enforces, among other statutes, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX protects people from discrimination based on sex in education programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance.<sup>[6]</sup>  
[https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix\\_dis.html](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html)

## **V. COMMUNICATION, COORDINATION, AND COLLABORATION**

A. The Parties recognize that regardless of which law enforcement agency ultimately has operational responsibility in responding to a sexual assault, other Parties may be the first responder to the report of the crime. Thus, each of the Parties has a responsibility to act in a manner that facilitates an effective law enforcement and institutional response, as well as appropriate treatment of the individual reporting the sexual assault. The Parties agree to enhance communication, coordination, and collaboration to remedy sexual assault and protect the victim’s confidential information. This includes ensuring the appropriate preservation of evidence and coordination with law enforcement to maintain chain of custody and authorize sexual assault forensic examinations.

B. The Parties will keep each other informed about current trends and patterns in sexual assaults both on and off campus by sharing data and analysis via group email exchanges and holding meetings as needed.

C. The Parties agree to coordinate the sharing of information about sexual assaults that may pose a serious threat to the health or safety of the campus and near-campus communities to facilitate the issuance of Clery Act-required timely warnings and emergency notifications. The Parties will create a system, to inform each other about such warnings.

D. The Parties agree to implement, when feasible, communication and information technology infrastructure to promote interoperability of law

enforcement, among other things, public safety radio and recordkeeping systems, and access to time-sensitive information and to coordinate operations to the extent permitted by law.

E. The Parties agree to provide each law enforcement agency with basic temporary workspace as needed for report-writing, interviews, and other basic operational purposes in furtherance of this MOU.

F. The Parties agree to share patrol and sector maps to clarify jurisdictional boundaries. Such maps will clearly depict all buildings and properties that are owned or controlled by the IHE, as well as all buildings and properties that are owned or controlled by recognized student organizations. All maps will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis or when a significant change is made to IHE property or local law enforcement reporting sectors. All modified maps will be shared with all law enforcement-related parties to this MOU. In addition, all maps will indicate any federal or tribal lands that are included in the jurisdictional boundaries, and if any such lands are present, all maps and action plans will be shared with those federal and tribal authorities.

G. With the consent of the victim, or where necessary to ensure the health, safety, or welfare of the campus community, the local law enforcement agency will promptly notify the campus police department or campus security office when students are identified as the victims or suspects of sexual assault that occur off campus, so as to coordinate resources to minimize/prevent further victimization, to trigger appropriate institutional investigative action and disciplinary proceedings against alleged offenders, and to adequately inform the greater campus community of serious ongoing threats to student and employee health and safety. All such notifications to campus authorities will be documented in police incident reports. Except in rare and exigent circumstances, personally identifying information will be shared only with the consent of the victim.<sup>76</sup>

H. IHEs that are made aware of an allegation or potential sexual assault that has occurred on campus property or reported by a student victim or alleged student assailant shall immediately notify Campus Police first (if available / applicable) and LEA second (if no Campus Police present). If there is an identifiable victim, the IHE will respect the victim's request as to whether or not they wish to file a formal report with Campus Police or LEA before doing so.

I. The Parties agree, at the appropriate time and as allowable by federal and state law, to share relevant documentation and other information created and/or maintained during local law enforcement investigations (such as records of interviews) in all cases where a victim of sexual assault consents to this information-sharing, and a victim of sexual assault and/or an alleged suspect are students or employees of an IHE, unless the law enforcement agency determines that the information should not be disclosed due to the risk of harm to any individual, harm to any law enforcement investigation, or other good cause as determined by the law enforcement agency. The purpose of this information-sharing is to ensure the delivery of appropriate services under Title IX, to facilitate full and fair disciplinary investigations, to prevent acts of retaliation against the victim or witnesses, and to assess special threats posed by offenders within the respective jurisdictions as part of an overall effort to prevent the occurrence of similar crimes.<sup>77</sup>

J. The Parties agree to work with internal and external individuals and organizations with expertise in sexual assault prevention and response efforts within their respective jurisdictions, and to hold at least annual meetings to address the effectiveness of their prevention and response policies, procedures and efforts.

K. [LEA] and/or “Campus Police” understands that once [IHE] becomes aware of an incident of sexual assault, it has obligations to take prompt and appropriate action to investigate, independent of any investigation by [LEA] or “Campus Police”. [IHE] understands that [LEA] and/or “Campus Police” may initiate an investigation and prosecution of an incident of sexual assault independent of any campus administrative proceeding.

