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Abstract
In Missoula: Rape and the Justice System in a College Town, Jon Krakauer explores the topic of campus-related sexual assaults and the circumstances, reporting impediments, and prevalence of them in a college town over the course of two years. This article offers a look at some of the key takeaways from the book for those who daily work on college and university campuses to prevent and address sexual assault.
Author Jon Krakauer is commonly known for his meticulous investigations into stories about adventure and tragedy, as in the case of his 1996 bestseller “Into the Wild.” In his latest effort Missoula: Rape and the Justice System in a College Town, Krakauer explores the topic of campus-related sexual assaults and the circumstances, reporting impediments, and prevalence of them in a college town over the course of two years.

Krakauer is not a college administrator, lawyer, or survivor of sexual assault. Rather, he is a journalist who is investigating a serious topic and offering perspective and information in a format geared towards those outside of the field. He accomplishes his goal, in part by allowing the survivors of assault themselves to retell their harrowing experiences of the crimes. Additionally, he details their subsequent quests for justice through the criminal and administrative processes with additional points of view from administrators, prosecutors, and the accused.

There is little that is inferred or left to the imagination in the review of these cases. For those new to the topic, the stories may seem graphic and intense, but are all too common place for professionals tasked with addressing such claims. The empirical research that undergirds the storytelling aspect of the book is relevant and supports the challenging of popularly held “rape myths” that are stated to have colored the investigations and adjudications of these cases. The work of clinical psychologist Dr. David Lisak is used in explaining the varied responses by survivors to having been assaulted. In addition to identifying characteristics of serial offenders, his research addresses common behaviors of survivors, such as attempting to normalize the assault by subsequent contact and the lack of physical resistance during an attack.

One glaring instance of a rape myth being espoused by an official is detailed in an exchange between Police Chief Mark Muir and University of Montana (UM) student Kerry Barrett. After inquiring about the lack of charges brought forward regarding numerous sexual assault complaints, Barrett stated that she engaged in a conversation with Muir about how she was asked whether or not she had a boyfriend by the investigating officer. She took offense to the question and assumed it was asked based on a belief that many women “make up” allegations to absolve them from instances of infidelity. She expanded that she believed false reporting was noted in less than 10 percent of cases, according to current studies. Barrett then recounted that Muir responded by stating, “Actually, you’re wrong. The rate of false claims is around 50 percent” (p. 103). Several days later, Barrett reported that Muir followed up with an email that included a 2009 article written by Bruce Gross referencing a now debunked study claiming that 45 percent of rapes reported were found to be false. The study “examined one police department in a small Midwestern city and took police officers at their word when they classified a case as false.” (p. 104). Moreover, the study included the threat and use of polygraphs in sexual assault cases, an inadvisable practice in any realm of addressing these matters.

It should be noted that Chief Muir since retired and clarified his statement to Barrett in a Huffington Post interview last year. He stated that he didn’t believe the high numbers, but “wanted to be perfectly clear that there are studies that have been done. Not everyone supports them, but that [false reports] may be as high as 40 to 50 percent.” (Kingkade, 2014, para. 18).

No population of campus offenders gets more attention in the media than male athletes. Missoula spends a considerable amount of time describing the culture and reverence toward members of the football team in the community. Two notable cases in the book detail the campus adjudication and criminal trials of Linebacker Beau Donaldson and Quarterback Jordan Johnson.

Donaldson admitted, in taped confessions on two different occasions, to sexually assaulting a childhood friend while she slept at his near-campus apartment. The case is a testament to the impediments that exist in the reporting and resulting processes that take place. A seeming “slam dunk” of a case required several disclosures and recounting of the experience, in addition to unnecessary advocacy and contretemps with prosecuting attorneys for an appropriate sentence.

The case of Jordan Johnson provides for a glimpse into the shortcomings — supported by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Department of Education (DOE) — of the university procedures that existed. Johnson was found responsible for violating sexual misconduct policies by a university board by a preponderance of evidence. Johnson proceeded to appeal not once, but three times, prior to having the case decided in his favor after being remanded back to the dean by the Commissioner of Higher Education, with instructions to use a “clear and convincing” standard. Noticeably absent from the process was the ability of the complainant to similarly appeal or equitably participate in subsequent reviews.

Krakauer highlights another phenomena related to the reporting of sexual assaults involving college athletes in the response received via social media. Devoted fans of the team took to Twitter and fan forum sites to question motives, harass, and ridicule the victims who reported. The rape myth of a star athlete being able to have sex with “anyone he wants” is alive and well on our campuses and in our court systems; this was put on display throughout the entirety of the book.

If there was an antagonist in the book, outside of the accused rapists,
it would be Kristen Pabst, the deputy county prosecutor from 2005–2012. She at one point participated in a campus proceeding as a witness, brought forward by the respondent, to explain why she chose not to prosecute the matter in criminal court. The author points out that this was not uncommon in that, under her leadership, the department prosecuted “only 12 percent of sexual-assault cases involving adult women referred by the Missoula Police Department” (p. 234). As the responsible party for prosecuting cases of rape in Missoula, she is a central figure in the DOJ’s criticism of the department’s reluctance to bring matters to trial.

Pabst’s involvement in the Johnson case was particularly interesting, considering that she had recently left her job in 2012 to start her own firm. Shortly after her resignation, she filed paperwork to have the case against Johnson dropped and remained part of his legal team throughout the trial. After a successful acquittal of her very popular client, she ran and was elected Missoula County Attorney in 2014.

The focus on the titular town and the University of Montana could have easily been shifted toward Eugene, Tallahassee, Waco, or numerous other college towns failing to respond as a system regarding cases of sexual assault. The issues addressed are not anomalous, and the “blueprint” established by the DOJ and DOE in response can be applied broadly. Climate surveys, appropriate training, and partnerships between the university and police were not only part of the resolution agreement, but are close to being codified for all campuses through legislation, with potential significant financial penalties if not adhered to.

The predominant emotion of most readers of Missoula will be frustration at systems that have shortcomings and have too long allowed for a passive and ineffective approach to handling these difficult cases. While many institutions have taken note of the particular shortcomings of the UM grievance procedures, resources, and educational efforts, as outlined in the DOJ report, plenty of work still exists to be done.

Missoula offers an intense read that captures the importance of the work being done by colleagues in and out of higher education around this topic. One of the essential takeaways from the book is the exposure of the lasting impact of sexual assault on survivors and the dignity sought throughout their individual journeys to justice. While Krakauer may be limited by not having the lived experience of an administrator, lawyer, or survivor, he does offer a significant platform for this issue to be discussed that few others have been able to accomplish.
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Abstract
As colleges and universities around the nation begin to institute sexual violence prevention and awareness programs for their students, there must be consideration for international students. International students come from different faiths and cultures, and have different ideologies, which may cause them to have trouble understanding key concepts presented in sexual violence programming. Most of the programs used by institutions of higher education are created with the domestic student in mind. California State University, San Bernardino, has created alternative cultural programming for sexual violence and bystander intervention training for international students, keeping cultural sensitivity and competency in mind. As a result, there has been an increase in foreign students self-reporting experienced acts sexual violence and sexual harassment to the university, as compared to previous years.
Introduction

Colleges and universities around the country are facing a unique challenge in educating their student populations on Title IX. Many mandated trainings and prevention programs for students have been created for domestic students in mind, while culturally specific programs for foreign students are not available. The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault has recently called for colleges and universities to offer bystander intervention programs on campuses as part of prevention and awareness strategies to eliminate sexual violence (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). Although there are many logistical issues surrounding mandating sexual violence training for all students, focusing on foreign students has yet to be addressed. According to Kimble, Burbridge, & Flack Jr., “research shows that people are more at risk of being targeted by sexual predators during times of transition: In the first few weeks of university or during study abroad programs” (as cited in Jorgensen, 2014). Students from other countries and cultures often grapple with the stressors that come with residing in a new environment, becoming proficient in a new language, and adjusting to new academic standards.

There is not a one-size-fits-all approach to training programs on Title IX, bystander intervention, and affirmative consent. Schools must consider the diversity of their audiences in sexual violence prevention training. With so much cultural diversity in higher education, we are faced with educating those who may have different cultural standards, beliefs, and expectations. Cultural barriers and language comprehension can also be a roadblock to effective training for international students.

Throughout your training programs, you might notice that international students do not actively participate as much as others. They might feel too intimidated to ask questions, or fail to fully understand the legal complexities that are involved with Title IX investigations as the process is described to them or what bystander intervention really entails. Perhaps they are insecure about their language competency, or they feel as though asking a clarifying question in a group setting will tarnish their self-image. How do campuses make certain that this diverse group fully understands its rights and options under Title IX? Are colleges and universities confirming that international students understand the spirit of Title IX, or are they merely going through the motions to just “get it done” for compliance reasons? Moreover, Title IX coordinators must understand that there is a fundamental need for specialized education efforts for prevention and awareness based on their unique target audiences.

Training our domestic students is an undertaking in and of itself. They enroll in our colleges and universities to increase their knowledge in certain academic areas of their choice. They often feel it a burden to be required to attend trainings and workshops about moral or social justice issues that are meant to educate them as whole persons. They also are mostly unaware of how federal laws such as Title IX affect them and place requirements on educational institutions to train them on these issues to decrease and end sexual violence on college campuses.

Many of those who are unaware of what bystander intervention and affirmative consent training is commonly ask, “Why do you have to have teach kids how to consent to sex? Shouldn’t their parents be teaching them?” It’s a common and sensible question to ask, although we cannot assume that parents are teaching their children about sex and consent. Statistics on sexual assault on college campuses illustrate how common acquaintance rape is, and the historical underreporting of these crimes.

I enjoy speaking to students at trainings and in passing as I go about campus. This generation of students has grown up with technology their entire lives. They are digital natives. They live their lives online through various social media outlets, and their attention spans have grown accustomed to watching a short Vine clip or Instagram video. They’ve grown to expect administrators to get to the point and share our messages all within a short allotment of characters or within 15 seconds.

Being considerate of their time, I tend to put a lot of energy into my presentations, especially with Title IX. Title IX is a serious topic to begin with, and “Title IX” is not the best descriptor of what the training or program will encompass. When training domestic students, it is important to be relatable to them, and to share lived experiences to keep them engaged. Students would rather have an open dialogue than sit through a one-hour PowerPoint presentation where someone unenthusiastically reads through each bullet point. I tend to be more physically animated when speaking with students, more so than when I present to a group consisting of university leadership. I find YouTube clips with young men and women that students can relate to. These clips about bystander intervention or consent are frank, open, and honest about these subjects. I believe it’s important for students to hear and see members of their generation talking to them about current topics in sexual violence, because they will most likely pay more attention to it than to a university administrator. For example, I once used a YouTube video clip from a young woman who posted “100 Ways to Say No to Sex.” It came after a few presentation slides, and it broke up the monotony of the presentation with comedic relief. The overwhelming chorus of laughter from the students in the audience as they watched the video showed me that they were actively listening. They became interested in the rest of the presentation, but they also learned from someone of their generation that it’s OK to say “no” to sex if you don’t feel like it. That seemed to be more effective than listening to a prepared lecture from a typical college administrator in a suit.
for Title IX. International students have challenges that are threefold: although the challenge educating domestic students still applies, students from international locations have more to lose with training for Title IX. International students have challenges that are threefold:

1. They come from countries where the rule of law is different. Many international students may not understand what “Title IX” is by definition because the laws in their country may not reflect the same standards, nor would they understand why college administrators are charged with investigating a crime. Perhaps these issues are kept squarely in the realm of law enforcement, legal professionals, or even religious leaders. Moreover, they might not understand the process of equity in Title IX investigations if they are accustomed to a different presumption of innocence. Law is rooted in culture, and for many foreign students, they must understand the political, social, and economic history that surrounds the legal system. The less a culture is similar to that of the United States, the stronger the chance the legal system they are accustomed to will be considerably different. (Svarney, p. 228).

2. Many international students come from different countries that have taught them different perspectives or ideas of what sexual violence is. Being exposed to a particular culture from birth until the start of adulthood cements their thoughts on what they feel is normative behavior. Perhaps students come from areas of the world where gender inequity is normal and a basic part of their culture, and where being a female is seen as a disadvantage or impairment. Other international students have been taught from an early age that saying “no” is offensive. In a study on the global perspectives of sexual behaviors, researchers found that “abstinence might not be an option where first sexual relations are forced, where sexual abuse of adolescents is common, and where financial circumstances force young people to sell sex” (Welling, Columbien, Slaymaker, Singh, Hodges, Patel & Bajos, p. 1718). How do Title IX coordinators successfully convey sexual violence training when there is a fundamental difference of cultural perceptions of sexual behavior or where their own experiences or circumstances are rooted in the socio-economic state of their own nation of origin?

3. When English is not students’ first language, comprehension issues are likely to exist. “Difficulties have been reported with English-language proficiency and with adjustments to the American culture that might contribute to academic stress. Furthermore, international students have difficulties adapting to a new educational system in such a short period of time” (Misra & Castillo, p. 132). Even though the challenge with our domestic students is to get them engaged in training, they understand the language I’m training them in. If you are unable to capture your audience in person, the likelihood of their engagement and understanding of the content is going to be very limited. As a result, all of our training presentations for international students have been transcribed into different languages so students can follow along if they feel it is more preferential to read than listen to me.

I was recently told of an incident between a brother and sister from a Middle Eastern country. It was an alleged domestic violence incident stemming from a disagreement on how the male student wanted to go back home but was unable to because he had the customary obligation to accompany his sister while she studied in the United States. He felt homesick, but she did not want to give up the academic work she had already completed. On the surface, I wondered why they had the argument, and why the male student couldn’t just go back home if he chose to do so. I clearly did not have my multi-cultural glasses on, and only observed the disagreement through my own cultural lenses. It was further explained to me that in this specific culture, a male relative must accompany a female out of the country, and only she had the authority to release him from his duty. To complicate things further, and what the crux of the matter was in this situation, was that if she did release her brother from his obligation, she would have to go back home too. If she did not go home, she could face ostracism from her family. Cases like these, where international customs do not follow our own gender equity ideals, are difficult to address when there is so much on the line for a student.

Furthermore, when the university introduced its mandatory sexual violence online training for all students, I received emails from faculty members concerned about the perceived lack of faith-based sensitivity for Middle Eastern students. They were concerned about the overt sexual tones of the programming, and how insensitive the program was to students whose culture highly disapproves of open sexual discourse, particularly female students who are married and who may feel uncomfortable with the scenarios presented throughout the online program. They felt that the program was created specifically for domestic students, who have no worries of facing a cultural backlash
after being exposed to what the faculty members deemed to be explicit sexual programming.

I appreciated the concern the faculty had for the well being of their students, and I was happy to talk about the work we did before we implemented the mandatory programming. My responses back to the concerned faculty members included information about our programmatic efforts to provide alternative options for students with faith-based or cultural sensitivity issues. Once the faculty read and understood the options we had carefully and thoughtfully created for this population of students, they became active supporters and felt our alternative training option was an excellent idea. They became advocates and intermediaries for us, helping to bridge the gap between their international students and the facilitators of the alternative workshops.

Since our campuses represent a salad bowl of tossed global chasms, we need to put on our multicultural glasses before we conduct training on a campuswide level. We need to understand each group before we mandate that they complete something they may not feel comfortable doing based on their cultural beliefs. We need to sit down with faculty and staff members who interact with international students on a daily basis to get a crash course on cultures from around the world before we force our culture and laws onto them. We need to make sure that we adapt our training and programs on sexual violence in a way that is culturally sensitive, but in a way that is also easy to comprehend from a foreign viewpoint. Why is Title IX and ending sexual violence important on college campuses around this country? How does consent look around the world, and how do we teach foreign students to say “no” when they don’t want to have sex? Title IX coordinators have an opportunity to relate Title IX, consent, and bystander intervention to international students as a way to discuss North American culture as it relates to sexual violence. These students come to our colleges and universities not only for the academics, but also for the experience of a new culture and surroundings. Although they have been raised in a specific culture that may not be similar to ours in the United States, they come to our campuses ready to learn; they are open and receptive to new ideas and concepts.

The One-Size-Fits All Approach

When we began the logistical implementation planning for our mandatory student training for sexual violence, many concerns were brought forward from all areas of faculty and leadership. Since I was new in my position at California State University, San Bernardino, I was not yet familiar with the diversity we had in our student body, and what that meant for our planned training. I did not think or even realize that our students were different, and viewed sexual violence through their own unique perspectives in life and culture. For instance, we have an international student population who would most likely have strong religious objections to taking the mandatory planned online program. The more we thought about it, the more we began to uncover problems, much like peeling an onion’s layers back. The one-size-fits-all approach does not work for sexual violence prevention training, especially if it is to be mandated or required, with consequences such as a registration hold.

Many institutions have opted to use online programming to satisfy mandates for providing sexual violence prevention programming. In many cases, institutions feel as though if it’s offered, their compliance requirements are done. In some cases such as mine, university systems are requiring mandated training for all students on all campuses. There are a myriad of new companies vying for contracts with campuses, offering multi-year contracts, and high-tech role-playing-based training. When we review these programs, do we look at them through the scope of what we think of as a common student, or do we look at it through the lens of a survivor, an international student, a transfer student, or a mid-level professional student? Do we only choose a pre-programmed training option to satisfy the needs of a systemwide mandate or a federal requirement without giving thought to the different subsets of students we have on our campuses, or do we get to the core of the onion to think of providing alternative trainings targeted to the various student subsets? Even though it is convenient for us to choose a one-size-fits-all model for prevention education, the spirit of the cause is lost if the preventative training cannot be understood or comprehended, especially by our international students, who may not feel comfortable with this type of training, who may not understand the language well enough, or who may have questions about how our laws and legal system differs than theirs.

Thinking Globally

During our planning phases, we began to think about how feasible it would be for our international students to complete the required online training. It was through a conversation with the dean who oversees a large majority of the international student programs that it was discussed how completing an independent online training would most likely be impossible for our international students. It would be difficult for them to fully understand the online program we had proposed. Not only was the language barrier a consideration, but faith-based objections could also pose an issue. The questions began to focus on how best to accommodate these students and their needs, while fulfilling our mandate to train them.

Methodology

Although we had proposed the one-size-fits-all training, we had the opportunity to also send staff members to a train-the-trainer event for a Bringing in the Bystander workshop focusing on bystander intervention. We decided that it would be important to send two designated trainers from the international program, which had similar
backgrounds to our Middle Eastern students. We chose two staff members of the same faith, a male and a female, to become trainers. Their participant groups of our Middle Eastern students were divided by gender according to the sex of the facilitator to give the students some comfort and ease in discussing this topic without the other sex present, which had been presented as a concern during the planning phase. Selecting these particular staff members as facilitators for the bystander intervention training for international students ensured they had familiarity and understanding of the needs that this particular subset of students.

These trainers had the expertise in how to present to international students, using pitch, clarity, and annunciation. Language had to be simplified in terms of text size and the level of vocabulary for those who were not fully fluent in English. Being able to speak in a clear manner ensured that students could connect with the content that was being presented, and also allowed for the students to feel at ease participating. The facilitators had to adapt their verbal communication to ensure that they were reactive to student comprehension and involvement. This adaptation gave the students a feeling that the facilitators were making the effort to present the topic in a culturally sensitive manner, but also ensured that participants could fully understand the concepts and materials.

Another consideration made during the planning process for international student training was a conscientious effort to not depict sexually suggestive materials. The online program we had planned to provide for domestic students had images of young adults drinking and going to parties, as well as sexually suggestive discussions. This type of training would not have been culturally or religiously sensitive to our Middle Eastern students. Training options gave an overall sense that they were primarily designed for domestic students, and the concepts were foreign to the way of life and the perceptions of the international audience. This is why the workshops were adapted in a way to ensure the information was palatable to the international student participants. The facilitators made every effort to touch on all aspects of bystander intervention, but with awareness that many of the participants would not be comfortable watching videos of young adults drinking or dancing closely. To still have a focus on the concept of bystander intervention, the facilitators talked about personal stories and asked the students to identify who the bystanders were, and how they might handle such situations. Not only did this method provoke dialogue and thought, but it also created a bond between the participants and the facilitators. The facilitators’ use of personal stories helped to redefine how the participants saw or thought of the content presented before they attended the workshop. A previous study by Terrazas-Carrillo, Hong, & Pace on international student adjustment and place attachment found that the participants’ narratives of their lived experiences in a Midwestern community were established after the “international students appeared to engage in a complex process of redefining meanings ascribed to places on a contextual and personal level” (p. 698).

Another issue I was informed of regarding our international students was that some students from Asian countries had challenges with the concept of saying “no” or with voicing their disapproval around sexual harassment because their normative cultural behavior has ingrained in them to say “no” indirectly to maintain relationships. In Japan, there are many instances of sexual assault in their crowded train systems. Train etiquette in Japan gives an expectation that people quietly endure the tight spaces and intrusions of personal space, where people stand closely to each other for the duration of their ride. Sexual predators often take advantage of this with females, knowing there is no place to flee and speaking out in the train is not viewed favorably (Jorgensen, 2014).

This is a cultural contrast from how we have taught our domestic students from early childhood to speak out and say “no” when they feel uncomfortable or in danger. As children, we are taught to “Say No To Drugs,” we are taught to decline candy from strangers, etc. When I thought about the challenge of how to teach young adults from another country such as Japan on saying “no,” I thought about their current perception of the word “no,” and how to teach them how to say it without actually forcing them to say it. I felt that teaching them to simply say “no” would not be beneficial to them, because they would either refuse to do it or be empowered enough to do it in their country despite the cultural stigma against it. In researching my options, I came across an interactive training that focused on assertiveness that was developed for children in seventh and eighth grades. It was developed by the Department of Public Health in Seattle and King County for the Family and Sexual Health (F.L.A.S.H.) education program. Its objective was to help students formulate an assertive refusal.

The training explained that it was OK to turn people down, and that using a three-fold approach would not only be an assertive way of saying “no,” but a respectful one as well. The first component was to say something caring as an introduction, such as, “Thanks for asking, but…” or “I care about you, but…” This caring component softens the blow of hearing a “no,” and in the culture of some international students, can help with the concern of saving face or disrespecting others. The second component focused on the actual refusal, which was saying “no.” There were many ways presented, such as, “No, I’m OK,” or “No, that’s alright.” The third component focused on a final or decision statement, such as, “I prefer…” or “How about…” I stressed that students never needed to feel as though they must give a reason for the refusal, especially if they felt it could lead to an argument.

After showing slides with different options for each component, I divided the class in small groups of about four or five students.
I passed out scenarios that were based on simple situations where they would have to say “no.” I gave the groups time to write down a refusal using the three-step method, and we all walked through each scenario and refusal together. There was much discussion between the groups on how to approach the refusal, and there were times some groups asked me for help. In the end, the students walked out with a new look at saying “no” in a polite yet assertive way.

Looking at Ourselves through a Culturally Competent Lens

Many of our international students stay off-campus with a families that welcome them into their homes for the time that they are students. This helps students fully immerse themselves and understand what life is like for the average American family. When I began my work at California State University, San Bernardino, one of the new requirements we implemented to be a participant of the home-stay program was to go through a Title IX/Sexual Harassment course designed to protect both the students and the families in the program. I developed a presentation for all family members over the age of 18. Participation was mandatory, and I addressed what Title IX is, and how students have rights and options to report sexual harassment and sexual violence to the university, and vice versa.

The key to this program was not just doing a Title IX presentation, but having it serve as a chance to talk about sexual harassment and cultural differences. What one person from one culture sees as a friendly hug, for example, might be seen in a different context to someone of another culture. Many of the families seemed prepared and knowledgeable about the cultures of the students they housed, but others did not. Nor did they think about the cultural differences in the realm of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct. When most of the families thought of sexual harassment training, they thought of sexual harassment in the workplace. To tie this in with Title IX and to differentiate from a perceived notion that sexual harassment can only happen at work, I reminded them that the international students were living with them as part of their educational experience.

Many of the participants seemed surprised when I spoke about hugs, for example. One man came up to me after the presentation and asked me if it was OK if his eight-year-old son hugged his home-stay student. I had to put his question into context by asking him, “If you are a 19-year-old female from another country who typically does not hug, and a 39-year-old man you might have just met, who is 6’2” tall hugs you, would you feel the same way as if an eight-year-old boy hugs you?” He took a few seconds to think about it, but quickly understood that the intent in both situations could be completely different. Not only that, but he admitted that he never thought of it in that way. This conversation made me realize that most people often see themselves as non-threatening because they know they’re good people. It is also important to examine ourselves through the lens of international students. That’s especially true for people who are going to cohabitate and interact with such students in a non-professional setting.

After the presentations for the home-stay families, I received great feedback from the families and often had participants tell me that they felt as though the training had been useful to them. They left with an understanding that miscommunication can happen, even with the best and purest of intentions. The training helped prepare them to introduce our culture to the international students in a way that took their students’ cultural norms into consideration and without making them feel uncomfortable or threatened.

Results

After training more than 16,000 students using either the online program or the face-to-face sessions, we found that both domestic and international students who had attended the face-to-face workshops had a more favorable experience than those who had completed the online program. Feedback from the students who attended the workshops included that they felt as though the personal interaction with the facilitators and the open dialogue was more educational than a role-playing computer program. They also stated that they felt as though the workshops lent more credibility and seriousness to the subject than an online program that, on the surface, looks like a role-playing game. Although the university has just completed a two-month initiative of offering bystander intervention workshops twice a day, everyday, the next step will be to send surveys to the students to assess their current understanding of bystander intervention as it relates to sexual violence.

The facilitators for the international student groups also shared their experiences with presenting to their participants, and stated they had more active involvement from the students than they had originally anticipated, considering the nature and sensitivity of the topic in relation to cultural restrictions. As a result of the success from these workshops, we decided to continue to offer these sessions as an alternative to the online program for all students. Moreover, this initial implementation taught us that we must continue to use the designated facilitators for the international students and to offer the modified workshops so that students can fully understand what it means to intervene as a bystander in situations of sexual violence.

Conclusion

While planning the logistics of implementing campuswide mandated training on sexual violence, we became aware that there was no single method that could fulfill the spirit and purpose of ending sexual violence on college campuses. Institutions should
consider all student populations before deploying mandatory programs that are developed with a broad purpose. Not all students come from the same cultural backgrounds, nor do they share the same faith-based beliefs or ideologies. Colleges and universities are welcoming students from all walks and aspects of life, and who have very different life experiences. Some students may have been previous victims, and training could re-victimize them. Older, nontraditional students may feel as though training on this topic is for the younger population, since many trainings focus on party situations. Most importantly, consideration must be given to the international students, who have challenges with English as a second language, and who may come from a country where the rule of law is different, or where gender inequity is common and accepted. Not only is language a barrier to understanding the complex issues of Title IX and sexual violence, but there are also certain cultural and faith-based issues that could prevent students from completing a mandated, campuswide program. This is why California State University, San Bernardino found alternative methods to train this group of students in a culturally sensitive way.
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Abstract
Institutions of higher education in the U.S. face increased legislative action, intense media scrutiny, and mounting public pressure to prevent and respond to sexual violence. This case study explores three promising practices that can help campus leaders think beyond new student orientation and other one-time campus events to build a comprehensive prevention experience for students. Discussion questions provide institutions with guidance on how to move toward a culture of prevention that extends beyond orientation to reach students throughout their entire time on campus.
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Introduction
Following the 2011 release of the “Dear Colleague Letter” from the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, institutions of higher education in the United States have been besieged with federal and state legislation, intense media scrutiny, and mounting pressure to prevent and respond to sexual violence on their campuses. Colleges and universities have responded by bolstering sexual violence prevention programming primarily for incoming, first-year students. Institutions are flocking to online education modules, orientation programming, peer-led workshops, and theater presentations.

Current research on sexual violence prevention education demonstrates the potential benefits of certain program formats and topics. Summarizing findings from a meta-analysis of sexual violence prevention programs, Gibbons (2013) found that: 1) professional presenters are more effective at meeting stated program goals than peers; 2) single-gender programs are more effective at meeting stated program goals than mixed-gender programs; and 3) discussions about gender roles and rape myths are more effective at changing student attitudes than attempting to increase empathy for victims of sexual violence. Several studies also show that engaging students as active bystanders in their communities and empowering men to step up may be helpful in reducing instances of sexual violence against women (Berkowitz, 2002; The White House, 2014). Despite finding that some violence prevention programs were “somewhat effective” in changing students’ perceptions about rape and increasing knowledge about the crime, Gibbons (2013) concluded that no program resulted in long-term changes to increased knowledge and decreased rape-supportive attitudes. Because the positive effects of prevention education diminish over time, institutions should increase the duration and frequency of interventions (Gibbons, 2013).

More rigorous research about the long-term effectiveness of prevention programming is needed to identify best-practice interventions that lower rates of sexual violence on campus. After analyzing 140 separate prevention studies, DeGue et al. (2014) concluded that there is a significant dearth of robust assessment and evaluation data about prevention programming and that the field’s ability to identify programs that have a lasting impact on students is significantly hindered by the quality of readily available research.

Despite the lack of research about what really works to prevent sexual violence, researchers and practitioners agree that meaningful prevention should be comprehensive, intentional, and integrated throughout the student experience (Cantalupo, 2015). Berkowitz (n.d.) argues that programming should be contextualized to the specific needs of a campus community and driven by both student and scholarly data. Institutions should use media campaigns with positive messaging and link prevention activities that are normally disconnected (Berkowitz, n.d.). Thinking about prevention practices that extend beyond new student orientation and other one-time events can help institutions build a comprehensive prevention experience for students.

Purpose of the Case Study
The researchers examined the current prevention landscape at the postsecondary education level to identify innovative programs that showed promise in preventing sexual violence. Successful programs were defined as those that used highly-trained staff or peers to deeply educate students about the causes and effects of sexual violence, sought to build students’ prevention knowledge and skills over time, reached a significant portion of the student population beyond their first year, and had some demonstrable impact.

Case Study Methods
The researchers conducted more than 60 interviews with higher education professionals. Interviewees included independent consultants, prevention educators, Title IX coordinators, vice presidents for student affairs, and women’s center directors at 50 different colleges, universities, nonprofits, and other organizations throughout the U.S. and Canada. Interviews were conducted over a nine-month period from January to September 2014. Each interview was audio recorded and summarized in a research memo. The researchers iteratively reviewed the recordings and memos to identify promising approaches.

Summary of Case Study Conclusions
The researchers found that sexual violence prevention programming at most institutions is a compilation of one-time events that primarily target students during pre-arrival and the beginning of their first year. Specifically, institutions are relying on online education modules, orientation programming, peer-led workshops, and other one-time programs to “check the box” of prevention.

In interviews, student affairs administrators and prevention educators emphasized that the content and experiences gleaned from one-time events like a Take Back the Night march and performance of The Vagina Monologues are valuable to students. However, at most institutions, there is a real gap in how these events are incorporated into a larger strategy to reach students with consistent prevention messaging and programming.

This is not because practitioners and experts fail to recognize the importance of long-term programming structured around concrete learning outcomes. In fact, many college and university leaders outline a strong vision of a prevention strategy that engages students throughout their time on campus. However, administrators and educators highlighted key barriers to implementing ongoing, sustainable,
and institutionwide programming, including limited resources, time constraints, and a lack of assessment data identifying evidence-based prevention interventions.

After a thorough review of the sexual violence prevention literature and after conducting interviews with higher education administrators and practitioners, the researchers found that many institutions are working to implement comprehensive prevention programs that aim to have a long-term, significant impact on campus sexual violence rates. This case study uncovered several promising practices that may make a difference, although currently no research is available that demonstrates impact. The three practices that are described in this article can help campus leaders think beyond orientation and other one-time campus events to build a comprehensive prevention experience for students.

**Provide a Certificate Program**

While a prevention workshop builds students’ basic knowledge and skills, some higher education administrators expressed a strong interest in offering (or even requiring) a wellness-focused course that spans an entire semester or academic year. Some institutions are moving in this direction by including information about sexual violence and campus resources in class syllabi and student-delivered class announcements. A handful of institutions, including Yale University, now require all second year students to attend a mandatory workshop on bystander intervention skills. While many campus leaders are interested in formally including information about sexual violence in the academic curriculum, that can be difficult to achieve because of the significant institutional commitment required.

Certificate programs may be a more viable and scalable approach to ongoing student education. A large public university in the northeast recently piloted an optional certificate program in bystander education. Students in the program complete interactive, discussion-based workshops and are immersed in skill-building exercises on how to identify and intervene in potentially harmful situations. A form of this program is currently being evaluated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Between 40 and 50 students completed the certificate program pilot during the 2013–14 academic year. Students who are part of leadership groups, like fraternities and sororities, received a donation for their organization’s philanthropic efforts by participating in the certificate program. Students who completed the program were rewarded with a certificate of completion and a notation on their transcripts.