L. Actions that may not necessarily meet the criteria of a “criminal action” may still be addressed through the IHE’s disciplinary proceedings / process. Further, a criminal disposition or judicial finding of “not guilty” in regards to a criminal matter, does not preclude a finding and or violation of IHE’s policies or procedures.

M. Clery Warnings “The Clery Act requires [IHE] to issue timely warnings for Clery crimes on- and off-campus that pose a serious threat to students and employees and emergency notifications for a significant emergency or dangerous situation

involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees on campus.”<sup>78</sup>

To facilitate the issuance of Clery Act-required timely warnings and emergency notifications, the Parties agree to coordinate the sharing of information as described. The Parties acknowledge [IHE] will inform [LEA] about such warnings as soon as practicable through the points of contact listed in this MOU and/or registering those points of contact to receive those notifications.

## **VI. AFTERMATH, VICTIM RESPONSE, AND EVIDENCE**

A. The Parties agree that in the immediate aftermath of a sexual assault, a victim should be directed to, and receive assistance (including transportation where appropriate) to access services, including referrals to counseling, a health examination and with the victim's consent, a sexual assault forensic examination (SAFE), at no cost to the victim. This is irrespective of whether the victim engages with law enforcement to file formal complaint.

B. The IHE will ensure victims know of the right to report the sexual assault to law enforcement and will assist victims who wish to report to do so promptly, in order to facilitate preservation of evidence and an effective response by trained criminal investigators. The Parties agree that where the sexual assault is reported to an IHE agent or employee, the IHE agent or employee will notify the victim of his or her reporting options, including the right to file a Title IX complaint with the IHE and his or her right to file a criminal complaint. The IHE will provide the victim with information about how to file Title IX and criminal complaints and in no circumstances will the IHE either dissuade or require the victim to make a criminal complaint.

B. In order to ensure a universal response to the victim all agencies agree to follow the New Jersey, “Attorney General Standards for Providing Services to Victims of Sexual Assault”, <https://www.nj.gov/oag/newsreleases18/AG-SART-Standards.pdf>. In addition, all agencies will provide each other with a copy of any applicable Sexual Assault Standard Operating procedures. All Parties may request assistance from, and render assistance to, the other agencies to respond to or investigate reports of sexual assault.

## **VII. SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND TRAINING<sup>79</sup>**

The Parties agree that training will occur in accordance with directives and policy issued by the Office of the Attorney General and Office of the Secretary of Higher Education.

## **VIII. ACCOUNTABILITY<sup>[13]</sup>**

A. The Parties agree to collect data, including a baseline number of sexual assaults from the year prior to entering into the MOU, comparison of baseline numbers to current numbers of cases reported, and for each individual case:

1. Whether the Parties met the MOU requirements and if not, why;
2. Whether the case was successfully prosecuted and if not prosecuted, identification of the reason why the case was not pursued; and
3. Feedback from the victim of his or her view of the process.

B. The Parties agree to collect data regarding the number and types of training each Party provides each year, to conduct regular evaluations of the efficacy of those trainings, and to include such evaluation in their data collection and management reviews to look for trends and areas that will need to be revised in future trainings. The Parties agree to determine common definitions to ensure a valid comparison of data collected.

C. Data collection related to the Parties' actions according to this MOU will be reviewed directly between the Parties on at least an annual basis for sexual assaults. Parties will evaluate changes in the number of reports each year and discuss whether any increases or decreases in reporting are due to changes in actual crime levels or changes in levels of reporting. Performance improvement areas, including strategies to increase levels of reporting and decrease instances of crime, will be identified through review of the data and the responsible party will develop action steps to improve those areas.

D. Each Party representative responsible for implementation of this MOU will meet at least annually to discuss and evaluate effectiveness of the MOU to determine areas for improvement and discuss appropriate next steps.

## IX. CONFIDENTIALITY

Student victim's contact with any of [IHE]'s confidential resources will remain confidential and will not be shared with [LEA] UNLESS:

- A. the student wishes for such information to be shared with [LEA]; or
- B. state or federal laws require that such information be shared with [LEA].