The program also reaches graduate students on campus — an often-overlooked population in conversations about prevention. Graduate students in the Master of Education in College Student Affairs program complete the bystander intervention program as part of a credit-bearing class. Participants noted that this was an important professional competency for their post-graduate goals and have praised the high quality of the program.

**Empower Students with Choice**

Many prevention educators assume that students come to college with very limited knowledge about sexual violence and healthy relationships. As a result, the content in mandatory trainings is usually focused on the basics. While this might be the case for some students, it overlooks that other students may already be well informed on these topics, and thus unengaged with such trainings.

A small public university in the western United States has taken a unique approach to mandatory prevention education, allowing students to select a prevention workshop to attend from a list of topics. Students can choose from about a dozen individual workshops offered across 30 sessions. At the beginning of each workshop, facilitators share the same 10-minute core message about sexual violence and available resources on campus. This unified core messaging ensures that all students receive critical content, in addition to the specialized material. The choice structure empowers students to select the workshop that best suits their interests, knowledge, and skill level.

Key to the success of this prevention program is that the responsibility of implementing the workshops is distributed across campus, relieving the burden typically placed on overloaded prevention educators. Offices like the counseling center and the health promotion office apply to host a workshop on a topic related to sexual violence prevention education. A committee of campus constituents, coordinated by the Violence Prevention Program Office, evaluates the applications to determine if the workshop meets the four learning outcomes set for all prevention education work at the institution: 1) recognizing sexual assault, 2) responding safely, 3) referring to appropriate resources, and 4) changing rape culture.

A public health faculty member and a team of undergraduate students used pre- and post-workshop survey data to evaluate the institution’s approach to prevention programming and found that most students reported learning about available resources, how to recognize signs of violence, how to respond to instances of violence, and how to positively influence the culture on campus.

While students are required to attend the workshops during their first semester, institutions could consider implementing the program in the second semester or even beyond the first year. Institutions with robust programming efforts in the first semester could use the choice program to extend the educational experience for students. In the first semester, it is most critical that students gain fundamental
knowledge about sexual violence, such as an understanding of the school’s definition of consent and sexual misconduct policies and procedures. After building a strong foundation of knowledge, the choice model allows students to identify what they are most interested in learning about in their second semester or beyond.

Sustain Support for Special Populations
A large public university in the western United States has developed an innovative program that aims to promote sustained prevention of sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, and stalking in the Greek community. The program trains one point-person in each fraternity and sorority to serve in a support role for their respective groups and to provide chapter members with education and resources.

Greek chapters are each responsible for electing a representative. These students receive training about sexual violence intervention and prevention strategies from trained campus and community educators on a monthly basis and report what they learn to their peers at weekly chapter meetings. Chapter representatives also have the opportunity to earn four academic credits for their work. At the annual Greek Awards Ceremony, a fraternity and sorority are each recognized for excellence in prevention education.

The program is particularly unique because it provides an at-risk community with highly trained student-advocates who are elected by their peers, ensuring that the advocates are trusted individuals in their own communities. This program has contributed to a record number of referrals of survivors seeking support. While the program is exclusive to Greek students at this institution, the program could be adapted to other hot spots on campus, like athletics and prominent student organizations.

Conclusion
The certificate program, student choice workshops, and Greek chapter representatives represent some of the promising sexual violence prevention work that is happening on campuses across the country. As national attention and public scrutiny continue in this area, the body of research on the impact of prevention practices will likely grow. Institutions can contribute to the field by ensuring that learning outcomes and assessment metrics are embedded within all prevention programming. Moreover, institutions can move toward creating a culture of prevention that extends beyond orientation to reach students throughout their time on campus.

Key Takeaways
- Craft and implement a prevention-focused strategy that spans the student experience and progressively builds students’ sexual violence prevention knowledge and skills.
- Develop learning outcomes and rigorous assessment efforts that measure immediate and long-term changes in students’ attitudes and behaviors.
- Consider exploring the curricular terrain with a certificate program or wellness seminar.
- Empower student learning in mandatory prevention workshops by allowing students to choose a workshop that is best suited to their individual interests and skill level.
- Provide specific and sustained support for special populations on campus, such as Greek organizations and athletic groups.

Case Study Discussion Points
Is a certificate program right for your campus?
- What content would be the focus of the program? What academic units could provide program content?
- What would the requirements of the program be?
- Who would manage the program?
- To whom would the program be available?
- What incentives would be used to encourage student participation?
- Is there support from academic affairs for a certificate program?

Will a choice program complement your current efforts on campus?
- What prevention programs currently exist for students? Consider conducting an audit of existing speakers, workshops, and educational events.
- What other partners might present program options?
- What office or staff person could coordinate and manage a choice program?
- When would a choice program have the largest impact on your campus? During students’ first year or sometime later during the student life cycle?
- What common course content would be shared across programs?
- How would the program be marketed or incentivized?

What are the potential benefits of programming that targets at-risk student populations on your campus?
- What student populations could benefit from specialized prevention programming?
- How do these students interact with current prevention education efforts? What prevention programming is this student population already participating in?
- What barriers exist that prevent students from engaging in prevention education efforts or seeking support on campus?
- How could these barriers be addressed in a way that encourages student involvement?
• Are there students within the special population that could be targeted to participate in a peer leadership initiative?
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Abstract
Student affairs practitioners and Title IX administrators are often charged with providing sexual consent education to students, as this is a best practice for the prevention of sexual violence. Peer education is often seen as an effective way to provide such programs on campus. Meanwhile, it’s likely that some of your faculty members are experts in campaign messaging and performing research in fields related to health promotion. This case study describes a partnership that leverages the research design and expertise of faculty with the involvement of a diverse group of students and access to resources in student affairs to design and implement a student-driven sexual consent education campaign for one campus. The final product resulted in a more refined consent education message, increased student engagement in the campaign, and greater visibility for the educational messages. This article provides information to assist campuses in launching a similar partnership and outlines areas for consideration when designing sexual consent education campaigns and programs.
Background and Introduction
In the midst of a continuing national conversation about the prevention of sexual assault on college campuses, higher education administrators may struggle to find effective ways to educate students about sexual violence issues, specifically related to consent. Not only should colleges and universities educate students about these issues, but recent legislation requires postsecondary institutions to report on regularly occurring prevention strategies and ongoing campaigns. Specifically, Section 304 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 requires reporting on programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including primary prevention and awareness efforts that provide students with information about consent in reference to sexual activity, safe and positive options for bystander intervention, and risk reduction.

Student affairs staff members may grapple with how to effectively and appropriately talk about issues of sexuality, healthy relationships, and sexual consent with students. Despite staff knowledge of the nature of primary prevention strategies and the need to provide opportunities for realistic dialogue around sex and relationships, many students are uncomfortable discussing their sex lives or romantic relationships with higher education administrators and staff. While a variety of third-party campaigns exist for use on campuses, these programs are rarely tailored or specific enough to the student population being served. They also tend to require significant marketing and implementation work by staff. Special populations, such as fraternities and sororities and athletes, also exist in unique environments with the need for customized initiatives. Additionally, some campuses may not have full-time prevention staff dedicated to issues of sex and relationships, or staff members may be stretched-thin and under-resourced. All of these situations present obstacles to the design and implementation of effective student educational campaigns.

At Texas Tech University, many of the factors mentioned above, in addition to other obstacles to effective prevention campaigns and education, were present when we began looking at how to better educate students about sexual consent. Fraternity and sorority students, for example, were inundated during the previous semester with new mandatory educational programs related to a campus Texas Tech Task Force for Greek Organization Culture. Student feedback indicated fatigue related to educational initiatives, specifically related to issues of sexual violence and fraternities. A new bystander intervention campaign was also slowly rolling out for the campus, but the involvement of students was still minimal and messaging primarily addressed how to notice problems already occurring instead of preventing them altogether. Also, the campus had committed resources to new prevention efforts, but staff members were not yet in place to tackle large-scale program design and implementation.

By leveraging the expertise of communication faculty and interested students at the university, we were able to design and implement a campaign that addressed our unique campus needs while also providing a valuable learning opportunity for students involved. These faculty members were uniquely suited for this research with experience in advertising, persuasion and messaging, and young adults and sexual health. While this initial launch did not include differentiated messaging for fraternities, sororities, or athletes, the involvement of students representing those communities increased the likelihood of campaign messaging reaching those subpopulations, and the campaign was informed by surveys of student rape myth acceptance within the subpopulations of fraternity men and sorority women. In addition, this model allowed us to reduce barriers to student engagement by using a peer-to-peer model, since students would much rather discuss issues surrounding sex and relationships with other students, either in person or online in a social media setting. Further, the research produced from the campaign through message testing and monitoring of student interactions within the campaign provided us with additional information to direct future programming and educational strategies. Finally, the collaborative approach allowed university staff to take a hands-off approach and avoid tainting the campaign with any hints of required or mandatory programming or compliance-driven initiatives.

The following sections will provide an overview of the aforementioned campaign’s development and tactics, with a focus on best practices learned from its successful implementation to help guide others interested in implementing similar strategies at their college or university.

Campaign Overview
Texas Tech University’s student-driven sexual consent education campaign targeted the undergraduate student population with online and on-campus messaging that encouraged students to consider and discuss issues related to sexual consent. Before its development, two communication faculty members leading the campaign, Rebecca R. Ortiz, Ph.D., and Autumn Shafer, Ph.D., conducted an online survey with a representative group of 505 Texas Tech undergraduate students and 11 focus groups (of which five groups included students specifically in social Greek organizations at Texas Tech) to better understand the needs and current knowledge base of students on the issue of sexual consent.

Results from the survey indicated that sexual assault is a major issue on campus and rape myth acceptance is high, particularly among students who engage in traditional party behaviors (e.g., binge drinking) and those in social Greek organizations. The student focus groups also revealed that many have a hard time defining sexual consent, and the campaign messages in use by the university or
other institutions were often not relatable or useful in helping to clear up confusion. The students regularly articulated that they knew consent “when they saw it,” but the examples they described were typically the most extreme, such as individuals being so intoxicated they cannot stand or when they clearly and consistently say “no.” Students also expressed general dislike for the use of the word “consent” in past campaign messages, as they felt it was too clinical or formal. Some male participants in particular indicated that when they saw use of the word “consent” in sexual assault prevention materials, they often assumed the message’s primary motive was to berate males for being perpetrators of sexual assault.

Those findings prompted the aforementioned faculty members to develop, implement, and test a sexual consent education campaign that would promote a clear, useful, and relatable definition of sexual consent to undergraduate students at Texas Tech. To ensure the campaign adequately addressed students’ needs, an undergraduate student advisory board was formed to help develop and implement it. The board was made up of interested undergraduate students representing various student groups on campus (e.g., traditional, athletes, Greeks, etc.). The committee met weekly to brainstorm and provide feedback on potential messaging strategies for the various components of the campaign. These students also played a strategic role in serving as the initial influencers to ensure the campaign would be adopted by other students. Recruiting student influencers was critical because the campaign needed to be seen as relevant to the “average” student, and not as something that was imposed or initiated by administrators, faculty members, or special-interest student groups. The student members were primarily recruited through a short email explaining the purpose of the project and encouraging them to volunteer. This email was sent out to campus student leadership groups and selected former students of the faculty members, who were also encouraged to forward the email to friends they thought might be interested. Recruitment efforts were targeted to ensure that the board included participation from nearly equal numbers of males and females, students from across majors, and students within and outside of the Greek population. Approximately 30 students volunteered, and about 20 of those students contributed consistently.

The resulting campaign was named “Define Your Line.” Its focus was on gathering and displaying feedback from students about questions they had related to sexual consent and sexual assault and ways in which they give and get consent in sexual relationships. The goal was to create campuswide “conversation” about how students define their “line” and communicate sexual consent to current or prospective partners. Students were encouraged to anonymously write down their questions and also to answer questions posed by other students. These questions and answers were gathered at various locations on campus, such as the student union building, student organization meetings, classrooms, the student recreation center, and online through a dedicated website (www.defineyourline.org). Campaign messages then appeared online through the website or related social media accounts (i.e., Facebook and Twitter), and on-campus through the use of posters, digital screen displays, and table tents. Disposable wristbands with the campaign’s logo and website address were also distributed and used by local bars frequented by our students. T-shirts with the campaign logo were also distributed to students and worn by advisory board members whenever they represented the campaign on campus.

To support the sense of a peer-driven initiative, all faculty and staff members involved in the campaign remained “behind the curtain.” This helped to maintain the perception that the campaign was driven by students, and not by faculty or staff. Therefore, the students on the advisory board were responsible for gathering the feedback from other students on campus and making presentations in classes, in the student union, and other meetings and locations. The primary messages of the campaign were also completely student driven, such that students from across the entire campus were able to ask and answer the questions most relatable to them. Examples of some questions asked by students included: 1) “How do you know if someone is too drunk to have sex?” 2) “Is not saying ‘no’ the same as saying ‘yes’ to sex?” and 3) “How do you tell someone you are dating that you are not ready to have sex?”

To ensure that harmful stereotypes and myths were not being perpetuated and accurate information was being received and reflected back to students, “experts” from across campus were asked to provide their own responses to some of those questions through the campaign’s website and social media accounts a couple of weeks post-launch. Our experts included faculty and staff members at the university from such areas as women’s studies, student counseling, and psychology, among others. These experts were identified as such when providing their informed responses to students’ questions and answers.

The campaign ran for six weeks in the spring semester. During this time period, the campaign website received 1,747 unique visitors in the United States (international website visits, in this case, may indicate referral fraud in website analytics and thus were not included); the Facebook page resulted in 359 Likes; and the Twitter account attracted 196 Followers. Messages on the campaign’s Facebook page resulted in over 84,000 gross (combined) impressions, and the campaign’s Twitter posts (Tweets) resulted in over 38,000 total impressions. The campaign also received both local and national news coverage.

An online survey was sent to all undergraduate students at the end of
the campaign. A total of 318 students (59 percent female) completed the survey, and 40 percent of respondents indicated that they remember seeing or hearing something about the campaign. Of those students, 81 percent agreed or strongly agreed that “the campaign is important” and that they “support” it. Seventy-two percent agreed or strongly agreed that the campaign was “relevant to students like me,” and 84 percent felt that the “campaign should continue next year.” Thirty-two percent also indicated interest in getting involved in the campaign in the future.

Lessons Learned and Best Practices

Feedback from students indicated that the campaign was overall perceived positively and as being both useful and relatable. Many of the students on the advisory board also indicated that they enjoyed their involvement and wanted to be involved in future efforts. While data regarding which specific elements of the campaign were most effective is still being analyzed, the overall strategy of generating a “campus conversation” among students about sexuality and sexual communication was well received. Following are some of the major lessons learned from the campaign’s implementation that may be applicable to other colleges and universities in their efforts to engage and educate undergraduate student populations about sexual assault prevention issues.

One of the major successes of the campaign was its ability to appeal to students that are historically difficult to reach and engage with educational messages about sexual consent and sexual assault, such as male fraternity members. As found in the initial research conducted by the faculty members leading the campaign, male students, and male fraternity members in particular, often tune out messages about sexual consent, as they do not find the messages relatable or they assume the underlying message is focused on males as sexual assault perpetrators. A major focus of the “Define Your Line” campaign, therefore, was to create an inclusive environment in which all genders and student groups could engage in a conversation about sexual consent from their unique perspectives. It was also important, however, not to single out any specific student groups as being the primary audience for the campaign so as not to stigmatize or place blame on any individual or group. The entire undergraduate student population was the target audience, but to ensure that all perspectives and needs were addressed, the student advisory board included representatives from each of the various groups on campus.

Heterosexual female students were the easiest students to recruit, arguably because they are able to see immediate benefit for themselves in sexual assault prevention initiatives, given that the majority of sexual assault victims on college campuses are heterosexual female students. Engaging male students, and particularly male fraternity members, required more strategic effort. The faculty members leading the campaign reached out to all identified individual students and student groups in person and by email, and while the recruitment messages were largely the same across all correspondence, special care was taken to use language that would specifically appeal to male students. For instance, instead of indicating that the campaign would be about “sexual consent,” the phrase “sexual communication” was used. Students were also told that the campaign would be driven largely by their needs and interests and not by the administration’s, allowing them to have ownership of its direction and focus. Lastly, students were informed that the primary focus of the campaign would be on ensuring that students “have better sex” (which ultimately became the campaign’s main slogan) by promoting open communication between sexual partners, and not about demonizing anyone based on gender or student group affiliation (e.g., fraternities). The message was extremely well received, and some of the most productive and insightful members of the advisory board ended up being the males belonging to fraternities.

While the campaign was successful in recruiting male students to the advisory board and appealing to a wide range of student groups on campus, it should be noted that there were some challenges too. For example, efforts to appeal to heterosexual male students through the campaign led to a lack of inclusivity for students who may not identify traditionally as male or female or as heterosexual. Some students from the campus’s Gay-Straight Alliance were members of the advisory board, but it became apparent early on that it would be difficult to maintain a campaign that adequately addressed sexual consent issues for all sexual and gender identity groups on campus without losing some of the campaign’s focus on engaging heterosexual males. That’s not to say that it’s impossible to do; only that our campaign efforts thus far still need work to address this issue, and that other colleges and universities should be aware of it before embarking on their own initiatives.

The campaign’s success resulted not only from the collaborative efforts of the students, but also from the efforts and insights of the administration and faculty and staff members. Having administrative support well before campaign development and implementation was crucial. While the campaign was ultimately student-driven, the initial research conducted by the faculty members and the insights gained from talking with administrators and support staff paved the way for the successful recruitment of students to the advisory board and support from others on campus during implementation. The campaign ultimately involved members of the administration, faculty, and staff members from many departments and offices on campus, which resulted
in the feel of a true “campus conversation” about issues related to sexual consent and sexual assault.

One of the biggest takeaways from our experiences with the “Define Your Line” campaign is that educational campaigns about sexual consent should be tailored to individual college campuses and to different student populations to increase effectiveness. Another is that peer-led educational initiatives can be particularly successful when it comes to sensitive topics such as sexuality and healthy relationships. The importance of collaboration is also worth mentioning. A variety of academic disciplines can contribute to these efforts through research partnerships and initiatives with faculty. However, since professors are often skilled in instrument development and assessment design but may not know how to engage students or student groups for the administration of surveys or focus groups, participation from university staff in identifying effective ways to gain student participation in such activities is essential.
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Abstract
Despite years of rigorous research, program development, and policy reforms, rates of sexual coercion and assault have stagnated at an unacceptable rate. Many prevention and response strategies rely on problematic, reductionist, and incorrect assumptions about gender, sexuality, intimacy, and sexual consent. This article reports on new research intended to recast our understandings of these identities and contexts in college students’ lived experiences to open new frontiers for reforming prevention efforts. This article is based on a paper delivered at the 2015 meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
Introduction

As scholar-practitioners, we share in the collective frustrations of educators, activists, law enforcement, and policy-makers seeking to end the intractable problem of sexual coercion and assault, particularly on college and university campuses. To put it bluntly, despite years of rigorous research and deployment of prevention programs, achieving the goal of eliminating — or even substantially reducing — sexual assaults among college students has yet to be realized. For example, the Department of Justice reports that each year, approximately one in 20 college women will be the victim of rape or attempted rape on campus; in a typical four-year career, one in five women may become a victim of rape. This statistic has stagnated for the past 60 years (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004), despite the adoption of national and state legal policies such as Title IX (with its various stipulations) or affirmative consent. The purpose of this article is to inform colleagues about a program of research currently being conducted to intervene in the widespread problems of sexual violence, coercion, and rape on college campuses, and to invite communication from those interested in offering feedback and remaining apprised of its activities and findings.

The investigators, each of whom has served in practitioner roles in schools and colleges before becoming researchers, are concerned with the relative stagnation in the collection of strategies available to achieve the objective of preventing sexual violence on college campuses. More specifically, the approaches being used by institutions of higher education have generally remained within a small number of categories for quite some time: speeches and skits about policies and communicating “no” messages; bystander intervention training; rape-myth reduction/empathy development; harm reduction (e.g., escort services, rape-aggression defense, “tips” to “stay safe” or “prevent rape,” etc.); and marketing interventions (e.g., “consent is sexy,” “no means no,” “my strength is not for hurting”).

Each of these approaches holds some merit, and we aspire to offer both friendly critique and suggestions for enhancement within the work products of our research. In the meantime, we argue that these existing tools rely on some problematic, under-examined, and even incorrect assumptions about what is really occurring in the lived experiences of college students. This is especially the case when it comes to consent. In short, “consent” is a term that feels clear and defined, and is thus something that can be taught, required, negotiated, communicated, and understood (and evaluated in a disciplinary hearing). However, there are substantial gaps in available knowledge about how consent actually happens in intimate spaces, interfering with students’ personal agency and institutional capacity to prevent sexual harassment, coercion and violence, and their health consequences. Moreover, there is little understanding as to how sexuality is learned in the first place. To this end, we initiated a program of qualitative, ethnographic research intended to elicit a more robust and nuanced understanding of how sexual coercion and violence occur within intimate space. This research also connects early learning of sexuality during childhood to open a new frontier for understanding its operation in collegiate social contexts. We were initially surprised to note that current collegiate sexual assault research rarely considers or connects students’ prior experiences and socialization in home, school, and so forth to their transitional and adult experiences of sexuality. We intend to design large-scale empirical quantitative research to validate theoretical findings and to intervene in service of eliminating sexual violence among college students.

Complex functions are served by socially maintaining a blurry definition of, and approach to, consent in practice that has not been adequately investigated or theorized. This “strategic ambiguity” (Currier, 2013) manifests itself in both the collective and intimate ethos of collegiate sexual culture. Some examples arose in our pilot study (described in more detail later) of first-year college students’ beliefs about, and experiences with, amorous and sexual encounters. Some participants shared stories about intentionally becoming intoxicated (essentially plying themselves with alcohol). Others, within the context of intimate situations, expressed reservations or unwillingness to engage in sexual relations when actually wanting to do so in order to reduce guilt, shame, or inhibitions around initiating or being receptive to sexual overtures. For researchers, policy-makers, administrators, and prevention practitioners, the political minefield associated with openly discussing and questioning these dynamics serves to additionally limit progress on this intractable issue. To be sure, there is a risk that critical questions could insinuate either victim blaming or minimizing the accountability of those who commit sexual coercion or violence. Yet, given that research and so-called prevention efforts to date have been unable to make substantial progress, it is arguably a mandate to accept the untidy reality and go forward in search of solutions.

For instance, current legal and policy frameworks guiding institutional practices assume and expect that students will communicate sexual interests, requests, agreements, or refusals in a clear manner as a precondition to sexual activity, and yet that is often severely constrained or even precluded by students’ social conventions and norms. It also disproportionately privileges bureaucratic and legalistic lenses and vocabulary vis-à-vis interpreting and engaging issues of amorous and sexual intimacy among students, undermining a credible, meaningful, or effective treatment of the issues (but ironically not preventing an institution from being deemed compliant with Title IX and related obligations). The common prevention efforts mentioned earlier also arguably situate within the predator/prey paradigm of sexual consent, which may or may not be useful for scenarios in which that is the arrangement. However, we argue there is a much wider diversity of scripts in operation among students, and we have
begun to capture some of them in our pilot study. As we expand our study, it will allow us to gather a much fuller inventory of these scenes and the belief systems at play leading into and through them. In turn, we intend to identify gaps in knowledge, policies, and practices; and propose (and pilot) remedies to reduce their risks and consequences.

Both co-investigators have served in practitioner capacities in K–12 and postsecondary school levels prior to our researcher role. We recently completed a pilot study in which a cohort of college students was followed over the course of their entire first year. The students shared about their most intimate encounters with remarkable candor, including elaborate rituals of consent negotiation, intentional or incidental risks, and strategies for reconciling shame and desire, among other important dynamics of relevance to reducing the problems under study. Our findings suggest that we are on the threshold of offering innovation in this essential enterprise, and it is hoped that this article will elicit useful feedback from the community of colleagues who share in the project of ending this intractable problem.

During the foundational investigative phase of our study entitled, “Sexual Coercion and Violence in College: Reforming Policies and Practices for Consent Education and Personal Agency,” our main purpose has been to examine the practices and beliefs held by college students with respect to their sexual experiences. We hold that consent is an under-theorized topic (Beres, 2007), and needs to be understood more robustly, which will benefit scholars, practitioners, and policy-makers across the spectrum of interests and attention. Our research explores the social ecology of college life, and specifically collegiate affectionate and sexual culture, with the intention that more knowledge of such phenomena will effectually inform needed interventions and changes in their social contexts. As the research evolves, it will offer a powerful instrument for critiquing existing strategies for sexual violence prevention and open up new and promising possibilities for research and practice to eliminate sexual coercion, violence, and their consequences.

We intend to expand our initial study to include targeted collegiate sub-populations not represented (or not adequately represented) in the pilot study. We have also recruited a small panel of advisors with whom to periodically consult on our research design and data analysis to ensure depth and nuance in our findings, detailed and actionable dissemination, and ready translation to innovations in practice. These colleagues currently include Dr. Alan Berkowitz, a respected scholar known for championing bystander intervention methods; Dr. Devon Reckmeyer, a forensic psychologist and certified sexual offender risk assessment professional actively engaged by courts and mental health agencies in California; Laurie Morgan, the associate director of campus wellness programs, who trains and supervises prevention education programs at this university; and Dr. Karisman Roberts-Douglass, a licensed clinical psychologist with expertise in gender violence, masculine role socialization, and racial diversity in relation to psychosocial development and mental health.

To this end, our research seeks to:
1. Gather more information and increase knowledge of consent practices, rituals, and beliefs;
2. Illuminate social learning about sexuality to impact effectiveness of sexual violence prevention efforts;
3. Develop program curriculum that engages with the complexities of sexual consent; and
4. Implement a pilot sexual violence prevention program based on evidence from this research.

Context of Study

Over the last few years, there has been a spate of media coverage about incidents of sexual assault on college campuses, particularly in terms of alleged failures by institutions to deal appropriately with allegations raised by students. The federal government, especially the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), has understandably pursued aggressive legal enforcement to ensure compliance with obligations to prevent and respond to cases of sexual violence, harassment, stalking, and the like. President Obama himself gave a major policy speech about the need to effectively address these issues, and OCR recently sent a significant “Dear Colleague” letter to institutional executives reminding them of their duties under the law, and that these would be enforced with great attention. This has been received seriously by most colleges and universities, with varying hasty or thoughtful efforts to fulfill the obligations to have well-crafted and communicated policies, educational prevention and response efforts, detailed procedures for investigation and adjudication, and advocacy for complainants and respondents to have their due process rights cared for.

The public has been given much more information than in the past, through materials distributed by institutions, and through federal-mandated Clery and other annual reports provided on websites and in other venues. Yet, there continue to be accounts of institutional missteps, enforcement actions, and a great deal of frustration that even when colleges and universities invest their attention, funds, and personnel to combat the problem of sexual violence, these terrible incidents continue seemingly unabated, and are perhaps even increasing. To be sure, more attention to reporting is likely to generate statistics implying an increase even if that is not the case, but it is an open secret that there are far more incidents than reports in any case. It is also a source of great frustration among many practitioners that the so-called best practices don’t necessarily reduce incidents, or at least not in the quantity or quality intended. However, it is dangerous to one’s professional standing to even suggest that our work is not effective, and it would be reductionist to do so. After all, it is debatable whether anyone — whether a prevention educator or the chief
executive for that matter — holds the political, positional, or moral authority to effect significant change in the social milieu of the institution. The institution is, after all, situated within a broader society that is collectively implicated in the problem and reluctant to change the conditions that lead to these traumatic experiences or assertions that they are isolated incidents.

These terrible situations arise at institutions of all types and in all regions of the United States (and elsewhere), though assumptions associated with institutional prestige or student demography can elicit variation in reactions to reports of sexual violence. This is to say that some may be surprised to learn that sexual harassment and violence occurs at an institution known to be academically rigorous, or they might not to be surprised by reports of such occurring at less-demanding schools. In regards to some of the prestigious institutions facing difficult media coverage about their failures, many (including editorial and comment section writers) assert that feelings of entitlement and privilege among students — especially males — lead to this kind of behavior. Similarly, there are stereotypical assumptions about students based on their gender, race, socioeconomic status, faith, sexual orientation, ability, and so forth, which lead to beliefs about who is or is not likely to be involved as a perpetrator or victim of sexual violence.

Steele (2011) and others have written about how such assumptions are in the national consciousness, affecting how people regard others and themselves, and how this affects self confidence, agency, and sense of worth. As we know full well, sexual harassment and violence occurs across institutional and social identities. However, the belief systems as taught in the intimacy of families and peer groups, or in societal institutions such as schools, faith communities, and the national media, all serve to teach and reinforce assumptions about these and other issues. So, while it can be traumatic for anyone to experience sexual violence, or to be accused of perpetrating it, there is additional difficulty for people whose social identities or institutional type is subject to stereotypical surprise and concomitant suspicion about the truthfulness of their story.

**Theoretical Framework**

Dominant societal notions of gender, sex, and sexuality are binary and reductionist, assuming an organization of male/female, and heterosexual/homosexual. They are highly problematic for people whose gender, sex, and sexual identities do not comport with such a dichotomy as well as for those whose do so. Whether one identifies according to these hegemonic arrangements or not, they are imposed on everyone, with a range of consequences. It is arguably the case that everyone — or nearly everyone — is aware of these constructs, yet that awareness varies in its salience and impact, depending on one’s identities and experiences.

In terms of the social construction of gender roles, such are reinforced by daily peer interactions, media, and institutionalized cultures, all of which conspire to reinforce conventions that sexual desire and pleasure are shameful for women, and sexual conquest is desirable for men. We believe that if students are directly asked about this, they will generally deny being motivated by such ideas, but their actual behaviors and interactions suggest otherwise. Some examples from the pilot data include slut-shaming, homophobia, and sexist/homophobic “joking” slurs uttered to peers, regardless of their actual sexual orientation. In addition, many sexual encounters deemed non-consensual by administrators might be regarded as consensual by those who experienced it. This is problematic in part because it accommodates self-doubt about whether something that happened to someone was rape (and since that word is so loaded, it is especially difficult to name). Moreover, because the dominant ideas haunt these spaces and interactions, these gendered sexual constructs interfere with individuals learning about how to articulate their wishes, whether as initiators, responders, or lateral agents in a sexual situation.

Even if institutions identify promising new approaches, the delivery of co-curricular/social education and feedback to students is generally conducted by student leaders (e.g., RAs, orientation leaders, club executives, peer wellness advocates, etc.) or through curricular interactions by graduate research and teaching assistants. These “official peers” have a great deal of capacity to offer meaningful contributions to prevention and support efforts, but they are generally uninformed and otherwise disconnected from institutional obligations, decision-making processes, or larger-scale analyses of the campus climate. Some of the same could be said of entry-level student affairs staff, such as residence hall directors, student activities advisors, or academic counselors. These categories of personnel conduct the majority of an institution’s direct interaction (i.e., time spent in conversation) with students. Future directions for our program of research include training and educational modules to address this gap.

**The Pilot Study**

The pilot study, which began in August 2012, was a one-year constructivist qualitative study in which a group of students at a nearby university, which has been given the pseudonym West Coast State University, offered candid accounts of their social and sexual experiences during their entire first year in college. This study sought to construct a contemporary framework for understanding students' gendered and sexual lives in order to guide effective efforts to eliminate gender-based violence. We recruited a cohort of 15 first-year college students (see Figure 1 below, wherein identities have been protected by pseudonyms) at West Coast State University to be interviewed three times over the course of their freshman year. Of those, 11 of the students completed the three rounds of interviews, and one dropped out and then returned at the end of the year. Two one-time interviews were also conducted with students whose social identities or experiences could add dimension to understanding what cohort members shared in their interviews.
In our pilot study, we were able to provide a safe environment and facilitation for students to explain in very specific detail how they communicated their preferences and requests, and their agreement or aversion in regards to sexual behavior. We were able to collect narratives about participant’s approach to consent that illuminate elaborate rituals of communication. These so-called Consent Stories™ can be used for educational efforts intended to reduce stigma and improve communication in ways that are simply not included in legal frameworks. In short, legislation and its enforcement are necessary but inadequate to prevent or even respond to the wide array of problematic encounters beyond acts of force that face fewer critical questions. We believe that the sharing the diverse collection of Consent Stories™ through such mechanisms as Social Action Theater, online and in-person programs, curricula, and so forth can potentially increase students’ sexual and social agency; and they can inform more candid dialogue in service to socially just relationships and improve communication in ways that are simply not included in legal frameworks. In short, legislation and its enforcement are necessary but inadequate to prevent or even respond to the wide array of problematic encounters beyond acts of force that face fewer critical questions. We believe that the sharing the diverse collection of Consent Stories™ through such mechanisms as Social Action Theater, online and in-person programs, curricula, and so forth can potentially increase students’ sexual and social agency; and they can inform more candid dialogue in service to socially just relationships and encounters. This is the trajectory for our research program, which is also expanding to include students across a range of sexual, gender, ethnic, ability, and other forms of diversity.