## X. OTHER PROVISIONS

- A. This MOU is effective upon signature by each Party.
- B. This MOU may be terminated upon 30 days' notice by any Party. This MOU may be amended or terminated by mutual agreement of the Parties. An amendment or termination should be done in writing.
- C. This MOU may be executed in counterparts.
- D. The Parties agree that any costs associated with this MOU will be covered as follows [insert any necessary language].
- E. Each Party agrees to act in good faith to observe the terms of this MOU; however, nothing in this MOU is intended to require any unlawful or unauthorized act by any Party. Nothing in this MOU shall be interpreted to limit or restrict each of the Parties' legal, jurisdictional, or other rights or obligations with respect to the subject matter of this MOU.
- F. No provision of this MOU shall form the basis of a cause of action at law or equity by any Party against any other Party, nor shall any provision of this MOU form the basis of a cause of action at law or equity by any third party.

_____	_____
[IHE Administrator] Signature	Date

_____	_____
[Campus Police Chief or Security Director]	Date



_____	_____
[Law Enforcement Agency] Signature	Date

_____	_____
[Prosecutors] Signature	Date

_____	_____
[Other LE] Signature	Date

_____	_____
[Other LE] Signature	Date

_____	_____
[Other LE] Signature	Date

## Appendix C

### Primary Prevention versus Risk Reduction: What's the Difference?<sup>80</sup>

Primary Prevention	Risk Reduction
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Preventing the perpetration of sexual violence; <i>stopping violence before it even occurs.</i>	<b>DEFINITION:</b> Reducing or minimizing the risk of someone becoming a victim.
What's the difference?	
<p><b>Changes the social norms</b> that allow sexual violence to happen.</p> <p>Addresses <b>all forms</b> of sexual violence.</p> <p>Educates on <b>creating safe spaces</b>.</p> <p>Focuses on <b>changing the root causes</b> of sexual violence.</p> <p>Places the responsibility on everyone in the community to eradicate the root causes of sexual violence.</p> <p>Addresses <b>multiple risk factors*</b> of sexual violence perpetration.</p> <p><i>* A risk factor is a characteristic that increases the likelihood of a person becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence.</i></p>	<p>Places the responsibility on the <b>potential victim</b> to prevent violence against themselves.</p> <p>Educates a <b>potential victim</b> on how to stop an attack in progress.</p> <p>Focuses on <b>some forms</b> of sexual violence.</p> <p>Educates on navigating through <b>existing harmful spaces</b>.</p> <p>Focuses on <b>individual acts of sexual violence</b>, but not the root causes.</p> <p><b>Does not address risk factors</b> of sexual violence perpetration.</p>
Activity Examples	
<p>A <b>comprehensive, multi-session</b> educational program implemented in a school with faculty and students that addresses gender inequity.</p> <p><b>Ongoing education</b> and support to parents on boundaries and building empathy.</p>	<p>Self-defense classes for the purpose of <b>fending off a potential attacker</b>.</p> <p>Drug-detection materials (color-changing coasters, straws, glasses, nail polish, etc. for the purpose of detecting GHB)</p> <p>Mace or pepper spray; rape whistles.</p>
Keep in mind...	

<p>One risk factor alone does not create sexual violence, but rather a combination of risk factors.</p> <p>There is not one specific primary prevention strategy that addresses all risk factors.</p> <p>While working to decrease risk factors, we can work to increase protective factors* against violence.</p> <p>Primary prevention requires a change in beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors across all layers of our society in order to see a shift in the culture.</p> <p>* A <b>protective factor</b> is a characteristic that decreases the likelihood of a person becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence because it provides a buffer against risk.</p>	<p>Risk reduction strategies do not acknowledge the reality of most sexual violence incidents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The majority of survivors know and trust the person who harmed them - it is not a stranger.</li> <li>● When the fight, flight, or freeze survivor modes are activated, survivors may experience the freeze reaction (not by choice)</li> </ul> <p>Some strategies, like self-defense, can be empowering for some, but should not be relied upon to prevent violence.</p> <p>Risk reduction strategies can inadvertently increase victim-blaming attitudes and behaviors by placing the responsibility on the victim rather than the perpetrator.</p>
--	--

## Appendix D

### Additional Resources

#### Prevention and Education

“Addressing Gender-Based Violence on College Campuses: Guide to a Comprehensive Model.” Changing Our Campus, n.d. Accessed December 30, 2019.