One of the main early findings of the students’ contributions is that consent is a (sometimes intentionally) vague process. It rarely manifests as overt or enthusiastic consent, despite efforts by college administration to encourage or require it. While most of the respondents in our first study were generally clear in their negative response to sexual solicitations, rarely did they report providing an affirmative, “Yes, I’d like to have sex” to a sexual solicitation, or giving what would be considered “enthusiastic consent.” Similarly, only one student reported asking to have sex in specific terms (e.g., “Would you like to have sex?”). Instead, the college students were likely to signal consent in other ways. Some examples include: tugging on pants and waiting for a positive response, or turning toward a partner rather than away to demonstrate agreement.

Even if there is a legal definition of “consent” adopted in college policy as required, there is wide variation in perceptions and experiences of how consent occurs in practice. Laws and policies justifiably require parties to agree to the amorous and/or sexual behaviors in which they are engaged, and that they must be capable of providing that consent (i.e., not compromised by alcohol, drugs, mental, or physical limitations, etc.). But, in the intimate locations where this communication is to occur, the notion that there is an explicit request and agreement — verbally or not — is simply not consistent with the reality of many or most situations. A reviewer of an earlier draft of this manuscript rightly noted that most affirmative consent policies do not require verbal consent, but define “consent” as mutually understandable words or actions. Our research engages the notion of “mutually understandable,” which we argue is fraught with enormous variation, complexity, and fluidity both within the intimate locations where sexual interactions occur, and in the broader collegiate and societal contexts in which we learn and perform our genders and sexualities. The convenience of a definitional policy of consent achieves compliance to federal and state laws, but they do little to help individuals navigate their socio-sexual interactions or college personnel to adequately respond to reports of assault. Neither do laws and most campus policies provide relief or guidance in the wake of mixed messages women receive in the broader social milieu about whether and under what circumstances it is acceptable for them to engage in sexual activity (e.g., the so-called “virgin/whore” dichotomy, the expectation of passivity, etc.); nor to men who are given messages that they are not masculine unless they desire and pursue sexual relations generally, that they should “take charge” in sexual encounters, and that they should have frequent heterosexual sexual interactions with multiple partners.

It should be mentioned here that we intend to conduct further research with gender fluid, queer, trans* and gay and lesbian students to investigate how sexual and gender diversity mediates the question of consent. This is important not only for considering the issues across a diversity of gender and sexual identities as a matter of equity, but also because identity variation likely generates differences in how these phenomena occur or are understood. We also expect that further research with gender and sexually fluid participants will not only benefit people with such identities, but may also illuminate information of value to gender binary (e.g., male/female) and heterosexual people.

One of the additional complications of this area of study is that while the law may insist that incapacitation (such as due to alcohol or drugs) precludes consent, the social norms and peer beliefs conflict with this. In our pilot study, we also heard of practices in which students became intoxicated intentionally to relieve themselves from hesitation, fear, shame, and other concerns about sexual relations. As such, there are social structural barriers to realizing the goal of consent. We intend to gain greater understanding of these issues and to broadly share our findings.
The findings from the pilot study raise significant questions about the ineffectiveness of large-scale campus efforts to achieve practices of enthusiastic consent, and the need to better understand the realities of the sexual experiences and practices of college students so that prevention strategies can be grounded in research-based realities of students’ experiences.

Methods
The pilot study was a constructivist inquiry intended to explore consent rituals and processes among college students, particularly relative to their sexual orientation and ethnic/racial identity. It also aimed to show how better understanding of these processes can aid in informing sexual violence prevention strategies on college campuses. The pilot study and the next phase of research will be conducted from a constructivist epistemological perspective (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), in which knowledge is acquired, and created, through engagement with the people and phenomena being studied. The purpose of constructivist inquiry is “to produce depth of understanding from a particular topic or experience” (Manning, 1999, p.12). Manning (1999) further proposes that this type of research “is well-suited to knowledge discovery about campus life” and that a case, if it evokes emotions from the reader, can render a vicarious experience impossible through statistical and quantitative analysis (p.12). Davis (2002) discusses knowledge as something that “does not and cannot produce representations of an independent reality, but instead is rooted in the perspective of the knower” (p.511). Thus, we are seeking to elicit knowledge as it is constructed through the lived experience of the participants, and to understand this experience phenomenologically through the participants’ perspectives.

The data has been, and will continue to be generated via interviews with college students, as has already been described in detail. This constructivist inquiry uses qualitative, semi-structured interviews, each lasting approximately one hour. Weiss (1994) writes, “We might want to learn not so much about an event as about how it is interpreted by participants and onlookers...Qualitative interviewing enables us to learn about perceptions and reactions known only to those to whom they occurred” (10). The ultimate goal for conducting interviews is to learn how teachers understand the events that they confront. Burgess (1984) describes these as “conversations with a purpose.” Mason (1996) discusses qualitative interviewing as informal in style, containing topics or themes to be explored through narrative, and assuming that data will be generated via the interaction because the respondent or the interaction itself are the data sources. Survey and other quantitative data would not be sufficient to determine how specific resources are used in practice, and the subjective and reciprocal relationship between applying resources to student interactions and the feedback received after doing so (Burgess, 1984). We have developed interview protocols that allow us to focus on the sexual socialization process as it has affected participants. All interviews are recorded by a digital audio recorder and transcribed by a professional.

The data consists of transcribed text generated from the individual interview and focus groups, as well as field notes taken during the interviews. Field notes include our own thoughts about the interviews, as well as observations of non-verbal expressions (e.g., facial expressions, inflections, and changes in demeanor or voice), and the defining physical features of the respondents. Moreover, as part of our strategy, we asked respondents to reflect back on their experiences and perspectives in the spirit of Participatory Action Research (Reason and Bradbury, 2008). One of the aims of PAR is to facilitate collaboration by research subjects in the production of knowledge with the researchers. A distinguishing aspect of Action Research is to responsibly and deliberately attend to the interests of a constituency, while in this case inviting critical reflection and empowering reform of belief systems, communication patterns, and behaviors that undermine personal worth and agency. We see as important to the project the strong possibility that participants will continue to be positively changed by the interview process and talking about some of the most intimate details of their lives in a respectful and nonjudgmental setting. We have found this to be true in the pilot interviews as respondents came to realizations about their experiences. As respondents came to these understandings, we acted responsibly, pausing the digital recorder when emotions were high or disseminating information about resources to those who expressed a need.

Social Context of Campus Culture: “Hook-up Culture” and its Distinctions
There has been a spate of media and scholarly attention to these issues over the past few years, including research about a so-called “hookup culture,” with its assumptions that the current generation of college students has abandoned moral and relational commitments in favor of impersonal and frequent sexual interactions with their peers (Bogle, 2008; Taylor, 2013; Rosin, 2014); insinuating a hedonistic disregard for boundaries or thoughtful decision-making regarding intimacy and sex. Whereas popular media still tout such salacious accounts, the scholarly community has debunked this as revisionist stereotyping. In fact, a recent study conducted by Martin A. Monto at the University of Portland found that today’s college students have fewer sexual partners and encounters than their parents’ generation (Perry, 2013). Both the media and academia have thus far avoided thorough attention to nuances and differences in these phenomena associated with social identity issues, such as socioeconomic class, race, and sexual orientation, or by institutional type (e.g., community colleges, large vs. small institutions, public vs. private, minority-serving, religiously affiliated, etc.). We intend to incorporate these differences in the lines of inquiry associated with our research program so that findings can be targeted to particular groups and settings.
As stated earlier, the pilot study explored these social phenomena in more detail. Participants offered unusually candid accounts of their social and sexual experiences, including specific details about how they navigated and made meaning of such encounters. The participants included students who were sexually abstinent, in monogamous commitments, and/or who had periodic sexual encounters or “hook-ups.” This also suggests the need to further investigate how generational differences and differences in orientations to the so-called “hook-up culture” might matter to questions of sexual consent and agency.

Potential Impacts
A clearer understanding of the gendered and sexual social phenomena in student populations would likely help us to reduce incidents of sexual assault, unwanted sexual encounters, strengthen relations among genders, foster better social outcomes, civic commitments, trust, connection, agency, and civic commitments, all of which are the aspirant dividends of higher education. Moreover, the spate of Title IX complaints and increased attention and enforcement by OCR reflect not only weaknesses in institutional capabilities and will to ensure safety and an appropriate learning climate, but also the intractable difficulty in identifying effective ways to foster agency and consent among students, and clarity about what happens when two people go to a room alone, especially when intoxicated. Rather than focusing on adjudication after the fact, we are interested in opening up more courageous and honest discourse about the taboos, socio-sexual conventions, and effective means of navigating them in college environments. Herein lie the implications for policy, pedagogy, co-curricular programs, and promotion of ownership of one’s sexuality and advancement of psychosocial development and other aspects of college success (and reduction of their constraints).

The major impact of this research on criminal justice policy and practices is that it will aid in reducing sexual violence and therefore incidents of crime. In addition to a decrease in crime rates, our focus on the intricacies of consent processes will result in the creation of new, more nuanced ways of understanding how consent is expressed and gained. The implications for the improvement of victim services are manifold.

Learning Sexuality
This research program draws under-theorized and necessary connections between sexual practices and beliefs and early learning of sexuality. While emerging adults, teenagers and, increasingly, middle school age adolescents are thought to have a clear and significant connection with sexuality, people rarely speak of sexuality as existing in the early part of the life cycle: childhood. Yet, the learning and teaching sexuality precedes adolescence. Exploring the sphere of children can help explain a great deal about sexuality and social learning (Ferguson, 2001; Foucault, 1990; Renold, 2005; Thorne, 1993). Through the realm of children, the complex ways in which sexuality is expressed and managed can be observed. Yet, childhood and sexuality seem to be mutually exclusive categories in the popular imagination, or at least this is a belief to which many people cling.

From the time of birth, people in the United States are born into a system of gender (Butler, 1990; Fausto-Sterling, 2000) accompanied by an overwhelming sexual culture (Foucault, 1990). Because the qualities of each are continually in flux, it is necessary to develop an approach that accounts for early sexual learning in undertaking work to change sexual relations. In her dissertation, co-investigator Boas (2013) found that early learning of sexuality in formal institutions (e.g., elementary schools) mostly occurs through silence or omission where adult responses to early sexual expressions are often met on a binary: ignored or punished. When lessons about sexuality are mediated through silence or omission, neglect, or punishment, young people learn that sexuality is taboo, which breeds shame (Scheff, 2003). That has profound consequences for sexual violence prevention work. It is stunning that collegiate sexual assault research has rarely if ever considered how students’ early learning about sexuality in the home, school, or elsewhere shapes their approach to it in college. One example of the problem is exemplified within so-called rape prevention tips found on many collegiate websites. One example is shown here, with the source redacted to protect the institution, and frankly because it is illustrative of others and so identifying the university is not germane to the point: “Determine what you want and what you don’t want and communicate your limits clearly. No one should pressure you into unwanted sexual activity. If you are uncertain about what you want, ask your partner to respect your feelings.”

If young people have not had opportunities to learn that sex and sexuality are topics that can and should be discussed, then it would conceivably be difficult for them to healthily explore their own desires and values around sex. Shame is also under-theorized as a social phenomenon, with Scheff (2003) and Scheff and Retzinger (2001) the only well known contributors to this literature. Their sociological studies of shame frame it as cultural rather than psychological, and thus a mediator in social relations. Scheff (2003) contends that shame is deeply rooted in the American cultural fabric, but because it is socially taboo, it operates through silence and denial, which surfaces in violence. His studies, however, have only just begun to scratch the surface of a subject that requires far more analysis of the relationship of shame to the perpetuation of sexual violence. The proposed research aims to fill the gap in research by interrogating the relationship between a culture of shame that is mediated and motivated through silence on sexuality and a culture where sexual violence is a common occurrence.

Conclusion
Research rooted in critical gender and sexuality theories has paid particular attention to the ways in which social systems promote minimization and stigma around sexual consent and assault, inhibiting safety and
equity. Practitioners within postsecondary institutions, on the other hand, have been concerned with gendered strategies that encourage women to give “enthusiastic consent” and men to ask permission. While this has been — and continues to be — meaningful and important work, it is reductionist or exclusionary of sexual diversity (e.g., gender binary and hetero-normative), and has failed to reduce the incidence of sexual coercion and assault. College students’ experiences and meaning-making of sexual consent communication and negotiation practices in their intimate encounters remains largely unknown. Without understanding these phenomena within the context of real intimate situations, work toward mitigating the problem of sexual violence on campus will continue to base education, intervention, and prevention strategies on an idealized, parochial, and ineffectual notion of how students should negotiate sex. Conversely, deeper understanding of these encounters within context can enable researchers, policymakers, and those who work to prevent, respond to, and/or adjudicate such incidents to take more effective approaches to their work. It is our hope that this research program will offer meaningful contributions to our understandings of the complex range of circumstances that comprise sexually coercive and non-consensual encounters; and offer actionable guidance for critical reforms to prevention and response policies, practices, and programs so our campus communities.
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Introduction

College and university counseling centers have an opportunity to significantly impact a higher education institution’s ability to prevent incidents of sexual violence and to respond effectively when incidents occur. In addition to the obvious mental health support service provided by departments, counseling centers are also uniquely positioned to provide information about the occurrence of violence on campus and how effective institutional mechanisms are at responding. Specifically, counseling centers and health centers are identified as a confidential reporting option for victims experiencing incidents of violence. Thus, there is an opportunity to collect aggregate data about campus violence that is unavailable in other settings because of various barriers to reporting and data collection.

Thus, two government areas provide guidance on crime reporting requirements, including support for confidential reporting options: the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act and the guidance around Title IX compliance from the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights. Both areas specify that professional counselors in college counseling centers are exempt from mandatory reporting requirements so they can offer confidential counseling support without the disclosure of crime information learned during counseling sessions. Because of this privilege as well as other distinctions related to the categorization of reporting campus crimes for the Campus Security Act, Clery Campus Crime Statistics consistently indicate lower numbers of victimization than counseling center reports (Lombardi & Jones, 2009), making the need for aggregate reporting from counseling centers even more significant.

Means to Increase Reporting Accuracy and Improve Prevention Efforts

Through sharing of aggregate client data, counseling and medical center directors can assist student affairs administrators and police in two central ways. First, it allows more accurate reporting of the overall statistics. One approach Clery staff could take with clinical directors would be to send overall statistics to the directors prior to submission. The clinical directors could then compare the list to their client data and offer basic information such as “add two assaults and one case of stalking” to the list. This doesn’t require a release of privileged data, but instead gives the clinical director a chance to compare the Clery list to their own data to see if there are missed reports.

The second way in which sharing data helps is by giving administrators and police the tools they need to better prevent future violence. This information can be used to identify dangerous locations on campus, times that are common for an attack, or whether or not alcohol or drugs were involved. This data becomes very useful for campus administrators to target prevention efforts and programming to prevent future sexual violence from occurring. Again, this sharing does not violate students’ confidentiality when the information is shared in an aggregate, anonymous format.

This request for aggregate data doesn’t come without its detractors; yet some dragons must be battled. While it is true that licensed medical and mental health providers are exempt from having to report identifying client information as it would create a conflict with state confidentiality laws, some see this restriction expanding beyond identifying client information altogether. The authors believe this is a well-meaning, protective overreach by administrators attempting to shield client information and prevent the creation of a “slippery slope” of sharing more with non-privileged sources. The sharing of aggregate data to assist administrators accurately comply with Clery requirements is, simply stated, the right thing to do as part of a collaborative team.

Barriers to reporting sexual violence are well documented, particularly college students experiencing sexual assault. The National Crime Victimization Survey indicates approximately 80 percent of student victims of sexual assault do not report to the police (Langton, 2014). The survey also indicates some of the reasons for not reporting incidents to law enforcement include victims not believing that the police would or could help, the incident was a personal matter they did not want reported to the police, and a general fear of reprisal. Victims find the expanded level of confidentiality available in counseling centers offers a safer place to report concerns and access support. Counseling and medical staff are in a position to share aggregate information that could help identify potential high-risk areas for assault and develop awareness and prevention strategies to prevent future victimization or assault.

Campuses need accurate reports of incidents of campus violence to inform policy and resource allocation. The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault indicates this data also informs Title IX administrators about “the general extent and nature of sexual violence on and off campus so the coordinator can track patterns, evaluate the scope of the problem, and formulate appropriate campus-wide responses” (The White House, 2014). As college campuses increase the availability of information to victims about resources and reporting options related to sexual violence, counseling centers are likely to see increased numbers of victims seeking services related to sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and other types of sexual violence. A delicate balance is required by counseling and health
center directors as they are asked to provide a safe, confidential environment for reporting while also helping provide data about violence on campus.

The authors provide a model for counseling and health centers to collect aggregate data that can help inform campus policy and services while maintaining confidentiality that supports victim reporting. To support the efforts of college counseling centers in providing aggregate data about reporting without interfering with the ability to protect personally identifiable information of clients, the authors have provided a suggested data collection form in the appendix that follows.

The data collection form can be integrated into processes in counseling centers or other medical and mental health departments on campus that are also privileged reporting locations. Individual providers can be given a form to complete after client sessions or the suggested data fields can be integrated into electronic medical or counseling record systems such as Titanium Schedule.
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# CLERY CONFIDENTIAL INCIDENT DATA REPORTING FORM

(This is a sample set of questions useful to consider for a counseling or medical center director to answer and share with the Clery officer at the time of the incident, or to be used by the counseling or health center to collect information to be summarized at the end of month/semester/year report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL INCIDENT DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of the Incident:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nonconsensual Sexual Intercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nonconsensual Sexual Touching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sexual Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Intimate Partner Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Incident:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time of Incident:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Location of Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ On Campus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Residence hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Greek house/facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other: ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Off Campus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other: ____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was the alleged known to the victim?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was the offender a student, faculty or staff?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was a weapon used?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>If yes, what kind?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was alcohol involved?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Were other drugs involved?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was a police report made?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Was a report made to Title IX staff?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes   ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CLERY AGGREGATE DATA REPORTING FORM

(This is a sample set of questions useful to consider for a counseling or medical center director to answer and share with the Clery officer at the end of month/semester/year report).

## END OF YEAR/SEMESTER/MONTH REPORTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual clients reporting incidents of any sexual harassment:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual clients reporting nonconsensual sexual intercourse:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual clients reporting nonconsensual sexual touching:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual clients reporting dating/domestic or Intimate Partner violence (IPV):</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents that happened:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident hall</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/facility</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents where the alleged known to the victim:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents where a weapon used:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of types of weapons:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents involving alcohol:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents involving other drugs:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents where police reports were made:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents where a report was made to Title IX staff:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents where the offender was a:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents that happened during:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Morning</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents that happened on:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents that happened in:</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
The field of Title IX coordination and investigations has recently seen a drastic increase in media attention and focus on college and university campuses. As such, The NCHERM Group, LLC., created the only and first-of-its-kind Title IX Coordinator Training and Certification Course in 2011 that is now an ATIXA signature professional development opportunity. ATIXA, the Association of Title IX Administrators, was created to provide training and a clearinghouse of information for those in the field.

Survey Methodology & Reporting
ATIXA developed an 88-question survey that was administered online to its 2,500 members during April 2015. More than 400 respondents completed the survey, and the data was summarized and shared in June through the 2015 Survey Summary.

Survey results are shared in detail in this paper in a variety of sections. Respondent Data provides general demographic information. General Findings offers a catchall category summary of basic findings from the survey. The Memorandum of Understanding and Climate Survey sections provide summaries of questions related to those two topics. Position-based summaries are then included in the Title IX Coordinator, Deputy Title IX Coordinator, and Title IX Investigator sections. A summary of training-related questions is covered in the Training section, while Areas for Survey Improvement offers some suggestions for improvements and updates for the 2017 membership survey. A copy of the 2015 survey questions is included in the appendix of this article.

Respondent Data
The following section offers a review of respondent and school data reported in the survey. Throughout the article, the question number from the survey is referenced with a “Q” and the number of the question from the survey for future reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Responses (Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K–12 school (primary and/or secondary)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential two-year college, community college, or system</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential two-year, community college, or system</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/technical college or system</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level-only institution</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional school</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary or for-profit college/university or system</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year public college, university, or system</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year private college, university, or system</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those responding to the survey, 25 percent reported that their school is affiliated with a religious order or denomination. Seventy-five percent reported they are not (Q3).

Ninety-eight percent of those responding reported that the primary teaching method of their institution was via in-person classrooms. Two percent responded that attending classes online was the primary way students were taught (Q4).

Thirty-eight percent of schools reported that their school is part of a larger system. Sixty-two percent reported they are not (Q5).

When asked about the size of their school, respondents offered the following (Q6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of School</th>
<th>Responses (Q6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000–3,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001–7,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001–15,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001–25,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001–35,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those schools that have a residential population, respondents offered data in the following breakdown (Q7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Population</th>
<th>Responses (Q7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000–3,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001–7,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001–15,000</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of full time employees, schools’ data is represented by the following breakdown (Q8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Employees</th>
<th>Responses (Q8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000–3,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001–7,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001–15,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked about the particular role of the person completing the survey, respondents answered in the following ways (Q9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Role at School</th>
<th>Responses (Q9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Coordinator (or equivalent)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Team Member</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the “other” responses, the most common answers included: A combination of investigator and coordinator, dean or associate dean, student conduct director, compliance officer, legal counsel, and human resources personnel.

**General Findings**

A summary of general findings follows here:

- Fifty-five percent of schools reported having the same investigation process for students as they do for their employees (Q71). Forty percent did not, and 5 percent were unsure.
- Only 31 percent of teams had a vision or mission statement for their Title IX efforts (Q72). Fifty-two percent did not and 17 percent were unsure.
- Sixty-eight percent of schools had a procedure, policy, or protocol for the role and responsibility of the Title IX office. Twenty-two percent did not and 10 percent were unsure (Q73).

The most frequent way schools described their Title IX resolution processes are listed below (Q79):

- 39%: A civil rights model with an appeal. (An investigator or investigators present a finding for implementation to the Title IX coordinator or other senior administrator. The finding can be appealed to one or more levels of appeal.)
- 19%: Hybrid fact-gatherer. (An investigation without finding precedes a hearing, the decision of which may be appealed.)
- 17%: Hybrid fact-finder. (An investigation renders a finding, and is then subject to a hearing and appeal.)
- 16%: ATIXA One Policy, One Process model.
- 15%: The pure civil rights model. (An investigator or investigators present a finding for implementation to the Title IX coordinator or other senior administrator. No formal or adversarial hearing takes place.)
- 13%: Traditional due process hearing model. (The hearing is used as the investigation, the finding, and sanctions, which are typically subject to appeal.)
- 9%: Other unified model, but not the ATIXA One Policy, One Process model. (This may consist of a unified pure civil rights or hybrid approach for all faculty, students, and staff.)

The most frequent way schools reported tracking their Title IX case-load are listed below (Q80):

- 26%: An Excel spreadsheet.
- 25%: Written records only.
- 19%: Maxient database.
- 6%: Internally developed database.
- 4%: Access database.
- 5%: Simplicity database.
- 1%: Pave database.
- 1%: Adirondack Solutions database.

The majority of survey respondents (79 percent) said their institutions had a Title IX mandatory reporting policy or statement for employees (Q74).

Fifty-one percent of institutions reported having a dedicated Title IX website as part of their school’s website (Q59).

Sixty-six percent of schools in the survey included contact information for the Title IX coordinator in all versions of the school’s non-discrimination statement (Q58). Twenty-four percent included it in some versions.

Seventy-three percent of schools had their prevention and training related to sex/gender discrimination overseen by the Title IX coordinator (Q60). Thirty-three percent had the prevention programming decentralized in various departments.

The following departments and positions have a role in Title IX based prevention/training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Department</th>
<th>Responses (Q61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Investigator</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Deputy Coordinator</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Life Office</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Offices</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Group/s</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy Office</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness services</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Prevention Program</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotions</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thirty-three percent of schools reported having a budget associated with their Title IX/compliance efforts (Q62). Fifty-one percent of schools did not. Sixteen percent were unsure if they had a budget.

For those schools that have a budget (Q63), more than half were unsure of its amount. For those that had a budget and knew the amount, 10 percent were 0–$5,000, 20 percent were $5,001–$25,000, 6 percent were $25,001–$50,000, and 3 percent were $50,001 and above.

Forty-eight percent of schools said they made sexual assault advocates available through an agreement with a community agency, while 43 percent reported having advocates that were employed by the school (Q69). Eight percent of schools made use of trained student-advocates. Fifty-six percent of schools considered sexual assault advocates to be confidential reporting resources (Q70).

Forty-nine percent of responding institutions had a written procedure to determine which process applies to a cross-constituent complaint if more than one process could apply. Twenty-four percent did not, 19 percent were unsure, and 8 percent did not find the question to be applicable.

Ninety-three percent of schools reported using the preponderance of evidence standard (more likely than not) for all Title IX-related complaints, including appeals (Q84). Seven percent were unsure.

Eighty-five percent of schools noted that they had a resolution process (e.g., pre-hearing preparation, hearing participation, and/or appeals opportunities) that offered options equitably to all students and employees in Title IX-covered cases. Four percent of schools did not, while another 11 percent were unsure.

Fifty-two percent of schools reported that they had developed a publication (brochure or pamphlet) for all victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking. Twenty-nine percent said they had publications in the process of being developed, while 13 percent did not. Six percent were unsure.

For schools that had developed a publication (brochure or pamphlet) for victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking, respondents said the publication contained the following information (Q87):

- 98%: Campus resources.
- 95%: Title IX coordinator.
- 94%: Local community resources.
- 89%: Campus counseling resources.
- 74%: Filing a report with campus police.
- 72%: Filing a report with local police.
- 61%: Campus health resources.
- 55%: Hospitals and medical attention.
- 47%: Deputy Title IX coordinators.
- 44%: Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR).
- 44%: Campus victim advocates.
- 41%: Coursework advocates.
- 40%: No-contact orders.
- 38%: Crime victim accommodations.
- 36%: SANE nurses/the importance of evidence collection.
- 33%: Work accommodations.
- 11%: Travel accommodations.

Seventy-nine percent of schools shared that students and employees in all cases involving sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking were afforded the same rights to an advisor of their choosing, including an attorney, in all meetings related to the complaint. Sixteen percent were unsure, while another 5 percent did not (Q88).

Memorandum of Understanding

Only 30 percent of Title IX offices represented in the survey had a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the campus law enforcement/security department as it pertains to Title IX. Thirty-six percent did not, while 18 percent were unsure and 16 percent found the question not applicable to their circumstances (Q75).

Twenty-seven percent of schools reported having a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to Title IX with the local law enforcement, while 48 percent did not and 25 percent were unsure (Q76).

Twenty-eight percent of respondents said their institutions had Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) related to Title IX with local advocacy organizations/agencies/shelters, while 44 percent do not and 28 percent were unsure (Q77).

For schools that reported using hearing boards/panels to resolve Title IX complaints, the following groups were eligible to serve as panelists: faculty (46 percent), staff (46 percent), administration (35 percent) and students (19 percent). Forty-four percent did not use hearing boards/panels to resolve Title IX complaints (Q82).

Climate Survey

Thirty-five percent of schools were in the planning stages to conduct a student-based climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination (Q64). Only 24 percent of schools had completed this type of climate survey in the past two years (Q64).

Twenty-seven percent of participating schools were in the planning stages to conduct an employee-based climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination (Q65). Only 10 percent of schools had completed this type of climate survey in the past two years (Q65).

For schools that had created a climate survey in the past two years, 38
percent did so internally, 33 percent did so in tandem with internal and external processes, and 29 percent had them created externally (Q66). External creation would assume that a school partnered with an outside organization to create and administer the survey.

For schools that reported having administered a climate survey in the past two years, 66 percent handled administration internally, 14 percent administered them in tandem with internal and external processes, and 20 percent had them administered externally (Q67).

Schools that created a climate survey included the following topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Survey Topic Areas</th>
<th>Responses (Q68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/gender discrimination</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title IX Coordinators**

The following responses address the role and make-up Title IX coordinators:

- Ninety-nine percent of schools had named a Title IX coordinator or administrator at their institution (Q10).
- Seventy-four percent of those coordinators were female, while 26 percent were male (Q12).
- Seventy-nine percent identified as white, 14 percent said they are black or African American, 4.5 percent identified as Latina/o or Hispanic, 2 percent said they are Asian, and 1 percent identified as Native American/Alaska Native (Q13).
- For schools part of a larger system, 13 indicated that there was a designated systemwide Title IX coordinator. Twenty-four percent indicated there was not a coordinator for the system, while 6 percent said they were unsure (Q11).

At most institutions represented, the Title IX coordinator was considered part time (81 percent), with their primary job responsibilities not involving non-discrimination (44 percent); or part time with other primary job responsibilities involving non-discrimination, such as equity, inclusion, and/or affirmative action (37 percent). Ten percent of schools had a full-time Title IX coordinator with no other primary job responsibilities. An additional 10 percent of responding schools indicated that they had a full-time Title IX coordinator with other mixed job duties (Q15).

The most common additional roles a Title IX coordinator has are listed in the table that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Roles</th>
<th>Responses (Q16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Equity/Inclusion/EEO</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President/Chancellor in SA</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director in Student Affairs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean in Student Affairs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean/Professor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA/Disability Coordinator</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Vice President for Compliance</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Finance Operations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of Clery Act/VAWA Section 304 compliance, most responding schools (56 percent) saw the Title IX coordinator as being partially responsible for reporting, and 16 percent of schools saw them as fully responsible for reporting. Nineteen percent said they saw their Title IX coordinator as having no responsibility for reporting under the Clery Act/VAWA or Section 304 compliance. Another eight percent of survey participants said they were unsure (Q18).

The salary range for full-time Title IX coordinators as reported is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Responses (Q26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the Title IX coordinator position was shared with another role, the following stipends were provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipend Amount</th>
<th>Responses (Q27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000–$10,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001–$20,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001–$30,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001–$40,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001–$50,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $50,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Title IX coordinator most often reported (Q32) to the college president (47 percent), student affairs (13 percent), vice president for business/finance (12 percent), human resources (9 percent), or academic dean/provost (8 percent). Less frequently, they reported to the board of trustees/visitors/education/regs/curators/etc. (3 percent), the director of equity and inclusion (2 percent) and general counsel (2 percent).

Sixty-five percent of Title IX coordinators played a formal role in decision-making about discrimination cases; 35 percent did not (Q32).

For those Title IX coordinators who did have a formal role in decision-making, they described this process as arbitration, appeal, oversight, responsibility, response, sanctions, advising the review board, and appeal (Q33).

Sixty percent of schools allow someone to overrule the decision made or approved by the Title IX coordinator. Twelve percent of schools do not allow this, and 28% of respondents are unsure of their process (Q34).

For those schools that allowed someone to overrule decisions, the dean of students, president, provost, board of trustees, or legal counsel most commonly did this.

Thirty percent of schools did not include Title IX roles in their written job descriptions (Q35). For those schools that did include Title IX roles in their job descriptions, 63 percent include Title IX coordinator, 22 percent included deputy coordinator, and 11 percent listed civil rights investigators.

Sixty-three percent of schools designated an alternate to whom complaints involving the Title IX coordinator could be made. Seventeen percent did not and 20 percent were unsure (Q36).

The majority of schools (54 percent) did not designate their Title IX
coordinator as their Section 504 coordinator. Twenty-four percent of schools did while 22 percent of respondents were unsure (Q37).

Forty-two percent of survey-takers described their Title IX coordinator responsibilities as a one-person department, while 23 percent reported having 1–3 full-time professional staff and 10 percent of schools had four or more full-time professional staff (Q38).

Thirty-five percent of schools in the survey had a full-time administrative assistant for their Title IX coordinator (Q38).

Forty-nine percent of Title IX coordinators worked closely with their general counsel or outside counsel (Q38).

Eighteen percent of Title IX coordinators reported having a Title IX strategic plan for their department (Q38).

Most Title IX coordinators polled said they had the knowledge (80 percent) and skills (91 percent) to do their job well (Q39).

Most Title IX coordinators reported that they were able to fulfill their compliance tasks (71 percent) and were able to stay on top of their current caseload (64 percent) (Q39).

Forty-six percent of Title IX coordinators shared that they were able to stay on top of their other coordinator responsibilities. Thirty percent were unsure if they were able to stay on top of these, and 24 percent shared that they were not able to stay on top of their other coordinator responsibilities (Q39).

Most Title IX coordinators said that senior-level administrators at their school understood (60 percent) and respected (72 percent) their role. Sixty-seven percent shared that senior level administrators gave them the authority to fulfill their Title IX coordinator responsibilities (Q39).

The majority of Title IX coordinators polled in the survey shared that senior-level administrators at their institution provided the support (64 percent) and funding (51 percent) necessary to ensure Title IX compliance (Q40).