<http://changingourcampus.org/documents/FINAL-GBV-Comprehensive-Model-22117.pdf>

This report provides background information and best practices for institutions to address gender-based violence on college campuses. The authors provide a framework for campuses to help begin a discussion on how to address and engage the community, as well as implement programs to reduce gender-based violence.

“Addressing Sexual and Relationship Violence on College and University Campuses.”

(2016) [pdf] American College Health Association. Accessed December 30, 2019.

[https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/Addressing Sexual Violence.pdf](https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/Addressing_Sexual_Violence.pdf).

The American College Health Association takes an ecological approach to preventing sexual and relationship violence on campuses providing recommendations in the following areas: prevention of sexual and relationship violence, risk reduction, and responding and supporting to sexual and relationship violence.

“Establishing Prevention Programming: Strategic Planning for Campuses.” (2014). U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. Accessed December 30, 2019. <https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/page/file/913331/download>.

The Office on Violence Against Women provides institutional leaders with guidelines and questions to help in the development of their institution’s strategic planning to address sexual violence.

“Prevention Programming Matrix.” Culture of Respect, NASPA. Accessed December 30, 2019. <https://cultureofrespect.org/programs-and-tools/matrix/>.

The Prevention Programming Matrix is a free tool that provides a list of evidence-based prevention programs. The matrix includes descriptions of the program, level of evidence available, descriptions of the format and target audience.

“Sexual Violence Prevention.” Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed December 30, 2019.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/index.html>.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides a wide range of resources and information on sexual violence including: a technical package of strategies, fast facts, prevention strategies, and additional resources.

### **Services for Survivors and Accused Students**

“Technical Assistance Documents.” Center on Violence Against Women and Children. Accessed December 31, 2019. <https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/rutgers-university-model/campus-sexual-violence-resources>.

The Center on Violence Against Women and Children at Rutgers University has provided technical assistance resources for addressing interpersonal violence. The documents include: running support groups, trauma-informed services, and establishing a comprehensive victim services program on campus.

“Victim Bill of Rights.” End Sexual Violence. Rutgers University. Accessed December 30, 2019. <http://endsexualviolence.rutgers.edu/policies-and-key-terms/victim-bill-of-rights/>.

The working group recognizes that impact of violence on victims and the surrounding community can be severe and long-lasting. Rutgers has adopted this Bill of Rights to articulate requirements for policies, procedures, and services designed to ensure that the needs of victims are met. Colleges and universities in New Jersey may adopt a similar framework to create and maintain communities that support human dignity.

“Where to start: A Guide to Safety Planning with Victims of Campus Sexual Violence.” Victim Rights Law Center. Accessed December 30, 2019.  
<https://www.victimrights.org/sites/default/files/VRLC%20MSCASA%20Safety%20Planning%20with%20Campus%20Sexual%20Assault%20Victims.pdf>.

This guide for administrators helps inform current gaps and next steps on campuses in order to help develop a more informed and appropriate response to sexual violence on campus.

## Investigation and Adjudication

“Research-Informed Methods for Sanctioning Students Found Responsible for Sexual Misconduct.” Changing Campus Culture, November 17, 2019.  
<https://vimeo.com/304220128>.

Changing Campus Culture provides a free video resource regarding informed sanctioning practices.

Smith, N E. “The Old College Trial: Evaluating the Investigative Model for Adjudicating Claims of Sexual Misconduct.” *Colum. L. Rev.* 117, no. 953 (2017).  
<https://columbialawreview.org/content/the-old-college-trial-evaluating-the-investigative-model-for-adjudicating-claims-of-sexual-misconduct/>.

The author explores procedures for addressing student-perpetrated sexual misconduct with a focus on the investigative model exploring what schools need to consider based on case law.

“Statement on Trauma-Informed Responses to Sexual Assault.” EVAWI Resource Library. EVAWI, September 23, 2019.  
<https://www.evawintl.org/Library/Detail.aspx?ItemID=1341>.

End Violence Against Women International recently issued a press release detailing the common misunderstandings of trauma-informed investigation and discussed the benefits for all investigators (police, college, etc.) to utilize this practice.

“SUNY Student Conduct Institute.” SUNY. Accessed December 31, 2019.  
<https://system.suny.edu/sci/>.

The SUNY Student Conduct Institute trains staff at public and private institutions of higher education on how to fairly and equitably investigate and adjudicate conduct violations and disclosures.