Forty-three percent of Title IX coordinators said their school had an insufficient number of trained investigators. Fifty-one percent shared that they do not have adequate staffing to fulfill the school’s Title IX needs (Q40).

Only 39 percent of Title IX coordinators polled felt their school’s budget was sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX employee and student training needs. Thirty-six percent felt the budget was sufficient to fulfill the institution’s Title IX prevention education needs (Q40).

When asked how much additional budget money would be needed to fulfill their school’s Title IX needs, coordinators shared the following: less than $10,000 (12 percent), $10,000–$30,000 (32 percent), $31,000–$50,000 (11 percent), $50,000–$100,000 (11 percent), more than $100,000 (6 percent). Twenty-eight percent reported this was not applicable (Q41).

Title IX coordinators shared that they had an annual opportunity to brief the following groups on Title IX (Q42):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Groups</th>
<th>Responses (Q42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Cabinet or Executive Committee</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs, Senior Academic Affairs Administrators</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President or Superintendent</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Trustees/Education/Visitors/ Curators/Regents</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity Diversity</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deputy Coordinators**

The following table provides a list of areas where respondents said their institutions made use of a deputy Title IX coordinator. Due to repeated use categories in the survey, the numbers do not add up to 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Areas</th>
<th>Responses (Q19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Student Affairs (not student conduct)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have none</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity Diversity</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police/ Public Safety</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Campus/Extension Site</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Site</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other areas commonly included: Title IX investigations, mediation and dispute resolution, institutional research, and multicultural affairs.

Fifty-five percent of schools had assigned investigator duties to the deputy coordinators (Q20).

**Title IX Investigators**

Most schools polled reported that they did not have a full-time Title IX or civil rights investigator (67 percent). Twelve percent of schools reported having one full-time Title IX or civil rights investigator, 9 percent had two, 3 percent had three, and 9 percent had four or more (Q46).

In terms of degree, Title IX and civil rights investigators shared the following. Note that there may be multiple staff members in these positions, so the percentages do not add up to 100% (Q49).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title IX/Civil Rights Investigator Degree</th>
<th>Response (Q49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Degree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty percent of institutions had designated their investigators as Title IX deputy coordinators. Fifty-four percent had not designated them as such, while 16 percent of survey-takers were unsure (Q 21).

Title IX and civil rights investigators shared that they were in the following departments on campus (Q50):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title IX/Civil Rights Investigator Location</th>
<th>Response (Q50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Affairs</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity/Inclusion</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only External Investigators</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title IX investigators listed the additional job duties they had (Q51) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title IX/Civil Rights Additional Job Duties</th>
<th>Response (Q51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Equity/Inclusion / EEO</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President/Chancellor in Student Affairs</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director in Student Affairs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean in Student Affairs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA/Disability Coordinator</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Dean/Professor</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Vice President for Compliance</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Finance/Operations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost/Assistant Provost</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Title IX investigators (Q52) reported to the Title IX coordinator (61 percent) or the deputy coordinator (7 percent).

The internal Title IX or civil rights investigators on campuses were staff members (80 percent), faculty (23 percent), dedicated, full-time investigators (10 percent), campus law enforcement (16 percent), school resource officers (3 percent), or other internal investigators (13 percent) (Q44).

Most schools (70 percent) reported not using external Title IX or civil rights investigators (Q45). For those that did, they worked with local attorneys (17 percent), local private investigators (3 percent), local law enforcement (4 percent), or other resources (8 percent). Please note: for schools that reported using external investigators, survey-takers were able to select more than one answer.

For the 30 percent of schools that reported using external investigators, they shared the following in terms of annual costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Investigator Annual Costs</th>
<th>Responses (Q 48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001- $100,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$250,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,001-$500,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $500,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 41 percent of Title IX investigators shared that they only investigate Title IX cases and no other forms of discrimination. Fifty-one percent said that they investigate other forms of discrimination as well. Nine percent of survey-takers were unsure (Q56).

Fifty-eight percent of Title IX investigators described their work as primarily fact-finding (making a recommendation or finding), and 38 percent described their work as fact-gathering (gathering information that informs the final decisions) (Q57).

Training
This section examines questions related to training received by Title IX staff members.

Fifty-six percent of schools reported using internal training for their coordinators and deputy coordinators. Eighty-eight percent shared that they used external trainings, and 56 percent reported using online trainings (Q24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATIXA Trainings</th>
<th>Coordinator (Q25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Coordinator Certification</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one Advanced Coordinator Certification</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Investigator Certification</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one Advanced Investigator Certification</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of training throughout the year, the table that follows helps to highlights the training differences among coordinators, deputy coordinators, and investigators who participated in our survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Coordinator (Q22)</th>
<th>Deputy Coord. (Q23)</th>
<th>Investigator (Q53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those reporting other shared that training is ongoing, quarterly, every other year, or that their institutions did not currently have a consistent training schedule/plan (Q23).

Title IX investigators report the following type of training they receive (Q54). Sixty-six percent of respondents report attending an external, in-person ATIXA training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Trainings</th>
<th>Responses (Q54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External (in-person)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal (in-person)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (online)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal (online)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About half (49 percent) of the Title IX investigators had completed the ATIXA Basic Investigation track. Twenty-three percent said they completed at least one Advanced Investigator Certification. And twenty-seven percent reported that they have not completed either (Q55).

For schools providing an appeal in Title IX complaints, respondents said appeals officers are trained with the following frequency (Q83):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Board</th>
<th>Respondents (Q83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For schools using hearing boards/officers/panels to resolve Title IX complaints, they offered training based with the following frequency (Q81).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Board (Q81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas for Survey Improvement
As this was the first ATIXA membership survey, there were several questions that will be updated and corrected for the next version. The following are a summary of the anticipated changes.

• Q17 would benefit from a checklist option to better contain
the variety of replies offered by respondents.

- On question 25, we asked about training completed by the Title IX coordinator. It would be helpful to add another question to ask about the deputy coordinator or blend these into one question. Also, “Basic Investigator” should be changed to “Introductory Investigator.” Tracks have since been updated and should reflect new names.

- On question 32, it would be helpful to separate out the provost as an option as well as adding general counsel.

- Question 47 is worded in a complicated way. “If you employ dedicated, full-time or part-time investigators, what is their annual salary range?” It would follow that most dedicated investigators would be full-time. It would be helpful to clarify if ATIXA is looking for data on full- or part-time investigators.

- For question 50, it would be helpful to stay consistent with previous questions and include “Title IX” and “Civil Rights,” rather than just “Title IX.”

- For Question 51, most respondents listed job positions rather than job duties. It would be also helpful to make this a checklist question based on the following results rather than keeping it as an open-ended question.
  - Human Resources
  - Diversity/Equity/Inclusion/EEO
  - Vice President/Chancellor in Student Affairs
  - Director in Student Affairs
  - Dean in Student Affairs
  - ADA/Disability Coordinator
  - Academic Affairs Dean/Professor
  - Director/Vice President for Compliance
  - Vice President for Finance/Operations
  - Provost/Assistant Provost

- Question 54 response options “External in-person” and “External in-person training program (e.g., ATIXA 2-day)” could be repetitive. It would be helpful to list out ATIXA programs.

- Several questions have small range problems creating some overlap in responses. Q26 should read $25,001–$50,000, Q27 should read $5,001–$10,000, Q41 should read $50,001–$100,000, Q48 should read $25,001–$50,000, Q67 should read $2,501–$5,000.

ATIXA members are encouraged to contact the author and share further suggestions for updates, additions, modifications, and new questions.

Analysis and Conclusion

Following the recent VAWA requirements and the large number of schools under investigation for Title IX related infractions, it should come as no surprise that colleges and universities are dedicating time, funding, and resources to address these issues. One positive development is that 99 percent of schools surveyed had named a Title IX coordinator or administrator at their institution (Q10). In terms of demographics, the majority of these coordinators were female (74 percent) (Q12) and white (79 percent (Q13), suggesting the need for greater racial and gender diversity as campuses hire new or additional Title IX administrators.

The majority of coordinators (87 percent) (Q28) and investigators (79 percent) (Q79) and reported having advanced degrees such as master’s, law, and doctoral degrees. The majority of coordinators (68 percent) (Q22), deputy coordinators (57 percent) (Q23), and investigators (69 percent) (Q53) received training annually or semi-annually. About half (49 percent) of Title IX investigators represented in the survey had completed the ATIXA Basic/Introductory Investigation track.

Most (77 percent) of Title IX coordinators were considered mid-level to senior level employees (Q14), and the majority of Title IX coordinators (81 percent) had additional job duties (Q15). About half of Title IX coordinators worked closely with their general counsel or outside counsel (Q38), and most Title IX coordinators reported that they are able to fulfill their compliance tasks (71 percent) and are able to stay on top of their current caseload (64 percent) (Q39).

While schools are paying attention to the need to address Title IX compliance and investigatory issues, the majority (62 percent) of Title IX coordinators reported being new to the work, having been in the position for fewer than two years (Q30). The survey offered some uplifting data, however. Despite being new to the position, the vast majority of Title IX coordinators reported that they felt they had the knowledge (80 percent) and skills (91 percent) to do their job well (Q39). In addition, 35 percent of schools represented had a full-time administrative assistant for their Title IX coordinator (Q38).

While it is obvious that OCR’s 2011 “Dear Colleague Letter” prompted increased awareness of and resources for Title IX compliance, this work will need to continue on an upward trajectory. For example, only half of the schools surveyed reported having a dedicated Title IX website (Q59). Strategic plans for the department also lagged behind, as only 18 percent of respondents indicated that they currently have one in place (Q38).

Most schools did not have a full-time Title IX or civil rights investigator (67 percent) (Q46). However, more than half of the institutions had assigned investigator duties to the deputy coordinators (Q20) to assist with the lack of full-time investigators.

About 10 percent of respondents said their schools did not include Title IX
information (including contact information for the Title IX coordinator) in the institution’s non-discrimination statement (Q 58). Only 43 percent of schools reported employing sexual assault advocates, instead relying on support from community agencies (48 percent) to provide these services. Developing comprehensive websites and employing adequate staffing to meet the demand of and adopt best practices in Title IX work are both opportunities for improvement for a majority of institutions.

Budget is another area that offers opportunity for improvement. Half of schools reported having a dedicated a budget associated with their Title IX compliance efforts (Q62). Only 39 percent of respondents felt that their school’s budget was sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX employee and student training needs. And only 36 percent felt the budget was sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX prevention education needs (Q40).

ATIXA would like to see improvement in the number of schools making the effort to assess their campus climate through the use of a survey. Only 24 percent of schools represented in our survey had conducted a climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination for students (Q64), and even fewer (10 percent) had conducted one for faculty and staff (Q65). There is positive movement, however, with 36 percent of schools working toward developing such surveys for students and 27 percent (Q64) in the process of developing surveys for faculty and staff (Q65).

Climate surveys are a bit of a third-rail when it comes to making the choice to implement. Campus leaders are often concerned about the potential negative press and often default into “let’s just wait until we have a problem” or “this is why we have insurance, let’s not borrow trouble here.” We argue that institutions would never take this approach with elevator or bridge inspections. It is better to understand the potential for a problem before the cable breaks or a small crack becomes a critical flaw. Climate surveys, too, provide opportunities for creating a safer campus. Developing and implementing a climate survey helps institutions to better monitor and assess the potential for a problem and provides and opportunity to get out in front of problems before they become catastrophic.

When compared against the larger spectrum of all survey respondents, non-residential, two-year colleges, community colleges, or systems yielded different results than their traditional four-year counterparts. Only 20 percent of these schools had conducted a climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination for students (Q64) and 27 percent were in the planning stages to conduct these surveys, compared to 24 percent/36 percent of all schools responding. About 40 percent of non-residential two-year colleges, community colleges or systems reported having a Title IX-specific website, compared to 51 percent of all schools responding.

The outlook for non-residential, two-year college, community college or systems looks better with regard to budget and staffing levels (Q40). Forty-six percent reported that their school’s budget was sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX employee and student training needs (compared to 39 percent of all schools). When asked if their school’s budget was sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX prevention education needs, 43 percent of survey-takers responded positively, compared to 36 percent for all schools.

Only 34 percent of non-residential, two-year colleges, community colleges, or systems had developed or were developing a publication (brochure or pamphlet) for all victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking. Public (47 percent) and private (88 percent) four-year colleges and universities had developed or were developing these publications (Q86).

As Title IX systems develop, we will likely see an increase in policies that extend beyond the physical walls of the institution. While only 27 percent of schools in the survey had an MOU with campus law enforcement/security department and 28 percent with local advocacy organizations/agencies/shelters, it would be our hope that future surveys show a growth in this percentage (Q77).

Most institutions (39 percent) reported using a Title IX resolution process that is based on a civil rights model with an appeal. This is described in the survey as “An investigator or investigators present a finding for implementation to the Title IX coordinator or other senior administrator. The finding can be appealed to one or more levels of appeal” (Q79). While other models were used (pure civil rights, hybrid fact gatherer/finder, traditional due process, and ATIXA 1P1P), the civil rights model with an appeal stands out above the rest (Q79).

One survey trend was a high percentage of “unsure” answers for a number of the questions. These questions offer opportunities for campuses to clarify key concepts and foundational information for their staff. For example, 10 percent of respondents did not know if the Title IX office had a policy and procedure manual (Q73) and 17 percent were unsure if the Title IX office had a vision or mission statement. Around 30 percent of survey respondents were unsure if someone at their school could overrule a decision made or approved by their Title IX coordinator (Q34), 14 percent of respondents were unsure if sexual advocates were employed or made available to students at their school (Q69), and 21 percent of those completing the survey were
unsure if their administration had designated them as confidential (not considered mandated reporters to anyone) (Q72).

It is to be expected that as Title IX enforcement on college and university campuses evolves, the campus community will develop a better understanding of these key issues. ATIXA hopes the questions and data provided here serve as a starting place to reduce the number of “unsure” responses in the next survey and encourage ATIXA members to be more aware of these key issues at their institutions.

Finally, most individuals (65 percent) responding to the survey indicated that they worked at a four-year, private or public college, university, or systems (Q2), while 27 percent shared that they worked at a residential and non-residential community and two-year college. There would be a value in a more focused, target outreach to community colleges in future surveys.

ATIXA is uniquely positioned as the sole membership association dedicated to Title IX administrators. As this is ATIXA’s first member survey, there is little opportunity to compare 2015 data to data from previous years. Rather, the 2015 survey results serve as baseline for future surveys. The next ATIXA membership survey will provide an opportunity to identify and explore developing trends in the field.
Appendix (Survey Questions)

Q1: What is the name of your school?

Q2: Your school is a [please select the most appropriate option]:
- K-12 school (primary and/or secondary)
- Non-residential two-year college, community college, or system
- Residential two-year, community college or system
- Vocational/technical college or system
- Graduate-level-only institution
- Professional school
- Proprietary or for-profit college/university or system
- Four-year public college, university, or system
- Four-year private college, university, or system

Q3: Is your school is affiliated with a religious order or denomination?

Q4: What is the primary way that students are taught at your school?
- Attending classes in person
- Attending classes online

Q5: Is your school part of a System?

Q6: What is the full-time equivalent student population at your school?
- Less than 1,000
- 1,000–3,000
- 3,001–7,000
- 7,001–15,000
- 15,001–25,000
- 25,001–35,000
- More than 35,000

Q7: What is the residential population on your campus?
- None
- Less than 1,000
- 1,000–3,000
- 3,001–7,000
- 7,001–15,000
- More than 15,000

Q8: How many of full-time employees work at your school?
- Less than 1,000
- 1,000–3,000
- 3,001–7,000
- 7,001–15,000
- More than 15,000

Q9: What is your role at the school?
- Investigator
Q10: Has your school named a Title IX Coordinator or Administrator?

Q11: If your school is part of a system, is there a designated system-level Title IX coordinator?

Q12: The Title IX coordinator at your school is [check all that apply]:
   - Male
   - Female
   - Transgender
   - Does not identify with gender binary
   - Other (please specify)

Q13: The Title IX Coordinator at your school is [check all that apply]:
   - White
   - Black or African American
   - Asian
   - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
   - Native American/Alaska Native
   - Latina/Latino/Hispanic
   - Multi-ethnic/multi-racial
   - Other (please specify)

Q14: The Title IX coordinator at your school is considered a:
   - Lower, mid-level employee
   - Mid-level employee (associate dean, dean, director)
   - Senior-level employee (VP, executive, some deans)
   - Cabinet-level employee
   - Other (please specify)

Q15: The Title IX coordinator at your school is best described as a:
   - Full-time Title IX coordinator with no other primary job responsibilities
   - Part-time Title IX coordinator with other primary job responsibilities involving non-discrimination (e.g., equity, inclusion, affirmative action, etc.)
   - Part-time Title IX coordinator with primary job responsibilities that do not involve non-discrimination
   - Other (please specify)

Q16: If your Title IX coordinator has other job duties outside of the Title IX role (whether full or part-time), please provide their title:

Q17: If your Title IX coordinator has other job responsibilities outside of the Title IX role (whether full or part-time), please briefly describe those responsibilities:

Q18: Please select the role/responsibility that your Title IX coordinator has with regards to the Clery Act/VAWA 304 compliance:
   - Not responsible for any aspect of Clery Act/VAWA 304 compliance
   - Fully responsible for all aspects of Clery Act/VAWA 304 compliance
Partially responsible for aspects of Clery Act/VAWA 304 compliance

Q19: Please select the areas in which your school (officially or unofficially) uses deputy Title IX coordinators [check all that apply]:
- We have none
- Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity Diversity Disability Services
- Student Services/Student Affairs (not student conduct)
- Student Conduct
- Human Resources
- Athletics
- President's Office
- Academic Affairs
- Residence Life
- Campus Police/Public Safety
- Branch Campuses or Extension Sites
- Study Abroad Sites
- Other (please specify)

Q20: Has your school assigned an investigation function to deputy coordinator(s)?

Q21: Has your school designated its investigators as deputy coordinator(s)?

Q22: Approximately how often does your school's Title IX Coordinator receive related training?
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Annually
- Other (please specify)

Q23: Approximately how often does your school's Deputy Coordinator(s) receive related training?
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Annually
- Other (please specify)

Q24: What types of training do your coordinator and/or deputies receive? [check all that apply]
- Internal
- External
- Online
- Other (please specify)

Q25: What level of ATIXA training has your Title IX coordinator completed? [check all that apply]
- None
- Basic Coordinator Certification
- At least one Advanced Coordinator Certification
- Basic Investigator Certification
- At least one Advanced Investigator Certification
Q26: If your coordinator is a full-time, dedicated position, what is their salary?
- Less than $25,000
- $25,000–$50,000
- $50,001–$75,000
- $75,001–$100,000
- More than $100,000
- Unknown
- Not Applicable

Q27: If your coordinator position is shared with another role or roles, please indicate what level of additional stipend they are provided as coordinator:
- None
- Less than $5,000
- $5,000–$10,000
- $10,001–$20,000
- $20,001–$30,000
- $30,001–$40,000
- $40,001–$50,000
- More than $50,000
- Unknown
- Not Applicable

Q 28: What is the highest degree attained by your Title IX coordinator?
- BA/BS
- Masters Degree
- Doctorate
- Law Degree
- Other (please specify)

Q 29: What is the location (department) of your Title IX coordinator on campus?
- Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity/Diversity
- Student Services/Student Affairs
- Human Resources
- Athletics
- President’s Office
- Academic Affairs
- Superintendent
- Principal
- Other (please specify)

Q 30: How long has your Title IX coordinator had this duty?
- Less than 1 year
- 1–2 years
- 2–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
- More than 10 years

Q 31: Please identify each answer that includes a responsibility or role of your Title IX coordinator [check all that apply]:
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☐ Oversight of non-discrimination programs
☐ Intake
☐ Response
☐ Policy development and implementation
☐ Procedure development and implementation
☐ Title IX compliance
☐ Compliance with state non-discrimination laws
☐ Compliance with (portions of) VAWA Section 304 (Campus SaVE Act)
☐ Investigation
☐ Case management, recordkeeping, and investigation oversight
☐ Remedies
☐ Training
☐ Prevention
☐ Climate
☐ Pattern detection, tracking, and remediation
☐ Central point of contact
☐ Other (please specify)

Q 32: To whom does your Title IX coordinator report in the school’s structure? [check all that apply]
☐ President
☐ Board of Trustees/Visitors/Education/Regents/Curators/etc.
☐ Student Affairs
☐ Human Resources
☐ Director of Equity and Inclusion
☐ Academic Dean/Provost
☐ Vice President for Administrative Affairs
☐ Vice President for Business/Finance
☐ Special Assistant to the President
☐ Athletics Director Other (please specify)

Q33: Does your Title IX coordinator have a formal role in decision-making about discrimination cases?

Q34: Can someone at your school overrule a decision made or approved by your Title IX coordinator?

Q35: Please select which of the following Title IX roles are included in written job descriptions for your school [check all that apply]:
☐ We do not include Title IX roles in job descriptions
☐ Title IX Coordinator
☐ Deputy Coordinators
☐ Civil Rights Investigators
☐ Other (please specify)

Q36: Does your campus designate an alternate to whom complaints involving the coordinator can be made?

Q37: Is your school’s Title IX coordinator also designated as the Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act) coordinator?

Q38: Please select the responses that best describe the Title IX coordinator at your school [check all that apply]:
☐ Is a one-person shop
☐ Has 1–3 other full-time professional staff
☐ Has 4 or more other full-time professional staff
Has support from one or more administrative assistants
Works closely with General Counsel or Outside Counsel
Works with a designated campus-wide Title IX Team/Committee
Has a Title IX strategic plan

Q39: Title IX coordinators, please answer the following statements by selecting one of five options:

- I have the knowledge to do my job well
- I have the skills to do my job well
- I am fulfilling my compliance tasks
- I am able to stay on top of my current caseload
- I am able to stay on top of my other coordinator responsibilities
- Senior-level administrators at my school understand my role as Title IX coordinator
- Senior-level administrators at my school respect my role as Title IX coordinator
- Senior-level administrators at my school give me the authority I need to fulfill my Title IX coordinator responsibilities

Q40: Title IX coordinators, please answer the following statements pertaining to funding and resource allocations at your school by selecting one of five options:

- Senior-level administrators at my school provide the support necessary to ensure Title IX compliance
- Senior-level administrators at my school provide the necessary funding to ensure Title IX compliance
- My school’s budget is sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX employee and student training needs
- My school’s budget is sufficient to fulfill the school’s Title IX prevention education needs
- My school’s Title IX staffing is sufficient to fulfill our Title IX needs
- My school has a sufficient number of trained Title IX investigators

Q41: Title IX coordinators, if you noted that you do not have sufficient financial resources to fulfill your school’s Title IX needs, please select the additional amount you would need per academic year:

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000–$30,000
- $31,000–$50,000
- $50,000–$100,000
- More than $100,000
- Not Applicable

Q42: Title IX coordinators, do you have an annual opportunity to brief the following groups on Title IX? [check all that apply]

- Department Chairs/Senior Academic Affairs Administrators
- The President/Superintendent
- The Board of Trustees/Education/Visitors/Curators/Regents/Etc.
- The President’s Cabinet or Executive Committee
Q43: Title IX investigators, please answer the following statements checking one of five options:

- I have the knowledge to do my job well
- I have the skills to do my job well
- My school has a sufficient number of trained Title IX investigators
- I am able to stay on top of my current caseload
- I am able to stay on top of my other job responsibilities
- The Title IX coordinator at my school understands how to comply with Title IX
- The Title IX coordinator at my school understands my role as Title IX investigator
- The Title IX coordinator at my school respects my role as Title IX investigator
- The Title IX coordinator at my school gives me the authority I need to fulfill my Title IX Investigator responsibilities
- The Title IX coordinator at my school provides me the support necessary to fulfill my Title IX investigator responsibilities

Q44: Who are the internal Title IX or civil rights investigators at your school? [check all that apply]
- Staff members
- Faculty
- Dedicated, full-time investigators
- Campus law enforcement officers
- School resource officers
- Other internal investigators
- Not Applicable

Q45: Who are the external Title IX or civil rights investigators at your school? [check all that apply]
- Local attorneys
- Local private investigators
- Local law enforcement
- Other
- Not Applicable — we do not use external investigators

Q46: How many full-time Title IX/civil rights investigator positions does your school have?
- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Q47: If you employ dedicated, full-time or part-time investigators, what is their annual salary range?
- Less than $25,000
- $25,000–$50,000
- $50,001–$75,000
- $75,001–$100,000
Q48: If your school uses external investigators, approximately what do your annual payments to them total?
- Less than $25,000
- $25,000–$50,000
- $50,001–$75,000
- $75,001–$100,000
- $100,001–$250,000
- $250,001–$500,000
- More than $500,000
- Unsure

Q49: What is the highest degree attained by your internal Title IX/civil rights investigator(s)? [check all that apply]
- BA/BS degree
- Masters degree
- Doctoral degree
- Law degree
- Unsure/Not Applicable

Q50: In what department are your Title IX investigator(s) located? [check all that apply]
- Equal Opportunity/AA/Equity/Inclusion
- Student Services/Student Affairs
- Student Conduct
- Human Resources
- Athletics
- President's Office
- Academic Affairs
- Residence Life
- Resource Center (Multicultural Center, Women’s Center, LGBTQIA, etc.)
- Superintendent's Office
- Only use external investigators
- Other (please specify)

Q51: If your Title IX investigator has other job duties in addition to investigation, please briefly describe them: [open ended]

Q52: Who does your Title IX investigator(s) report to in the institutional structure?
- Title IX Coordinator
- Title IX Deputy Coordinator
- Other (please specify)

Q53: How often does your Title IX Investigator(s) receive training?
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Annually
Q54: What type of training do(es) your Title IX investigators(s) receive? [check all that apply]
- Internal in-person
- Internal online
- External in-person
- External in-person — Training program (e.g., ATIXA 2-day)
- External online
- Other (please specify)

Q55: What level of ATIXA Training have your Title IX investigator(s) completed?
- None
- Basic Investigator Certification
- At least one Advanced Investigator Certification

Q56: Do your investigators only investigate Title IX cases or other forms of discrimination as well?
- Just Title IX
- Other forms of discrimination as well
- Unsure

Q57: The investigators at your school are best described as:
- Fact finders (make or recommend a finding)
- Fact gatherers (gather information without analysis that informs the decision of another official or entity)
- Other (please specify)

Q58: Is Title IX information, including contact information for the Title IX coordinator, included in your school’s non-discrimination statement?
- Yes, in all versions
- In some versions
- No, not at all

Q59: Does your school have a Title IX-specific website?

Q60: Please select which statements best apply to prevention and training related to sex/gender discrimination at your school [check all that apply]:
- Decentralized in various departments
- Centralized under a prevention office/coordinator
- Run by a committee
- Overseen by the Title IX Coordinator
- Overseen by Campus Safety/Security/Law Enforcement
- Involves a group or groups of students
- Other (please specify)

Q61: Indicate all who have a role in your school’s Title IX-based prevention/training [check all that apply]:
- Title IX Coordinator
- Title IX Deputy Coordinator
- Title IX Investigator
- Victim Advocacy Office
- Health Services
Q62: Does your school have a budget associated with its Title IX office/compliance efforts? Budget refers to all general operating expenses, training, office outreach, etc. (not including salaries).
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q63: If there is an annual formal budget or reoccurring funds allocation, please indicate its range:
- Less than $2,500
- $2,500–$5,000
- $5,00–$10,000
- $10,001–$25,000
- $25,001–$50,000
- $50,001–$75,000
- $75,000–$100,000
- $100,001–$250,000
- $250,001–$500,000
- More than $500,000
- Unsure

Q64: Has your school conducted a student-based climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination within the last two years?
- Yes
- No
- Currently in planning stages
- Unsure

Q65: Has your school conducted an employee-based climate survey specifically related to sex/gender discrimination within the last two years?
- Yes
- No
- Currently in planning stages
- Unsure

Q66: If your school has conducted a climate survey in the last two years, was it:
- Created internally
- Created in tandem by internal and external sources
- Created externally
Q67: If your school has conducted a climate survey in the last two years, was it:
- Administered internally
- Administered in tandem by internal and external sources
- Administered externally

Q68: If your school conducted a climate survey, please identify the topics/areas covered [check all that apply]:
- Dating violence
- Domestic violence
- Stalking
- Sexual harassment
- Sexual violence
- Sex/gender discrimination
- Other (please specify)

Q69: Sexual assault advocates for victims at your school are [check all that apply]:
- Made available through an agreement with a community agency
- Employed by my school
- Not available
- At least in part, trained student advocates
- Unsure

Q70: If your school offers sexual assault advocates, has the administration designated them as confidential (not considered mandated reporters to anyone)?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q71: Does your school have the same Title IX investigation and resolution process for students as it does for employees?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q72: Does your school have a mission/vision statement for its Title IX efforts?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- No Applicable

Q73: Does your school have a procedure, policy or protocol for the role and responsibilities of the Title IX office?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q74: Does your school have a Title IX mandatory reporting policy or statement for employees?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q75: Does your school’s Title IX office have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to Title IX with the
campus law enforcement/security department?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure
☐ No Applicable

Q76: Does your school have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to Title IX with the local law enforcement department(s)?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure

Q77: Does your school have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to Title IX with local advocacy organizations/agencies/shelters?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure

Q78: Does your college or university have a written procedure to determine which process applies to a cross-constituent complaint if more than one process could apply?(A cross-constituent complaint is where a member of one group on campus such as a staff member is alleged to have committed a policy violation against a member of another group, such as a student.)
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure
☐ No Applicable

Q79: The Title IX resolution process at your school is best described as [check all that apply]:
☐ The pure civil rights model (An investigator or investigators present a finding for implementation to the Title IX coordinator or other senior administrator. No formal or adversarial hearing takes place.)
☐ Civil rights model with an appeal (An investigator or investigators present a finding for implementation to the Title IX coordinator or other senior administrator. The finding can be appealed to one or more levels of appeal.)
☐ Hybrid Fact Gatherer (An investigation without finding precedes a hearing, the decision of which may be subject to appeal.)
☐ Hybrid Fact Finder (An investigation renders a finding, and is then subject to a hearing and appeal.)
☐ Traditional due process hearing model (The hearing is used as the investigation, the finding and sanctions from which are typically subject to appeal.)
☐ ATIXA One Policy, One Process model
☐ Other unified model, but not the ATIXA One Policy, One Process model (A unified pure civil rights or hybrid approach for all faculty, students and staff.)
☐ Other (please specify)

Q80: Please select which method your school primarily uses to track its Title IX- related caseload:
☐ Written records only
☐ An Excel spreadsheet
☐ An Access database
☐ An internally-developed database
☐ The Maxient database
☐ The Simplicity database
☐ The Pave Systems database
Q81: If your school uses Hearing Boards/Officers/Panels to resolve Title IX complaints, how often do they receive training?
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Annually
- Not Applicable
- Other (please specify approximate total number of hours provided annually)

Q82: If your school uses Hearing Boards/Panels to resolve Title IX complaints, which of the following groups are eligible to serve as panelists? [check all that apply]
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Administration
- Not Applicable
- Other (please specify)

Q83: If your school provides an appeal in Title IX complaints, how often do appeals officers receive training?
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Annually
- Not Applicable
- Other (please specify approximate total number of hours provided annually)

Q84: Does your school use the preponderance of evidence (more likely than not) evidence standard for all Title IX-related complaints, including appeals?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q85: Are key elements of the resolution process at your school (e.g., pre-hearing preparation, hearing participation, and/or appeals opportunities) offered equitably to all students and employees in Title IX-covered cases?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q86: Has your school developed a publication (brochure or pamphlet) for all victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking?
- Yes
- No
- In production
- Unsure

Q87: If your school has developed a publication (brochure or pamphlet) for all victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking, please select what information it contains [check all that apply]:

□ Adirondack Solutions database
□ Other (please specify)
Campus resources
Local community resources
No contact orders
Filing a report with campus police
Filing a report with local police
Title IX coordinator
Deputy Title IX coordinators
Campus counseling resources
Campus victim advocates
Campus health resources
Living accommodations
Work accommodations
Coursework accommodations
Travel accommodations
Hospitals and medical attention
SANE nurses/the importance of evidence collection
Crime victim advocates (locally, not campus-based)
Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR)

Q88: [Colleges/Universities only] At your school are students and employees in all cases involving sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence and stalking afforded the same rights to an advisor of their choosing, including an attorney, in all meetings related to resolution of the complaint?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Not a college or university
The Journal of Campus Title IX Compliance and Best Practices (Campus IX)
is published annually by ATIXA, the Association of Title IX Administrators, both in print and online.
For more information, please visit https://atixa.org/resources/campus-ix-journal/.

ATIXA provides a professional association for school and college Title IX coordinators and administrators
and brings them into professional collaboration to explore best practices, share resources, and advance the worthy goal
of gender equity in education.