“Title IX.” Addressing Sexual Violence. TCNJ. Accessed December 31, 2019.  
<https://titleix.tcnj.edu/policies/>; and “University of Michigan Policy & Procedures on Student Sexual & Gender-Based Misconduct & Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence.” University of Michigan. Accessed December 31, 2019.  
<https://studentsexualmisconductpolicy.umich.edu/>.

The College of New Jersey and the University of Michigan are two of the first institutions to create and implement an alternative resolution process, based in restorative practices, into their Title IX policies.

## Community Collaboration

“Minimum Standards for Creating a Coordinated Community Response to Violence Against Women on Campus.” U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. Accessed December 30, 2019.  
<https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ovw/legacy/2008/01/11/standards-for-ccr.pdf>.

The Office on Violence Against Women provides guidelines for creating a coordinated community response team.

## Evaluation and Assessment

“Campus Violence Prevention Resource Guide.” CALCASA. Accessed December 30, 2019.  
[http://www.calcasa.org/wp-content/uploads/files/calcasa\\_campus\\_violence\\_prevention\\_resource\\_guide.pdf](http://www.calcasa.org/wp-content/uploads/files/calcasa_campus_violence_prevention_resource_guide.pdf)

This guide provides information to administrators regarding strengthening policies, improving support services, and utilizing prevention education.

Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). “Sexual Violence on Campus: Strategies for Prevention.” Centers for Disease Control and National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Accessed December 30, 2019.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/campusvprevention.pdf>.

This guide recommends the use of data, specifically climate surveys, to tailor prevention efforts to the needs of the campus. It includes the recommendation that prevention plans and evaluation plans be developed simultaneously and that results should be shared with the community.

“Protecting Students from Sexual Assault.” The United States Department of Justice Archives. U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women. Accessed December 30, 2019. <https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>.

This website provides resources, including the Not Alone Toolkit and a section on campus climate surveys.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault (CSA) study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.
- <sup>2</sup> Gentlewarrior, S., & Fountain, K. (2009). Culturally competent service provision to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender survivors of sexual violence. In *Applied Research Forum (Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2009)*, <http://www.vawnet.org> (pp. 171-72).
- <sup>3</sup> The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 State Report. Atlanta, GA. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- <sup>4</sup> Curtis, M. J., & Love, T. (2009). Tools for change: An introduction to the primary prevention of sexual assault.
- <sup>5</sup> DeGue, S. (2014). Evidence-based strategies for the primary prevention of sexual violence perpetration. *Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: lessons from research and practice*.
- <sup>6</sup> DeGue, S. (2014). Evidence-based strategies for the primary prevention of sexual violence perpetration. *Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: lessons from research and practice*.
- <sup>7</sup> DeGue, S. (2014). Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>9</sup> Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). Sexual violence on campus: Strategies for prevention.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>12</sup> Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2003) Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32, 61-79.
- <sup>13</sup> Borges, A. M., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2008). Clarifying consent: Primary prevention of sexual assault on a college campus. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 36(1-2), 75-88.
- <sup>14</sup> Dixie, K. (2018). Defining consent as a factor in sexual assault prevention.
- <sup>15</sup> Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). Sexual violence on campus: Strategies for prevention.
- <sup>16</sup> Sharoni, S., & Klocke, B. (2019). Faculty confronting gender-based violence on campus: opportunities and challenges. *Violence against women*, 25(11), 1352-1369.
- <sup>17</sup> Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). Sexual violence on campus: Strategies for prevention.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>19</sup> Melanie A. Beres, Gareth J. Treharne & Zoran Stojanov (2019): A whole campus approach to sexual violence: the University of Otago Model, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, DOI: 10.1080/1360080X.2019.1613298
- <sup>20</sup> Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). Sexual violence on campus: Strategies for prevention.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup> Adapted from NJCASA Primary Prevention VS. Risk Reduction Document and Curtis, M. J., & Love, T. (2009). Tools for change: An introduction to the primary prevention of sexual assault.
- <sup>23</sup> Resource from <https://cultureofrespect.org/programs-and-tools/matrix/>
- <sup>24</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> McMahon, S., Camerer, K., Burnham, J., Snyder, S. & Buttner, C. (2019). Establishing a Comprehensive Victim Services Program on Campus. Retrieved from: <https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/rutgers-university-model/campus-sexual-violence-resources>
- <sup>28</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014b). Building Partnerships with Local Rape Crisis Centers: Developing a Memorandum of Understanding. Retrieved from:



- 
- <sup>29</sup> Campus Technical Assistance and Resource Project (CTARP). (2015). Addressing gender-based violence on college campuses: Guide to a comprehensive model. Retrieved from <http://changingourcampus.org/documents/FINAL-GBV-Comprehensive-Model-22117.pdf>
- <sup>30</sup> National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC). (2013). Building cultures of care: A guide for sexual assault services programs. Retrieved from [http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications\\_nsvrc\\_guides\\_building-cultures-ofcare.pdf](http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_guides_building-cultures-ofcare.pdf)
- <sup>31</sup> Campus Technical Assistance and Resource Project (CTARP). (2015). Addressing gender-based violence on college campuses: Guide to a comprehensive model. Retrieved from <http://changingourcampus.org/documents/FINAL-GBV-Comprehensive-Model-22117.pdf>
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). (2015). A safer campus: A guidebook on prevention and response to sexual and intimate partner violence and stalking for Ohio campuses. Retrieved from [https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/CampusSafety/ASafer-Campus\\_Final-Draft\\_071515.pdf](https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/CampusSafety/ASafer-Campus_Final-Draft_071515.pdf)
- <sup>35</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014b). Building Partnerships with Local Rape Crisis Centers: Developing a Memorandum of Understanding. Retrieved from:
- <sup>36</sup> Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). (2015). A safer campus: A guidebook on prevention and response to sexual and intimate partner violence and stalking for Ohio campuses. Retrieved from [https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/CampusSafety/ASafer-Campus\\_Final-Draft\\_071515.pdf](https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/CampusSafety/ASafer-Campus_Final-Draft_071515.pdf)
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>38</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014b). Building Partnerships with Local Rape Crisis Centers: Developing a Memorandum of Understanding.
- <sup>39</sup> NJ CASA. "Core Competencies: New Jersey Confidential Sexual Violence Advocates." Retrieved from <https://njcasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/22-April-2015-Manual-Content.pdf>
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>42</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>43</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (WHTFPSSA) (2014). Checklist for Campus Sexual Misconduct Policies. Retrieved from: <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/page/file/910271/download>
- <sup>44</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>45</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>47</sup> Addressing Campus Sexual Violence – Creating Safer Higher Education Communities. NJ Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault Report and Recommendations. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>49</sup> <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ss.20255>

- 
- <sup>50</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2017). "Preventing and addressing campus sexual misconduct: a guide for university and college presidents, chancellors, and senior administrators." Washington, D.C.
- <sup>51</sup> <https://titleix.tcnj.edu/policies/>
- <sup>52</sup> <https://titleix.cornell.edu/reporting/amnesty/>
- <sup>53</sup> New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault (2017). "Addressing campus sexual violence: creating safer higher education communities."  
<https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>54</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2017). "Preventing and addressing campus sexual misconduct: a guide for university and college presidents, chancellors, and senior administrators." Washington, D.C.  
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/images/Documents/1.4.17.VAW%20Event.Guide%20for%20College%20Presidents.PDF>
- <sup>55</sup> N.J.S.A 84A:22.14: "Definitions"; N.J.S.A 2A: 84A-22.15: *Victim counselor confidentiality privilege.* "
- <sup>56</sup> National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention. Reviewed 2019. "Prevention Strategies."  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/prevention.html>
- <sup>57</sup> Dills J., Fowler D., Payne G. (2016) "Sexual violence on campus: strategies for prevention." Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/campusvprevention.pdf>
- <sup>58</sup> New Jersey Coalition Against Sexual Assault (2016). "Meaningful social change: primary prevention."  
[https://njcasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Prevention-Philosophy\\_Web.pdf](https://njcasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Prevention-Philosophy_Web.pdf)
- <sup>59</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, *Ibid.*
- <sup>60</sup> Basile K.C., DeGue S., Jones K., et al. (2016). "STOP sv: a technical package to prevent sexual violence." Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/SV-Prevention-Technical-Package.pdf>
- <sup>61</sup> New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault (2017). "Addressing campus sexual violence: creating safer higher education communities."  
<https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>62</sup> New Jersey Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault (2017). "Addressing campus sexual violence: creating safer higher education communities."  
<https://www.nj.gov/highereducation/documents/pdf/index/sexualassaulttaskforcereport2017.pdf>
- <sup>63</sup> White House Task Force on Protecting Students (2015) "Building Partnerships among Law Enforcement Agencies, Colleges and Universities: Developing a Memorandum of Understanding to Prevent and Respond Effectively to Sexual Assaults at Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.  
<https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/page/file/910376/download>
- <sup>64</sup> Listening to Our Communities: Assessment Toolkit (2014). <https://www.nsvrc.org/publications/nsvrc-publications-toolkits/listening-our-communities-assessment-toolkit>
- <sup>65</sup> Stith, S., Pruitt, I., Dees, J., Fronce, M., Green, Som, A., & Linkh, (2006). Implementing community-based prevention programming: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 27 (6), 599-617.
- <sup>66</sup> NASPA Culture of Respect, <https://www.naspa.org/focus-areas/violence-prevention/culture-of-respect>
- <sup>67</sup> Caldwell University. (2018). "Caldwell is recipient of Justice Dept. Grant."  
<https://www.caldwell.edu/news/caldwell-university-is-recipient-of-justice-department-grant>
- <sup>68</sup> This section was modified from California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General's "TEMPLATE MOU MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING." Retrieved October 2016 from <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/campus/template-mou.pdf>
- <sup>69</sup> A "responsible employee" is a term of art under Title IX, and refers to any employee who has the authority to redress sexual harassment, who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual harassment or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate school designee, or whom a student could reasonably believe has this duty or authority.
- <sup>70</sup> A "campus security authority" is a term of art under the Clery Act, and includes campus police or security officers, persons who have responsibility for campus security, persons who have been designated by the IHE to receive reports of criminal offenses, and IHE officials who have significant responsibility for student and campus activities.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ohio Attorney General's Campus Sexual Assault Initiatives Report 2018, Reviewed 2019. "Appendix A: Recommendations for Crafting a Memorandum of Understanding Between Critical Partners Responding to Reports of Campus Sexual Assault". <https://www.ohioattorneygeneral.gov/Files/Publications-Files/Publications-for-Schools/Campus-Sexual-Assault-Initiative-Report> WEB

<sup>72</sup> White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2017). "Preventing and addressing campus sexual misconduct: a guide for university and college presidents, chancellors, and senior administrators." Washington, D.C. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/images/Documents/1.4.17.VAW%20Event.Guide%20for%20College%20Presidents.PDF>

<sup>73</sup> California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General's "TEMPLATE MOU MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING." Viewed September 2019 from <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/campus/template-mou.pdf>

<sup>74</sup> Clery Center, "Summary of the Jeanne Clery Act" Viewed September 2019 from <https://clerycenter.org/policy-resources/the-clery-act/>

<sup>75</sup> State of New Jersey Department of Law & Public Safety Office of the Attorney General, New Jersey State Police "Sexual Violence Information", Viewed September 2019. <https://www.njsp.org/division/operations/sexual-violence-info.shtml>

<sup>76</sup> Prior to obtaining consent from the victim to share personally identifying information, the local law enforcement agency should inform victims of sexual assault that notification to the campus police department or campus security office likely will also result in notice to the campus Title IX coordinator.

<sup>77</sup> The local law enforcement agency and the campus police department will develop a plan regarding the jurisdiction of each agency over sexual assault, including but not limited to geographic locations and types of crimes. Such plans also may involve information-sharing to ensure both agencies can promptly and effectively respond to crimes within their jurisdiction and appropriately refer any that fall outside their jurisdiction.

<sup>78</sup> California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General's "TEMPLATE MOU MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING." Viewed September 2019 from <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/campus/template-mou.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> This section is a modified combination of California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General's "TEMPLATE MOU MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.", the White House Task Force on Protecting Students (2015) "Building Partnerships among Law Enforcement Agencies, Colleges and Universities: Developing a Memorandum of Understanding to Prevent and Respond Effectively to Sexual Assaults at Colleges and Universities, and the NJ Attorney General Guidelines.

<sup>80</sup> This resource was created by the New Jersey Coalition Against Sexual Assault.

Mercy, J., et. al. (1993). Public Health Policy for Preventing Violence. Health Affairs. 12(4), 7-29  
Smith, S.G., Chen, J., Basile, K.C., Gilbert, L.K., Merrick, M.T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 State Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

